

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM: Evaluation of the CSR – Texas High School Initiative and Improving Teaching and Learning Grant Programs



Evaluation Project Staff

Andrew Moellmer
Allen Seay
Eishi Adachi
Karen Herbert
Linda Adams
Amie Rapaport
Jessica Sievert

Program Staff

Cory Green
Elvis Shoaf
Rebecca Ligon
Barbara Knaggs
Chris Cesar
Donnell Bilsky

**Office for Planning, Grants and Evaluation
Texas Education Agency**

January 2007

1

Table of Contents

List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	v
Executive Summary	vi
I. Introduction and Background	1
Research on Comprehensive School Reform	2
Comprehensive School Reform in Texas	3
Research Questions.....	5
Research Methods and Data Sources.....	6
II. Profile of CSR Students.....	8
Number of Students Served.....	9
Student Demographics.....	9
III. CSR Program Implementation.....	12
Implementation of Program Components.....	12
Barriers and Facilitators to Program Implementation.....	14
Stakeholder Buy-In and District Support	16
IV. CSR Program Impacts	18
Professional Development.....	18
Parent and Community Involvement	19
Classroom Practices	21
Perceived Change in Student Achievement	22
Impact of CSR Programs on TAKS Performance.....	23
CSR-THSI Grant Program.....	24
CSR-ITL Cycle 3 Grant Program	27
Summary of Program Impacts	28
V. Concluding Observations.....	30
References Cited.....	32
Appendix A: Survey Instruments	A-1
Appendix B: Comparison Campus Selection	B-1
Appendix C: Statistical Analysis Methods and Results.....	C-1

List of Tables

Table 1.	Survey Response Rates by Grant Program and Respondent Group.....	7
Table 2.	Number of Students Served by CSR Programs.....	9
Table 3.	Distribution of Students Enrolled at CSR–Funded Campuses by Grade Level – 2005–06 School Year.....	10
Table 4.	Demographic Characteristics of Students Enrolled at CSR-Funded Campuses	11
Table 5.	Percentage of CSR Campuses that Fully Implemented a CSR Component.....	13
Table 6.	CSR Components for which Grantees Received Technical Assistance - THSI.....	14
Table 7.	Perceived Barriers to Successful Program Implementation: Teacher and Principal Perspectives.....	15
Table 8.	Factors Perceived to Facilitate Successful Program Implementation: Teacher and Principal Perspectives.....	16
Table 9.	Support for CSR Programs: The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective.....	17
Table 10.	Types of District Assistance Provided to CSR Campuses	17
Table 11.	Professional Development Provided to Teachers, Staff, and Administrators	18
Table 12.	Percentage of CSR Campuses Implementing Parent and Community Involvement Activities	19
Table 13.	Effect of CSR Programs on Classroom Practices: Teacher and Principal Perspectives.....	21
Table 14.	Effect of CSR Programs on Classroom Practices: The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective.....	22
Table 15.	Perception that CSR Programs Had a Large Impact on Student Performance: The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective	23
Table 16.	Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading and Mathematics at THSI Campuses.....	25
Table 17.	Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading and Mathematics at ITL Cycle 3 Campuses	28
Table B.1.	THSI Program Mean Comparison Between CSR Campus and the Comparison Campus.....	B-2
Table B.2.	ITL Cycle 3 Program Mean Comparison Between CSR Campus and the Comparison Campus.....	B-3
Table C.1.	Results from the Mixed-Model 2006 Reading (THSI).....	C-2
Table C.2.	Results from the Mixed Model 2006 Mathematics (THSI).....	C-2
Table C.3.	Results from the Mixed-Model 2006 Reading (ITL Cycle 3)	C-3
Table C.4.	Results from the Mixed Model 2006 Mathematics (ITL Cycle 3)	C-3

List of Figures

Figure 1. Distribution of THSI Campuses.....	8
Figure 2. Distribution of ITL Cycle 3 Campuses	8
Figure 3. Effect of theTHSI Program on Parent and Community Involvement: Teacher and Principal Perspectives	20
Figure 4. Effect of the ITL Cycle 3 Program on Parent and Community Involvement: Teacher and Principal Perspectives.....	21
Figure 5. Adjusted Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading at THSI Campuses.....	26
Figure 6. Adjusted Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Mathematics at THSI Campuses	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program was first established by Congress in 1998 as a demonstration project for the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), and was reauthorized in 2001 through Title I, Part F of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. CSR programs are intended to foster coherent school-wide improvements in high-poverty, low-achieving schools that cover all aspects of their operations, through curriculum changes, sustained professional development, and enhanced involvement of parents. To achieve these goals, schools are encouraged to examine and include successful, externally-developed models that incorporate well-researched and well-documented designs for school-wide change and that have been replicated with proven results. Models are required to include 11 components related to their design, activities, resources, evaluation, and research base in order to be included in the CSR program.

CSR funds in Texas are distributed through two grant programs. The CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL) grant program was the initial program through which federal funds were distributed to Title I eligible campuses at all grade levels. A total of 85 schools received funds for Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program (ITL Cycle 3), which began implementation on August, 1 2004 and will conclude its third and final year of funding on July 31, 2007. The current evaluation of the ITL Cycle 3 grant program covers the August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2006 period.

The CSR – Texas High School Initiative (THSI) grants began on January 1, 2005 with funding for 84 eligible Title I high schools that were not receiving CSR funds through ITL. This grant program will conclude its third and final year on December 31, 2007. The current evaluation of THSI activities covers the January 1, 2005 to July 31, 2006 period.

Evaluation Results

This evaluation report examines implementation and student outcome data for THSI and ITL Cycle 3 programs. Implementation data included progress reports completed by school principals, as well as surveys of teachers, staff, principals, and external technical

assistance providers (TAPs). Surveys also included information on participants' perceptions of the impact of CSR programs on professional development, classroom practices, student performance, and parent involvement. Student outcome data included Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) performance in reading and mathematics from 2004 to 2006.

Profile of CSR Students

CSR campuses in both grant programs enrolled an average of 863 students per campus (based on 2005-2006 enrollment data, the most recent year of program activities). Compared to statewide averages, a higher percentage of CSR students were Hispanic and classified as economically disadvantaged. The high proportion of students in both grant programs that were classified as economically disadvantaged is an indication that CSR grants are serving the intended student populations, in keeping with the goals of the grant program.

Program Implementation

According to school principals, CSR reforms in both grant programs have achieved high levels of implementation in the majority of the 11 core components of CSR. The only exception was parental/community involvement, which was reported as lagging behind by the highest percentage of school principals.

There was substantial agreement among principals, teachers, and TAPs about the most significant barriers to successful program implementation. A lack of time, poor parent/community involvement, insufficient human resources, and lack of teacher buy-in or support for the programs were commonly cited as key obstacles.

Principals and teachers agreed that the most important facilitators of successful program implementation were support from school administration, training and professional development, support/buy-in from teachers, and adequate financial resources.

Program Impacts

A number of positive program impacts were identified by principals, teachers, and TAPs:

- Professional development is being implemented at high rates and in various formats. Participants are rating professional development received as adequate and valuable;
- Parental/community involvement continues to be difficult to facilitate, though grantee campuses are making efforts;
- Principals and teachers are perceiving positive changes in classroom behaviors among students and on classroom practices. TAPs are perceiving positive changes among teachers.
- Preliminary, long-term impacts are beginning to be observed among THSI campuses. Among those grantee campuses with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged students, analyses of student achievement data indicated:
 - Grantee campuses are outperforming comparison campuses on TAKS reading; and
 - Grantee campuses are outperforming comparison campuses on TAKS mathematics.

Conclusions

Both THSI and ITL Cycle 3 schools seem to have successfully implemented nearly all components of the CSR program. Participants reported that the program had a number of positive effects on their campuses in professional development, classroom practices, and student behavior and performance. The primary difference found between performance of CSR schools and comparison schools, however, was for high schools with large percentages of economically disadvantaged students. The CSR program appears to have been particularly effective in improving reading performance among economically disadvantaged high school students, in line with grant program goals.

Future reports on the CSR program can help to shed light on these and other issues by examining more closely the effect of program implementation on outcomes, including student achievement and changes in school practices. Research on school reform has shown that quality of implementation can vary greatly both within and between schools, and is associated with student learning outcomes. Thus, it is important to understand how quality of implementation is related to student achievement outcomes. Given the

complexity of CSR programs, it is also important to evaluate effects not just for programs as a whole, but also for specific components to identify particular practices that may be useful in improving student outcomes. These issues will be explored further in the next statewide evaluation of CSR programs, which will be conducted by TEA in 2007.

I. Introduction and Background

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program was first established by Congress in 1998 as a demonstration project for the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), and was reauthorized in 2001 through Title I, Part F of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The CSR program was developed to help high-poverty, low-achieving schools address common obstacles to improved student achievement through effective school-wide reform. In FY 2004, Congress allocated approximately \$308 million for schools pursuing comprehensive school reform. A total of \$205 million was appropriated for FY 2005. Appropriations in FY 2006 were allocated only for the National Comprehensive School Reform Clearinghouse¹ and totaled \$1.45 million.

Rather than improving only selective programs or adopting a piecemeal, fragmented approach to reform, CSR programs are intended to foster coherent school-wide improvements that cover all aspects of a school's operations, through curriculum changes, sustained professional development, and enhanced involvement of parents. To achieve these goals, schools are encouraged to examine and include successful, externally-developed models that incorporate well-researched and well-documented designs for school-wide change and that have been replicated with proven results.

The USDE, through Public Law 107-100, requires that a CSR program incorporate the following 11 components in order to be considered a “comprehensive” reform effort utilizing a “scientifically based” approach (USDE, 2005). CSR programs must include:

- Proven **research-based methods** and strategies for student learning, teaching and school management;
- A **comprehensive design** integrating instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement and school management;
- **Professional development** that involves high-quality proven, innovative strategies and provides continuous training;

¹ This was established through award of a contract in FY2006 by the U.S. Department of Education to Learning Point Associates in Naperville, IL, which operates the clearinghouse in partnership with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) in Austin, TX. For more information, see the National Clearinghouse’s website at: <http://www.centerforsri.org>.

- **Measurable goals and benchmarks** for student achievement;
- **Support of school staff for reform**, including teachers, principals, administrators and other school staff;
- **Support provided for staff** through the creation of shared leadership and broad responsibility for reform efforts;
- **Parent and community involvement** in planning, implementing and evaluating reform programs;
- **External assistance** and support provided to teachers for school-wide reform from high-quality external entities;
- **Annual evaluation** of the implementation of the school reforms and student achievement;
- **Coordination of resources** including federal, state, local and private financial and other resources that support and sustain the reform model; and
- Strategies to improve **student achievement** that meet one of the following requirements: the program has to be found, through scientifically-based research, to significantly improve the academic achievement of participating students; or the program has been found to have strong evidence that it will significantly improve the academic achievement of participating students.

Research on Comprehensive School Reform

Because of the complexity of many CSR models and their relative “youth,” much of the literature has focused on program implementation. It is also notable that, because the majority of CSR models are implemented in K-8 sites, little research has been conducted in high schools. Evaluations by the RAND Corporation of New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) programs, most of which are included in the federal CSR program, found that levels of implementation varied considerably, with half the schools studied implementing the programs below targeted levels (Berends et al., 2005).

Factors found to be important for high-quality, coherent implementation included high expectations and support among teachers, small school size, strong and stable principal leadership, clear communication and support from the design teams, and district support. Interestingly, the researchers found that variation in both implementation and student learning outcomes was most variable within schools rather than between schools. While some teachers in these schools were consistently implementing the practices promoted in the models, others in the same schools were not. Student performance in the NASDC

schools was found to be uneven. About half the schools studied made gains relative to average district gains in reading and mathematics.

Evaluations of various CSR programs have found that their impact on student outcomes is often minimal or inconsistent. A meta-analysis of studies of the most widely discussed and disseminated CSR models found that the research base for many of the programs examined in the literature was weak, inconsistent, or potentially biased (Borman et al., 2002). Only three models were found to have statistically significant, positive results based on a large number of independent studies and observations across the United States.

Although research into the effectiveness of CSR models is limited, four critical components that contribute to success of the models have been identified (Borman et al., 2002). Schools that implement a model with the “greatest fidelity” to the model’s prescriptions experience the most positive results. Reforms that are more clearly defined and have more prescriptive designs tend to be implemented more successfully than those that are less clearly defined. Successful reforms utilize strong professional development techniques and have effective follow-up to address teachers’ specific problems. Finally, stakeholders, including parents and community members, have significant “buy-in” in successful reform models.

Prior research conducted by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) confirms these findings on the importance of high levels of component implementation. An evaluation of CSR programs in Texas conducted in 2006 showed that there was a statistically significant correlation between high levels of program implementation and improved student performance on statewide academic assessments (TEA, 2006).

Comprehensive School Reform in Texas

Funding for CSR implementation is targeted toward schools most in need of reform and improvement, such as schools with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students and low student achievement. States receive CSR funding based on their Title I

formulas. TEA awarded grants of \$50,000 to \$150,000 per year to schools whose CSR programs meet the 11 criteria specified by Public Law 107-100.

To facilitate the implementation of these components, Texas schools are utilizing a wide variety of CSR models. Schools have the option of developing their own reform models that include each of the 11 components; however, many schools have turned to external sources for the development and implementation of their particular reform models. External CSR models are developed by a number of entities, including universities, educational service centers, nonprofit corporations, and regional educational laboratories.

Grants were awarded in Texas through two different programs. The CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL) grant program was the initial program through which federal funds were distributed to Title I eligible campuses. Beginning in 2001, CSR funds were distributed to 188 schools for Cycle 2 of the CSR – ITL program.² Another 85 schools received funds in 2004 for Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL (ITL Cycle 3) program, which began implementation on August 1st of that year. This grant program will end on July 31, 2007. The first statewide evaluation of CSR programs covered all years of Cycle 2 program implementation and the first year of program implementation for Cycle 3 (TEA, 2006). The current evaluation for Cycle 3 covers the August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2006 period, when the latest progress report was submitted by grantees.

The CSR – Texas High School Initiative (THSI) grant program was first implemented for the 2004-2005 school year and distributes funds to 84 eligible Title I Part A schools serving high school students.³ THSI grants began implementation on January 1, 2005 and will end on December 31, 2007. The current evaluation for THSI covers the January 1, 2005 through July 31, 2006 period.

Congress did not appropriate funds for CSR beyond FY 2006, and year two funds have been reallocated by TEA to support the third year of program implementation in Texas.

² This was the first set of grantees for which program evaluation was required by federal law. ITL Cycle 2 grantees received four years of funding which ended on June 30, 2005.

³ Campuses serving high school students were not eligible for CSR-THSI funding if they were already receiving CSR funds or if they had been awarded a CSR grant prior to the 2004-05 school year.

Whereas earlier grant cycles received funding for four years, both of the existing grant programs will conclude after their third year of implementation.

Research Questions

This evaluation seeks to answer three broad questions:

- 1) What is the demographic and socioeconomic makeup of the campuses served by THSI and ITL Cycle 3 grant programs?
- 2) To what degree have CSR-funded campuses implemented the various components of their programs; and
- 3) What impact has the CSR program had on changes in campus activities and student performance?

This report is structured around these questions, and follows the outline provided below.

- I. Profile of CSR Students
 - a. How many students are being served at CSR campuses?
 - b. What are the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of students at CSR campuses?
- II. Program Implementation
 - a. To what degree have each of the 11 CSR components been implemented at grantee campuses?
 - b. What barriers and facilitators of program implementation have been encountered/experienced?
 - c. How have school districts supported CSR grantees to help implement their programs?
- III. Program Impacts
 - a. What are the perceived effects of CSR programs on:
 - professional development opportunities
 - parental/community involvement
 - classroom practices

- student achievement

- b. What objective impacts have CSR reforms had on student academic achievement?

Research Methodology and Data Sources

Quantitative methods were employed to address each of the research questions. Results from grantee progress reports and surveys were compiled and analyzed to determine level of program implementation and perceived impacts of the program on campus climate and student performance outcomes. Statistical analyses were conducted to determine whether a relationship exists between CSR program participation and student performance outcomes.

Data for the evaluation were derived from a number of different sources. Program implementation ratings were collected through grantee progress reports submitted by campus principals. Data on perceptions of program impacts were derived from surveys of principals, teachers, staff, and technical assistance providers (TAPs) from CSR grantee campuses, and from grantee progress reports. Objective data for statistical analyses of student academic performance were obtained from TEA administrative databases (Public Education Information System (PEIMS) student-level files, Student Assessment data).

Surveys were administered between March 1, 2006 and May 15, 2006 to gather information on stakeholder perspectives regarding implementation experiences and the effectiveness of CSR programs at grantee campuses. Resources for Learning, LLC, was contracted by TEA to conduct the online surveys (see Appendix A for complete survey instruments)⁴ in addition to qualitative research on selected CSR programs.⁵ The survey

⁴ Survey instruments used in this evaluation are proprietary and were adapted by Resources for Learning, LLC from instruments developed by The Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at the University of Memphis. See S.M. Ross and M.J. Alberg. *Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire* (Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis, 1999), E.D. Butler and M.J. Alberg. *School Climate Inventory* (Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis, 1989), and S.M. Ross, L.J. Smith and M.J. Alberg. *School Observation Measure* (Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis, 1989).

⁵ Resources for Learning's evaluation report can be accessed through the following web link: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/progeval/CampusWide/CSR_Report_v5Electronic_final.pdf

questionnaire was administered to TAPs, principals, and teachers and staff at all of the CSR grantee sites. Grant administrators were asked to encourage participation among potential respondents. Table 1 presents survey response rates for each CSR grant program.

Table 1
Survey Response Rates by Grant Program and Respondent Group

GrantProgram	Respondent Group	Population	Responses	Response Rate
THSI	TAPs	84	62	73.8%
	Principals	84	70	83.3%
	Teachers & Staff	5,692	2,064	36.3%
ITL Cycle 3	TAPs	85	55	64.7%
	Principals	85	72	84.7%
	Teachers & Staff	4,870	1,993	40.9%

Source: TAP, Principal, and Teacher/Staff Surveys, TEA Administrative Data (PEIMS Teacher Data Files), Texas Education Agency, 2006.


II. Profile of CSR Students

As previously indicated, TEA implemented two separate CSR grant programs: 1) the THSI program, which is intended to serve primarily high school campuses; and 2) the ITL program, which is intended to serve all eligible campuses.


As depicted in Figure 1, the vast majority (80%) of THSI campuses funded through CSR were traditional public high schools, with the remaining 20% comprised of all-grade campuses (e.g., schools enrolling students in Grades K-12 and open-enrollment charter schools enrolling students in Grades 9-12).

The largest proportion of ITL Cycle 3 grantees were primary/elementary school campuses (42%). Middle schools accounted for just over one-third (35%) of these grants, 15% of the ITL grantees were high school campuses, and 7% were open-enrollment charter schools (Figure 2). It is not surprising that representation of high schools is low among ITL grantees since the majority of these campuses are served through the THSI program.

**Figure 1
Distribution of THSI
Campuses**



**Figure 2
Distribution of ITL Cycle 3
Campuses**



Source: TEA Administrative Data (PEIMS Student-Level Files), Texas Education Agency, 2006.

*Number of Students Served*⁶

CSR programs in Texas enrolled 147,595 students during the 2005-2006 school year, with an average of 863 students per campus. Average enrollment was 964 students for THSI campuses and 762 students for ITL Cycle 3 campuses (Table 2).

Table 2
Number of Students Served by CSR Programs

Program	Number of Campuses	Total Number of Students Served	Average Number of Students per CSR Campus
THSI	84	82,861	964
ITL Cycle 3	85	64,734	762
Total	171	147,595	863

Source: TEA Administrative Data (PEIMS Student-Level Files), Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Student Demographics

Approximately 96% of all students attending THSI campuses were enrolled in Grades 9-12, consistent with the purposes of the grant program (Table 3).

It appears that ITL Cycle 3 grants tended to focus more heavily on the middle school grades (grades 6 through 9). Compared to statewide enrollment counts by grade, ITL Cycle 3 campuses had a lower percentage of students in Kindergarten through Grade 5 (47% statewide, compared to 31% of CSR students) and a higher proportion of students in Grades 6 through 9 (31% statewide, compared to 48% of CSR students). There was little difference in the proportion of CSR students enrolled in Grades 10-12 compared to statewide averages.

⁶ Descriptive data on student enrollment and student demographics are based on TEA administrative data from 2005-2006, the most recent year of program activities.

Table 3
Distribution of Students Enrolled at CSR–Funded Campuses by Grade Level –
2005-06 School Year

Grade Level	THSI		ITL Cycle 3		State
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent	Percent
Early Education	23	0.0%	361	0.6%	0.6%
Pre-Kindergarten	683	0.8%	2,726	4.2%	4.0%
Kindergarten	314	0.4%	3,001	4.6%	7.7%
Grade 1	242	0.3%	3,344	5.2%	7.9%
Grade 2	248	0.3%	3,321	5.1%	7.6%
Grade 3	191	0.2%	3,085	4.8%	7.5%
Grade 4	192	0.2%	3,072	4.7%	7.3%
Grade 5	196	0.2%	3,731	5.8%	7.5%
Grade 6	183	0.2%	6,398	9.9%	7.2%
Grade 7	362	0.4%	8,335	12.9%	7.5%
Grade 8	719	0.9%	7,640	11.8%	7.4%
Grade 9	25,797	31.1%	8,113	12.5%	8.7%
Grade 10	21,373	25.8%	4,802	7.4%	7.1%
Grade 11	16,851	20.3%	3,622	5.6%	6.2%
Grade 12	15,487	18.7%	3,183	4.9%	5.7%
Total	82,861	100%	64,734	100%	100%

Source: TEA Administrative Data (PEIMS Student-Level Files), Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Compared to statewide averages, a higher percentage of CSR students were Hispanic and classified as economically disadvantaged (Table 4). At THSI campuses, 58% of students were Hispanic (compared to 45% statewide) and 67% were economically disadvantaged (compared to 56% statewide). At ITL Cycle 3 campuses, 66% of students were Hispanic and 76% were economically disadvantaged. The high proportion of students in both grant programs that were classified as economically disadvantaged is an indication that CSR grants are serving the intended student populations, in keeping with the goals of the grant program.

Table 4
Demographic Characteristics of Students Enrolled at CSR-Funded Campuses

Characteristic	THSI		ITL Cycle 3		State
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent	Percent
Hispanic	48,053	58.0%	42,641	65.9%	45.3%
White	16,932	20.4%	11,785	18.2%	36.5%
African-American	16,715	20.2%	9,374	14.5%	14.7%
Asian	1,016	1.2%	782	1.2%	3.1%
Native American	145	0.2%	152	0.2%	0.3%
Economically Disadvantaged	55,231	66.7%	49,333	76.2%	55.5%
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	9,361	11.3%	13,964	21.6%	15.7%
Total	82,861	100%	64,734	100%	100%

Source: TEA Administrative Data (PEIMS Student-Level Files), Texas Education Agency, 2006.

III. CSR Program Implementation

The full benefits of a grant program cannot be realized until implementation reaches a high level throughout the campus. For this evaluation, school principals were asked to rate their school's level of implementation for each of the 11 CSR components. Though possibly biased in a positive direction, these ratings present a picture of how far along the schools were in their implementation of CSR reforms.

Grant implementation is not expected to roll out seamlessly. In fact, a critical and required component of CSR reform efforts is to provide grantees with resources and support through Technical Assistance Providers (TAPs). TAPs were surveyed as part of this evaluation to assess the degree to which grantees utilized TAPs to help them implement their programs. Thus, the following section presents information on principals' perspectives on level of implementation achieved, and the reform areas in which TAPs provided assistance. These responses are based upon program implementation since grant award (i.e., covering the January 1, 2005 to July 31, 2006 period for THSI and the August 1, 2004 to July 31, 2006 period for ITL Cycle 3).

Implementation of Program Components

Principals ranked each CSR component on a scale of one to five, with one indicating no implementation and five indicating full implementation (i.e., the component is evident across the campus and fully developed in accordance with the program description in the grant application). In the review of findings to follow, it is important to remember that ITL Cycle 3 programs were implemented six months earlier than THSI programs, and that ITL Cycle 3 campuses were primarily elementary and middle schools, while THSI campuses were primarily high schools. These factors will likely have an impact on the program implementation results.

Overall, across both programs, all of the CSR components received high implementation ratings, with one exception. At THSI campuses, the largest percentage of principals rated support of school staff for reform, coordination of resources, and student achievement as

highly implemented (see Table 5).⁷ At ITL Cycle 3 campuses, the largest percentage of principals rated support of school staff for reform and student achievement as highly implemented. Parent and community involvement was rated as highly implemented by the smallest percentage of campus principals in both grant programs (59% of THSI principals and 73% of ITL Cycle 3 principals). It is important to note that the higher implementation ratings for ITL Cycle 3 campuses may reflect the fact that they have had more time to implement their programs than THSI campuses.

Table 5
Percentage of CSR Campuses that Fully Implemented a CSR Component

Component	THSI	ITL Cycle 3
Support of School Staff for Reform	88%	95%
Coordination of Resources	89%	93%
Student Achievement	88%	95%
Professional Development	86%	93%
Goals and Benchmarks	84%	94%
Support Provided for Staff	84%	92%
Annual Evaluation	86%	93%
External Assistance	88%	93%
Research-Based Methods	80%	94%
Comprehensive Design	82%	94%
Parent and Community Involvement	59%	74%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: Results are based on progress reports submitted by 53 THSI grantees and 81 ITL Cycle 3 grantees.

These relatively high reports of component implementation are consistent with the perspectives of TAPs, who provide on-site technical assistance to campuses implementing CSR programs. TAPs indicated which CSR components they assisted schools with by indicating “yes” or “no” for each survey item.⁸ TAPs provided much assistance across a wide range of reform areas. As can be seen in Table 6, more than 83% of TAPs provided assistance to grantees in 9 of the 11 CSR components across both programs. Only the areas of parent and community involvement and coordination of resources to sustain school reform reflected somewhat lower levels of TAP assistance.

⁷ For purposes of this analysis, a rating of 4 or 5 on a five-point scale resulted in a determination that the program component was “highly implemented.”

⁸ Approximately 86% of TAPs in both grant programs indicated that they were the “original” TAP for their school since grant implementation began.

Table 6
CSR Components for which Grantees Received Technical Assistance - THSI

Component	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
Comprehensive design	83.9%	96.3%
Continuing professional development	93.5%	92.6%
Coordination of resources to sustain school reform	74.2%	77.4%
Evaluation of school reform implementation and results	80.0%	92.6%
External support and assistance	91.9%	96.3%
Generating school faculty, administrators, and staff support	88.7%	85.2%
Measurable goals and benchmarks	87.1%	92.6%
Parental and community involvement	75.8%	70.4%
Research-based methods and strategies	93.5%	96.4%
Shared leadership and teamwork	87.1%	83.3%
Strategies to improve student academic achievement	96.7%	96.2%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Barriers and Facilitators to Program Implementation

Understanding the barriers and facilitators that grantees encountered in their implementation of the CSR program is vital to improving future education initiatives, developing new grant programs, and identifying needed technical assistance for grantees during the course of a grant. Principals, teachers, and staff indicated whether they had experienced a number of barriers and facilitators since they received their grant award. Supplementing this information, TAPs reported the extent to which they had observed barriers being encountered at the campuses they served over the same period. Ratings were provided on a one to four point scale, where one represents that the barrier was “not at all” observed and four represents that the barrier was observed to “a great extent.” Results below present the percentage of TAPs indicating a barrier was experienced from a moderate to great extent.

Interestingly, although THSI and ITL Cycle 3 programs served different grade levels, the most common barriers and facilitators experienced by teachers and principals in both grant programs were the same. Insufficient time to implement the program was reported as the most common barrier by far, with approximately 60% of teachers and principals reporting this to be a problem. The lack of parental/community involvement was also identified as a significant barrier by teachers and principals alike (Table 7).

Table 7
Perceived Barriers to Successful Program Implementation:
Teacher and Principal Perspectives

Response	THSI Percent		ITL Cycle 3 Percent	
	Teacher	Principal	Teacher	Principal
Lack of assessment/use of data	7.8%	2.9%	6.7%	4.2%
Lack of curriculum focus	11.1%	8.6%	8.8%	9.7%
Lack of evaluation of progress	10.7%	8.6%	8.2%	5.6%
Lack of or insufficient financial resources	30.3%	12.9%	27.2%	19.4%
Lack of or insufficient human resources	23.1%	24.3%	17.2%	23.6%
Lack of or insufficient support from district administration	12.7%	12.9%	12.0%	11.1%
Lack of or insufficient support from school administration	11.8%	1.4%	10.3%	2.8%
Lack of or insufficient support from TEA	7.8%	7.1%	8.4%	8.3%
Lack of or insufficient support from teachers	17.8%	10.0%	15.4%	13.9%
Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from Educational Service Centers (ESCs)	7.4%	10.0%	9.6%	15.3%
Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from provider	5.6%	5.7%	6.5%	11.1%
Lack of or insufficient technology	17.3%	12.9%	14.8%	12.5%
Lack of or insufficient time	60.1%	68.6%	57.1%	63.9%
Lack of or insufficient training/professional development	17.5%	12.9%	15.0%	8.3%
Lack of or poor parent/community involvement	35.7%	37.1%	32.3%	29.2%
Lack of reform focus	10.4%	10.0%	8.9%	5.6%
Lack of whole school focus	20.6%	15.7%	17.4%	13.9%

Source: Teacher/Staff Surveys, Principal Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

These perspectives on critical program implementation barriers were shared by the TAPs. Lack of staff time (40% for THSI and 43% for ITL Cycle 3) and lack of parental/community involvement (28% for THSI and 29% for ITL Cycle 3) were most commonly reported as barriers by TAPs.

Support from school administration, training/professional development, and support /buy-in from teachers were cited as the most important facilitators of program implementation among teachers and staff across both grant programs. Support/buy-in from teachers and support from school administration were the two most commonly cited facilitators among principals. THSI principals indicated adequate financial resources as particularly important, while ITL Cycle 3 principals noted training and professional development as important to program implementation (see Table 8).

Table 8
Factors Perceived to Facilitate Successful Program Implementation:
Teacher and Principal Perspectives

Response	THSI Percent		ITL Cycle 3 Percent	
	Teacher	Principal	Teacher	Principal
Academic standards	33.0%	58.6%	43.7%	75.0%
Adequate financial resources	25.3%	81.4%	32.7%	73.6%
Adequate human resources	22.2%	37.1%	26.8%	44.4%
Adequate time	20.8%	32.9%	27.4%	26.4%
Assessment/use of data	32.8%	52.9%	44.1%	76.4%
Curriculum focus	38.9%	61.4%	49.7%	76.4%
Evaluation of progress	28.9%	44.3%	40.3%	73.6%
Parent/community involvement	17.1%	31.4%	26.2%	52.8%
Reform focus	25.1%	54.3%	23.6%	66.7%
Support/buy-in from teachers	53.0%	85.7%	56.8%	87.5%
Support from district administration	45.7%	78.6%	46.0%	76.4%
Support from school administration	66.4%	82.9%	69.5%	87.5%
Support from TEA	14.5%	41.4%	20.4%	44.4%
Technical assistance from ESCs	13.7%	22.9%	15.1%	20.8%
Technical assistance from Local Education Agency (LEA)-selected provider	9.3%	31.4%	10.2%	37.5%
Technology	39.7%	65.7%	52.9%	56.9%
Training/professional development	53.8%	77.1%	61.4%	81.9%
Whole school focus	34.0%	60.0%	41.5%	66.7%

Source: Teacher/Staff Surveys, Principal Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

These data show that CSR-funded campuses had reached high reported levels of implementation given the relatively short period of time that had elapsed since the grants were awarded (18 months for THSI and 24 months for ITL Cycle 3). Those most involved in carrying out the CSR programs experienced common obstacles, but also cited important facilitators that are in line with those reported in previous research. These findings point to the importance of professional development, staff buy-in, district support, and financial resources for achieving program goals.

Stakeholder Buy-In and District Support

As previously noted, stakeholder buy-in and district support were identified by principals and teachers as important facilitators for successful implementation. TAPs provided information on perceived support for the CSR programs among district and campus staff since grant implementation began, and on the types of support that school districts provided to help grantees implement their programs. In line with principal and teacher

perceptions, the majority (70%) of TAPs across both grant programs observed a high level of support (measured as a scale score of 7 or above on a 10 point scale) among teachers, staff, the school board, and school and district administrators for the CSR program (Table 9). In some cases, as many as 90% of TAPs observed such support.

Table 9
Support for CSR Programs:
The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective

Category	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
District Administrator support for the CSR Program	77.7%	81.1%
School Administrator support for the CSR Program	89.9%	87.1%
School Board support for the CSR Program	70.6%	74.4%
Staff Support for the CSR Program	83.6%	84.0%
Teacher Support for the CSR Program	79.6%	90.6%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

District support came in various forms. As shown in Table 10, the most common type of help provided by TAPs was assistance with grant applications (80%). Approximately half of the TAPs reported that district staff attended staff development events associated with the grant, and notified schools about the grant award. The least common type of district support noted among these campuses was updating the district webpage with information about grant implementation (7%).

Table 10
Types of District Assistance Provided to CSR Campuses

Category	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
District provided staff to support grant activities	48.4%	43.6%
District staff attended staff development events associated with the grant	53.2%	54.5%
District staff helped the school apply for the grant	80.6%	80.0%
Superintendent invited the principal to present to the board about the grant	24.2%	21.8%
The district notified all schools about the grant award	46.8%	58.2%
The district supplemented the grant with additional funds	29.0%	32.7%
The district updated grant implementation information on its web page	6.5%	18.2%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Approximately 51% of THSI TAPs and 79% of ITL Cycle 3 TAPs indicated observing high levels of community support for the CSR program (as measured by a score of 7 or greater on a 10 point scale).

IV. CSR Program Impacts

Some of the desired short-term impacts of the CSR program are to increase opportunities for professional development, increase parental/community involvement, and change classroom practices. It is expected that changes in these areas will lead to progress toward the long-term goal of improving student achievement.

Professional Development

The provision of professional development opportunities is a required component of CSR programs. Table 11 shows the percentage of CSR campuses that had provided different types of professional development since their grants programs were first implemented. The majority of THSI campuses provided professional development through whole school training (82%), workshops (79%), conferences (77%), and coaching/mentoring (74%). Study groups were the least common type of professional development, provided by only 38% of the campuses.

The majority of ITL Cycle 3 campuses provided professional development through workshops (89%), whole school training (84%), coaching/mentoring (84%), and conferences (69%). Only 44% of the schools used study groups to provide professional development.

Table 11
Professional Development Provided to Teachers, Staff, and Administrators

Activity	THSI Percent	Cycle 3 Percent
Coaching/Mentoring	74.2%	83.6%
Conferences	77.4%	69.1%
Study Groups	38.7%	43.6%
Whole school training	82.3%	83.6%
Workshops	79.0%	89.1%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

More than 63% of responding teachers, staff and principals across both grant programs indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that professional development received was adequate and valuable. These findings are encouraging, indicating that professional

development is being provided at high rates under the CSR program, and to a degree of quality resulting in high levels of satisfaction by participants.

Parent and Community Involvement

As mentioned previously, parent and community involvement in campus programs is difficult to achieve, but is also known to be critical to the success of school reform. At THSI campuses, parent and community involvement activities had not been routinely offered at the majority of campuses, with at most between 20% and 40% of campuses implementing parental involvement strategies (Table 12).

A higher percentage of ITL Cycle 3 campuses had offered parent involvement activities, with at least 50% offering opportunities for involvement in school improvement activities, decision-making, and volunteer programs. This is a promising finding, given the fact that these programs have been in effect for two years. It is possible that, as THSI programs become more fully implemented, a higher percentage of campuses will offer these kinds of activities. However, the difference in campus types served by these grants may be a factor.

Table 12
Percentage of CSR Campuses Implementing
Parent and Community Involvement Activities

Activity	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
Home visits	22.6%	14.5%
Parent education or training	37.1%	49.1%
Parent involvement in evaluating school improvement activities	25.8%	30.9%
Parent involvement in implementing school improvement activities	38.7%	58.2%
Parent/community volunteer programs	32.3%	52.7%
Parental involvement in decision-making	40.3%	56.4%


Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

The difficulty of involving parents and the community was evidenced by teacher, staff, and principal responses to survey items addressing the impact of such activities on the campus. Less than one-third of teachers and staff at THSI grantee campuses agreed or strongly agreed that parental and/or community involvement had increased since their

grant programs were first implemented (Figure 3). This percentage was somewhat higher among ITL Cycle 3 campuses. This result is in line with the previous finding that a higher percentage of these campuses were offering parental/community involvement activities.


Principals were more likely than teachers to agree that parents were more involved in the school’s education program because of the CSR grant, and that community support for their school had increased since CSR had been implemented. This positive perception on the part of principals was consistently higher than teachers’ perceptions across both THSI and ITL Cycle 3 programs (Figure 4).

Figure 3
Effect of the THSI Program on Parent and Community Involvement
Teacher and Principal Perspectives



Source: Teacher/Staff and Principal Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Figure 4
Effect of the ITL Cycle 3 Program on Parent and Community Involvement
Teacher and Principal Perspectives



Source: Teacher/Staff and Principal Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Classroom Practices

Changing classroom practices is an essential element of whole school reform. As with parent/community involvement, school principals reported a more positive impact of the reforms on classroom practices than did teachers and staff. Approximately 70% or more of principals in both grant programs agreed or strongly agreed that the CSR program was having a positive impact on classroom practices (Table 13).

Table 13
Effect of CSR Programs on Classroom Practices
Teacher and Principal Perspectives

Response	THSI Percent		ITL Cycle 3 Percent	
	Teacher	Principal	Teacher	Principal
Our CSR program has changed classroom learning activities a great deal	38.1%	76.80%	57.7%	77.80%
Students are using technology more effectively because of our CSR program	43.5%	69.10%	60.2%	70.00%
Students in this school are more enthusiastic about learning than they were before we became a CSR school	32.1%	67.10%	53.0%	74.30%

Source: Teacher/Staff and Principal Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

TAPs also provided their perspectives on the perceived impact of CSR reforms on classroom practices (Table 14). Unlike principals and teachers, TAPs were asked about perceived impacts on teacher behavior in the classroom. For both grant programs, a high percentage of TAPs responded that CSR was having a moderate to significant impact on teacher behavior in the classroom. The most common areas of perceived impact were aligning instructional practices with program goals, teaching to standards, and cooperating and team teaching.

Table 14
Effect of CSR Programs on Classroom Practices:
The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective

Response	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
Increased use and integration of technology in instruction	43.7%	71.7%
Lessons are more interdisciplinary and project-based	50.0%	75.0%
Teachers aligned their instructional practices with the program goals	70.9%	81.5%
Teachers are teaching to standards	69.0%	81.5%
Teachers cooperate and team teach more often	56.4%	81.1%
Teachers developed and use authentic assessments	48.2%	64.1%
Teachers use worksheets and workbooks to a lesser extent	45.4%	71.2%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Perceived Change in Student Achievement

It is important to determine if program participation impacted students in measurable ways. A key consideration is whether school staff and administrators perceive the program to be beneficial. A smaller proportion of teachers than principals reported that student achievement was positively impacted by CSR programs. Substantial proportions of THSI (48%) and ITL Cycle 3 (65%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed that student achievement was positively impacted by CSR. Over three-quarters (76%) of THSI principals and 83% of ITL Cycle 3 principals reported student achievement improvements resulting from the CSR program.

TAPs provided greater detail about a range of perceived program impacts on students. As Table 15 shows, TAPs were very positive in their perceptions of program impacts. Across all possible areas of program impacts about which TAPs were surveyed, large

percentages of ITL Cycle3 and THSI TAPs felt that the CSR program was having a large impact on student achievement results.

Table 15
Perception that CSR Programs Had a Large Impact on Student Performance:
The Technical Assistance Provider Perspective

Response	THSI Percent	ITL Cycle 3 Percent
Students are more interested in learning	60.0%	82.7%
Students are more motivated	64.0%	84.9%
Students attend school more regularly	54.6%	70.8%
Students' conduct has improved: fewer disciplinary problems	58.3%	76.7%
Students do their homework more often	39.5%	68.3%
Students have more respect for their teachers	63.3%	79.5%
Students perform better academically on school tests	60.5%	83.4%
Students perform better on standardized tests	57.8%	81.3%
Students' quality of work had improved	58.3%	86.3%

Source: TAP Surveys, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Impact of CSR Programs on TAKS Performance

Because the ultimate goal of school reform is to improve student achievement, it is important to gauge impacts on student outcomes using objective data. Thus, a variety of statistical analyses were employed to explore the relationship between CSR program participation and student performance on TAKS reading and mathematics assessments. All analyses were conducted at the campus level, meaning that student results were aggregated to calculate campus averages.

Whole school reform efforts typically require three to five years of implementation before changes in student outcomes are observable. The analyses presented below are preliminary, in that only 18 to 24 months of implementation have occurred, depending upon the grant program. Significant findings should be interpreted with caution, and lack of significance does not necessarily indicate lack of ultimate success. After more years of implementation, future research can determine program impacts more conclusively.

The THSI grant program and ITL Cycle 3 programs were evaluated separately because the timing of their program implementation periods and the nature of participating

campuses was substantially different between the two programs. For this reason, results for the two grant programs should not be compared.

CSR-THSI Grant Program

The relationship between the THSI grant program and the campus level rate of passing the 2006 TAKS reading assessment was analyzed. To evaluate the performance of the grantee campuses, it is necessary to have a comparison group of campuses similar to the campuses funded through the THSI program. Therefore, comparable campuses to the grantee campuses were selected from Texas public schools that had not participated in the CSR grant program. Comparison campuses were matched to CSR campuses on student demographic variables and 2004 TAKS performance assessed before the CSR program was implemented (see Appendix B for a description of the matching process).

Table 16 shows the average TAKS reading and mathematics passing rates for the THSI group and the comparison group. On average, 74.4% of students at THSI campuses passed the 2004 TAKS reading assessment, compared to an average of 75.5% of students at the comparison group campuses. The matching process revealed similar 2004 TAKS reading performance before CSR implementation began, allowing for detection of possible differences in 2006 TAKS results attributable to CSR implementation.

There was a small difference in TAKS mathematics performance between grantee and comparison campuses before grants were awarded. Both campuses experienced declines in campus passing rates from 2004 to 2006.

Table 16
Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading and Mathematics at THSI Campuses

Group	Reading		Math	
	2004	2006	2004	2006
CSR Program	74.40%	80.37%	54.22%	51.40%
Comparison Group	75.45%	80.08%	56.40%	53.01%

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data. Texas Education Agency, 2006


Note: The number of campuses included in the table and analysis in THSI section is as follows: CSR High School Program (N=78); the comparison group (N=78).

Though the average campus performance on TAKS reading in 2006 did not appear to differ between grantee and comparison campuses, statistical analyses enable evaluators to adjust for important demographic differences and then determine whether there is a systematic relationship between program participation and student achievement.

Adjusting for remaining student demographic differences, an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) revealed an important difference between grantee and comparison campuses with high proportions of economically disadvantaged students. As Figure 5 depicts, CSR grantees outperformed comparison group campuses on TAKS reading when the percentage of economically disadvantaged students was high ($p < .05$). This finding did not hold for campuses with low percentages of economically disadvantaged students (ANCOVA tables are provided in Appendix C).

These results suggest that THSI program participation may have had a positive impact on TAKS reading performance among campuses with the highest concentration of economically disadvantaged students. This is particularly noteworthy given the high threshold used to identify schools with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students (81%). This result aligns with program objectives that focus on improving student achievement at economically disadvantaged campuses.

Figure 5
Adjusted Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading at THSI Campuses




Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data. Texas Education Agency, 2006.
 Note: Low economically disadvantaged is defined as a campus-level economically disadvantaged rate one standard deviation (41%) below the sample mean (61%). Highly economically disadvantaged is defined as a campus with one standard deviation above (81%) the sample mean of campus-level economically disadvantaged student rate. The adjusted mean takes into account variations in demographics and preexisting academic achievement difference in the computation process. The adjusted mean values may be different from actual mean values, which do not take into account these variations.

The same analysis was conducted for TAKS mathematics performance at THSI campuses. Similar to the reading results, THSI campus pass rates were higher than comparison campuses at schools serving high populations of economically disadvantaged students (Figure 6), though this difference did not reach statistical significance (p=.058).⁹ Thus, on both reading and math test performance, some of the CSR campuses are indeed showing gains, relative to peer campuses not receiving grant funds.

⁹ This finding should be interpreted with caution, as the a priori significance rate was set to .05. The direction of effects (i.e. the similarity between results for reading and for math for THSI campuses), and the relatively small sample size (i.e., low power for detecting effects) suggest that this finding is worth noting, despite the .058 level of significance.

Figure 6
Adjusted Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Mathematics at THSI Campuses



Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data. Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: Low economically disadvantaged is defined as a campus-level economically disadvantaged rate one standard deviation (41%) below the sample mean (61%). Highly economically disadvantaged is defined as a campus with one standard deviation above (81%) the sample mean of campus-level economically disadvantaged student rate. The adjusted mean takes into account variations in demographics and preexisting academic achievement difference in the computation process. The adjusted mean values may be different from actual mean values, which do not take into account these variations.

CSR-ITL Cycle 3 Grant Program

ANCOVAs were performed separately for ITL Cycle 3 campuses. Because the participating campuses consist of a mix of elementary, middle, high and all-grade schools, the school type composition must be taken into account in the selection of the comparison group. Matching methods were again employed to select an appropriate comparison group (see Appendix B for a description of the matching process). Given the differing grade levels enrolled between the grant programs, it is important not to compare results in this section with those on the THSI program presented above.

Table 17 shows campus average passing rates for TAKS reading and mathematics. The comparison campus matching strategy was successful for TAKS reading results, though small differences existed at baseline (2004) for TAKS mathematics results.

Table 17
Mean Passing Rate of TAKS Reading and Mathematics at ITL Cycle 3 Campuses

Group	Reading		Math	
	2004	2006	2004	2006
CSR Program	79.58%	81.35%	68.30%	67.46%
Comparison Group	80.17%	81.17%	70.11%	68.02%

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data. Texas Education Agency, 2006

Note: The number of campuses included in the table and analysis in this section is as follows: ITL Cycle 3 Program (N=83); the comparison group (N=83).

After adjusting for demographic variations and prior academic achievement differences, these analyses did not detect a statistical difference in 2006 TAKS reading performance or TAKS mathematics performance between CSR-ITL campuses and the comparison group. The results suggest that that program impacts on student performance are not yet observable at ITL Cycle 3 campuses (ANCOVA tables are available in Appendix C).

Summary of Program Impacts

So far, after two years of grant implementation for ITL Cycle 3 campuses, and close to a year and half of implementation of THSI campuses, program impacts are promising. The main findings presented herein include:

- Professional development is being implemented at high rates and in various formats. Participants rated the professional development they received favorably, with high ratings of adequacy and value.
- Parent and community involvement continues to be difficult to increase, though grantee campuses are making efforts.
- Teachers/staff and principals are perceiving positive changes in classroom behaviors among students, and TAPs are perceiving positive changes in the classroom among teachers.

- Preliminary long-term impacts are beginning to be observed among THSI campuses, though only among campuses with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged students. Further research will reveal the long-term impact on student achievement as these results often take years to emerge.

Concluding Observations

Both Texas High School Initiative (THSI) and Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL) schools were reasonably successful in implementing all components of the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program. Participants also reported that the program had a number of positive effects on their campuses in professional development, classroom practices, and student behavior and performance. Teachers and principals reported that they received professional development from their technical assistance providers (TAPs), and that the training they received was valuable. Teachers in CSR schools also reported improvement in aligning instruction to standards; using interdisciplinary curriculum, project-based lessons, technology, and authentic assessments; and collaboration with colleagues on instruction. Students were reported to be more motivated and interested in learning, to have better attendance, and to have improved in academic achievement.

However, teachers and principals reported little improvement in parent involvement and community support for their reform efforts. At the same time, lack of parent and community support was reported to be a barrier to successful implementation of their CSR programs. Difficulties experienced by schools in this area may have been due to weak or ineffective implementation of parent and community involvement programs, particularly in THSI schools.

Program impacts are beginning to be observed in student TAKS performance, though only at THSI campuses, and only for those grantee campuses with higher proportions of economically disadvantaged students. This is promising, as the programs have only been implemented for a short period of time, and already student gains are beginning to be detected. The CSR program appears to have been particularly effective in improving literacy skills (as identified by passing rates on the 2006 TAKS reading exam) among disadvantaged high school students. This finding is particularly noteworthy given the high threshold used to identify schools with high percentages of economically disadvantaged students (81%).

Teachers, principals, and TAPs reported that insufficient time was a barrier to successful implementation of their CSR programs. Other school improvement initiatives have found that at least 5 years of implementation are needed to establish new practices and realize gains in student achievement (Berends et al., 2005, Bryk et al., 1997). It is possible that stronger effects on student learning will be seen over a longer period of time. Indeed, participants perceived student learning in their schools to be improving and that the program was having a positive influence on their instructional programs.

It is also important to note that insufficient financial and human resources were perceived by many participants as barriers to successful implementation. The success of whole-school reform programs often hinge on the capacity of schools and personnel to understand and fully engage in reform efforts (Hatch, 2001). Thus, problems such as faculty turnover and lack of support for reform (noted by both principals and technical assistance providers) can limit schools' ability to consistently and appropriately enact new practices and programs. Insufficient financial resources can also translate to inadequate instructional materials or a lack of staff time available for overseeing implementation of reforms (SEDL, 2006).

Future reports on the CSR program and other state-funded campus reform programs (e.g., Texas High School Redesign and Restructuring Grant Program) can help to shed light on these and other issues by examining more closely the effect of program implementation on outcomes, including student achievement and changes in school practices. Research on school reform has shown that quality of implementation can vary greatly both within and between schools. Implementation is also associated with student learning outcomes (Berends et al., 2005). Thus, it is important to understand how quality of implementation is related to student achievement outcomes. These issues will be explored further in the next statewide evaluation of CSR programs, which will be conducted in 2007.

REFERENCES CITED

- Berends, M., Bodilly, S., & Kirby, S.N. (2005). Reforming whole schools: Challenges and complexities. In J. Petrovich & A.S. Wells (Eds.), *Bringing equity back: Research for a new era in American educational policy* (pp. 161-194). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Borman, G. D., Hewes, G.M., Overman, L.T., and Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*. Baltimore, MD: CRESPAR/Johns Hopkins University, Retrieved on March 28, 2005, from <http://csos.jhu.edu/CRESPAR/techReports/Report59.pdf>
- Bryk, A.S., Kerbow, D., & Rollow, S. (1997). Chicago school reform. In D. Ravitch & J.P. Vitteritti (Eds.), *New schools for a new century: The redesign of urban education* (pp. 164-200). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Butler, E.D. and M.J. Alberg. (1989) *School Climate Inventory*. Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis
- Hatch, T.C. (2001). It takes capacity to build capacity. *Education Week*, 20, 44, 47.
- Ross, S.M., L.J. Smith and M.J. Alberg (1989). *School Observation Measure*. Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis
- Ross, S.M. and M.J. Alberg (1999). *Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire*. Memphis, TN: The Center for Research in Educational Policy, The University of Memphis
- Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (2006). *SEDL's Working Systemically model: Final report*. Austin, TX: Author.
- Texas Education Agency (2006). *Comprehensive School Reform: Evaluation of the CSR – High School Initiative and Improving Teaching and Learning Grant Programs*. Austin, TX. Author.

Appendix A
Survey Instruments

**COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM
PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire is part of an evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform grants the Texas Education Agency awarded to 170 schools, including your school. The Comprehensive School Reform grants promote school-wide improvements through activities such as curriculum changes, sustained professional development, and increased involvement of parents to enable students to meet challenging academic standards.

1. School Name: _____
2. District Name: _____
3. County-District-Campus Number: _____

V. I. Demographic Information

1. Is your school: **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**

1 Elementary School	5 K-8
2 Middle School	6 K-12
3 Junior High School	7 7-12
4 Senior High School	8 Other

2. How many years of experience do you have as a school principal? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**

1 5 years or less	2 6-10 years	3 11-15 years
4 16-20 years	5 More than 20 years	

3. How many years of experience do you have as a principal at this school? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**

1 Less than one year	2 1-5 years	3 6-10 years
4 11-15 years	5 More than 15 years	

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**

1 Bachelor's Degree		
2 Master's Degree		
3 Law Degree, Doctoral Degree, Other, Please Specify		_____

5. What is your age group? (**SELECT ONE ONLY**)

- 1 29 years or younger
- 2 30-39 years
- 3 40-49 years
- 4 50-59 years
- 5 60 years or older

6. What is your gender?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

VI. II. Comprehensive School Reform

Using a 5-point scale ranging from 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, to 5-strongly disagree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items as they are currently reflected in your school. *If you have no basis on which to respond, leave the item blank.*

Response categories: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, don't know/not sure

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
1. I have a thorough understanding of this school's comprehensive school reform (CSR) program.						
2. I have received adequate initial and ongoing professional development/training for CSR program implementation.						
3. Professional development provided by external trainers, model developers, and/or designers has been valuable.						
4. Guidance and support provided by our school's external facilitator, support team, or other state-identified resource personnel have helped our school implement its program.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
5. Teachers are given sufficient planning time to implement our program.						
6. Materials (books and other resources) needed to implement our CSR program are readily available.						
7. Our school has sufficient faculty and staff to fully implement this program.						
8. Because of our CSR program, technological resources have become more available.						
9. Because of our CSR program, teachers use textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets less than they used to for basic skills or content area instruction.						
10. Our comprehensive school reform program has changed classroom learning activities a great deal.						
11. Students in most classes spend at least two hours per school day in interdisciplinary or project-based work.						
12. Students in most classes spend much of their time working in cooperative learning teams.						
13. Students are using technology more effectively because of our CSR program.						
14. Student achievement has been positively impacted by CSR.						
15. Students in this school are more enthusiastic about learning than they were before we became a CSR school.						
16. Because of CSR, parents are more involved in the educational program of this school.						
17. Community support for our school has increased since comprehensive school reform has been implemented.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
18. Students have higher standards for their own work because of our school's program.						
19. Teachers are more involved in decision making at this school than they were before we implemented comprehensive school reform.						
20. Our program adequately addresses the requirements of students with special needs.						
21. Because of our school's program, teachers in this school spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instruction.						
22. Teachers in this school are generally supportive of our CSR program.						
23. Because of CSR, interactions between teachers and students are more positive.						
24. The elements of our CSR program are effectively integrated to help us meet school improvement goals.						
25. As a school staff, we regularly review implementation and outcome benchmarks to evaluate our progress.						
26. Our school has a plan for evaluating all components of our comprehensive school reform program.						
27. My school receives effective assistance from external partners (e.g., university, businesses, agencies, etc.).						
28. I am satisfied with the Federal, State, local and private resources that are being coordinated to support our CSR program.						

29. Think of your experience with your school's comprehensive reform program; which of the following helped facilitate program implementation? (**SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**)

- 1 Support from district administration
- 2 Support from school administration
- 3 Support (buy-in) from teachers
- 4 Support from TEA
- 5 Adequate human resources
- 6 Adequate financial resources
- 7 Adequate time resources
- 8 Training/professional development
- 9 Technical assistance from ESCs
- 10 Technical assistance from LEA-selected provider
- 11 Technology
- 12 Whole school focus
- 13 Reform focus
- 14 Curriculum focus
- 15 Academic standards
- 16 Assessment/use of data
- 17 Evaluation of progress
- 18 Parent/community involvement
- 19 Other (**DESCRIBE**): _____

29a. Which three of these do you consider the main facilitators of your school's comprehensive reform program implementation? (**RECORD NUMBERS FROM Q.29**)

____ _

30. Again, think of your experience with your school's comprehensive reform program; what barriers did you and other teachers or administrators experience in implementing the program? (**SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**)

- 1 Lack of or insufficient support from district administration
- 2 Lack of or insufficient support from school administration
- 3 Lack of or insufficient support from teachers
- 4 Lack of or insufficient support from TEA
- 5 Lack of or insufficient human resources
- 6 Lack of or insufficient financial resources
- 7 Lack of or insufficient time
- 8 Lack of or insufficient training/professional development
- 9 Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from ESCs
- 10 Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from LEA-selected provider
- 11 Lack of or insufficient technology
- 12 Lack of whole school focus
- 13 Lack of reform focus
- 14 Lack of curriculum focus

- 15 Lack of assessment/use of data
- 16 Lack of evaluation of progress
- 17 Lack of or poor parent/community involvement
- 18 Other: (DESCRIBE): _____

30a. Which three of these are the biggest barriers? (RECORD NUMBERS FROM Q.30)

III. School Climate

Using a 5-point scale ranging from 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, to 5-strongly disagree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items as they are currently reflected in your school. *If you have no basis on which to respond, leave the item blank.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
1. The faculty and staff share a sense of commitment to the school goals.						
2. Low achieving students are given opportunity for success in this school.						
3. School rules and expectations are clearly communicated.						
4. Teachers use a variety of teaching strategies.						
5. Community businesses are active in this school.						
6. Students are encouraged to help others with problems.						
7. Faculty and staff feel that they make important contributions to this school.						
8. The administration communicates the belief that all students can learn.						
9. Varied learning environments are provided to accommodate diverse teaching and learning styles.						
10. The school building is neat, bright, clean, and comfortable.						
11. Parents actively support school activities.						
12. Parents are treated courteously when they call or visit the school.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
13. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced.						
14. School employees and students show respect for each other's individual differences.						
15. Teachers at each grade (course) level design learning activities to support both curriculum and student needs.						
16. Teachers are encouraged to communicate concerns, questions, and constructive ideas.						
17. Students share the responsibility for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.						
18. Parents are invited to serve on school advisory committees.						
19. Parent volunteers are used whenever possible.						
20. The administration encourages teachers to be creative and to try new methods.						
21. Students are held responsible for their actions.						
22. All students in this school are expected to master basic skills at each grade level.						
23. Student discipline is administered fairly and appropriately.						
24. The administration encourages teachers to be creative and to try new methods.						
25. Student misbehavior in this school does not interfere with the teaching process.						
26. Students participate in solving school-related problems.						
27. Students participate in classroom activities regardless of their sex, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or academic ability.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
28. Faculty and staff cooperate a great deal in trying to achieve school goals.						
29. An atmosphere of trust exists among the administration, faculty, staff, students, and parents.						
30. Student tardiness or absence from school is not a major problem.						
31. Teachers are active participants in the decision making at this school.						
32. Information about school activities is communicated to parents on a consistent basis.						
33. Teachers use curriculum guides to ensure that similar subject content is covered within each grade.						
34. The principal (or administration) provides useful feedback on staff performance.						
35. Teachers use appropriate evaluation methods to determine student achievement.						
36. The administration does a good job of protecting instructional time.						
37. Parents are often invited to visit classrooms.						
38. Teachers are proud of this school and its students.						
39. This school is a safe place in which to work.						
40. Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty.						
41. Pull-out programs do not interfere with basic skills instruction.						
42. The principal is an effective instructional leader.						
43. Teachers have high expectations for all students.						
44. Teachers, administrators, and parents assume joint responsibility for student discipline.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
45. The goals of this school are reviewed and updated regularly.						
46. Student behavior is generally positive in this school.						
47. The principal is highly visible throughout the school.						
48. Teachers use a wide range of teaching materials and media.						
49. People in this school really care about each other.						

50. Please provide any additional comments you may have pertaining to your school's climate:

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE!

**COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM
TEACHER/STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire is part of an evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform grants the Texas Education Agency awarded to 170 schools, including your school. The Comprehensive School Reform grants promote school-wide improvements through activities such as curriculum changes, sustained professional development, and increased involvement of parents to enable students to meet challenging academic standards.

1. School Name: _____
2. District Name: _____
3. County-District-Campus Number: _____

VII. I. Demographic Information

1. Is your school: (SELECT ONE ONLY)

3	Elementary School	5	K-8
4	Middle School	6	K-12
3	Junior High School	7	7-12
4	Senior High School	8	Other

2. Indicate your position at your school. (SELECT ONE ONLY)

1	Teacher
2	Counselor (SKIP TO Q.5)
3	Librarian (SKIP TO Q.5)
4	Other: (DESCRIBE) _____

3. What grade level(s) do you teach? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

PK K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

4. What content areas do you teach: (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

1	Reading/Language Arts
2	Mathematics
3	Science
4	Social Studies
5	Other: (DESCRIBE) _____

5. How many years of experience do you have as a school employee (teacher or staff)? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**
- | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---|--------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | 5 years or less | 2 | 6-10 years | 3 | 11-15 years |
| 4 | 16-20 years | 5 | More than 20 years | | |
6. How many years of experience do you have as an employee at this school? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**
- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|--------------------|---|------------|
| 1 | Less than one year | 2 | 1-5 years | 3 | 6-10 years |
| 4 | 11-15 years | 5 | More than 15 years | | |
7. What is the highest level of education you have completed? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**
- | | |
|---|--|
| 4 | Bachelor's Degree |
| 5 | Master's Degree |
| 6 | Law Degree, Doctoral Degree, Other, Please Specify _____ |
8. What is your age group? **(SELECT ONE ONLY)**
- | | |
|----|---------------------|
| 6 | 29 years or younger |
| 7 | 30-39 years |
| 8 | 40-49 years |
| 9 | 50-59 years |
| 10 | 60 years or older |
9. What is your gender?
- | | |
|---|--------|
| 3 | Male |
| 4 | Female |

II. Comprehensive School Reform

Using a 5-point scale ranging from 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, to 5-strongly disagree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items as they are currently reflected in your school. *If you have no basis on which to respond, leave the item blank.*

Response categories: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, don't know/not sure

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
1. I have a thorough understanding of this school's comprehensive school reform (CSR) program.						
2. I have received adequate initial and ongoing professional development/training for CSR program implementation.						
3. Professional development provided by external trainers, model developers, and/or designers has been valuable.						
4. Guidance and support provided by our school's external facilitator, support team, or other state-identified resource personnel have helped our school implement its program.						
5. Teachers are given sufficient planning time to implement our program.						
6. Materials (books and other resources) needed to implement our CSR program are readily available.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
7. Our school has sufficient faculty and staff to fully implement this program.						
8. Because of our CSR program, technological resources have become more available.						
9. Because of our CSR program, I use textbooks, workbooks, and worksheets less than I used to for basic skills or content area instruction.						
10. Our comprehensive school reform program has changed classroom learning activities a great deal.						
11. Students in my class spend at least two hours per school day in interdisciplinary or project-based work.						
12. Students in my class spend much of their time working in cooperative learning teams.						
13. Students are using technology more effectively because of our CSR program.						
14. Student achievement has been positively impacted by CSR.						
15. Students in this school are more enthusiastic about learning than they were before we became a CSR school.						
16. Because of CSR, parents are more involved in the educational program of this school.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
17. Community support for our school has increased since comprehensive school reform has been implemented.						
18. Students have higher standards for their own work because of our school's program.						
19. Teachers are more involved in decision making at this school than they were before we implemented comprehensive school reform.						
20. Our program adequately addresses the requirements of students with special needs.						
21. Because of our school's program, teachers in this school spend more time working together to develop curriculum and plan instruction.						
22. Teachers in this school are generally supportive of our CSR program.						
23. Because of CSR, interactions between teachers and students are more positive.						
24. The elements of our CSR program are effectively integrated to help us meet school improvement goals.						
25. As a school staff, we regularly review implementation and outcome benchmarks to evaluate our progress.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
26. Our school has a plan for evaluating all components of our comprehensive school reform program.						
27. My school receives effective assistance from external partners (e.g., university, businesses, agencies, etc.).						
28. I am satisfied with the Federal, State, local and private resources that are being coordinated to support our CSR program.						

29. Think of your experience with your school's comprehensive reform program; which of the following helped facilitate program implementation? (**SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**)

- 1 Support from district administration
- 2 Support from school administration
- 3 Support (buy-in) from teachers
- 4 Support from TEA
- 5 Adequate human resources
- 6 Adequate financial resources
- 7 Adequate time
- 8 Training/professional development
- 9 Technical assistance from ESCs
- 10 Technical assistance from LEA-selected provider
- 11 Technology
- 12 Whole school focus
- 13 Reform focus
- 14 Curriculum focus
- 15 Academic standards
- 16 Assessment/use of data
- 17 Evaluation of progress
- 18 Parent/community involvement
- 19 Other (**DESCRIBE**): _____

29a. Which three of these do you consider the main facilitators of your school's comprehensive reform program implementation? (**RECORD NUMBERS FROM Q.29**)

30. Again, think of your experience with your school's comprehensive reform program; what barriers did you and other teachers or administrators experience in implementing the program? (**SELECT ALL THAT APPLY**)

- 5 Lack of or insufficient support from district administration
- 6 Lack of or insufficient support from school administration
- 7 Lack of or insufficient support from teachers
- 8 Lack of or insufficient support from TEA
- 5 Lack of or insufficient human resources
- 6 Lack of or insufficient financial resources
- 7 Lack of or insufficient time
- 8 Lack of or insufficient training/professional development
- 9 Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from ESCs
- 10 Lack of or insufficient technical assistance from LEA-selected provider
- 11 Lack of or insufficient technology
- 12 Lack of whole school focus
- 13 Lack of reform focus
- 14 Lack of curriculum focus
- 15 Lack of assessment/use of data
- 16 Lack of evaluation of progress
- 17 Lack of or poor parent/community involvement
- 18 Other: (**DESCRIBE**): _____

30a. Which three of these are the biggest barriers? (**RECORD NUMBERS FROM Q.30**)

____ _

III. School Climate

Using a 5-point scale ranging from 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-neutral, 4-disagree, to 5-strongly disagree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following items as they are currently reflected in your school. *If you have no basis on which to respond, leave the item blank.*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
50. The faculty and staff share a sense of commitment to the school goals.						
51. Low achieving students are given opportunity for success in this school.						
52. School rules and expectations are clearly communicated.						
53. Teachers use a variety of teaching strategies.						
54. Community businesses are active in this school.						
55. Students are encouraged to help others with problems.						
56. Faculty and staff feel that they make important contributions to this school.						
57. The administration communicates the belief that all students can learn.						
58. Varied learning environments are provided to accommodate diverse teaching and learning styles.						
59. The school building is neat, bright, clean, and comfortable.						
60. Parents actively support school activities.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
61. Parents are treated courteously when they call or visit the school.						
62. Rules for student behavior are consistently enforced.						
63. School employees and students show respect for each other's individual differences.						
64. Teachers at each grade (course) level design learning activities to support both curriculum and student needs.						
65. Teachers are encouraged to communicate concerns, questions, and constructive ideas.						
66. Students share the responsibility for keeping the school environment attractive and clean.						
67. Parents are invited to serve on school advisory committees.						
68. Parent volunteers are used whenever possible.						
69. The administration encourages teachers to be creative and to try new methods.						
70. Students are held responsible for their actions.						
71. All students in this school are expected to master basic skills at each grade level.						
72. Student discipline is administered fairly and appropriately.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
73. Teachers often provide opportunities for students to develop higher-order skills.						
74. Student misbehavior in this school does not interfere with the teaching process.						
75. Students participate in solving school-related problems.						
76. Students participate in classroom activities regardless of their sex, ethnicity, religion, socioeconomic status, or academic ability.						
77. Faculty and staff cooperate a great deal in trying to achieve school goals.						
78. An atmosphere of trust exists among the administration, faculty, staff, students, and parents.						
79. Student tardiness or absence from school is not a major problem.						
80. Teachers are active participants in the decision making at this school.						
81. Information about school activities is communicated to parents on a consistent basis.						
82. Teachers use curriculum guides to ensure that similar subject content is covered within each grade.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
83. The principal (or administration) provides useful feedback on staff performance.						
84. Teachers use appropriate evaluation methods to determine student achievement.						
85. The administration does a good job of protecting instructional time.						
86. Parents are often invited to visit classrooms.						
87. Teachers are proud of this school and its students.						
88. This school is a safe place in which to work.						
89. Most problems facing this school can be solved by the principal and faculty.						
90. Pull-out programs do not interfere with basic skills instruction.						
91. The principal is an effective instructional leader.						
92. Teachers have high expectations for all students.						
93. Teachers, administrators, and parents assume joint responsibility for student discipline.						
94. The goals of this school are reviewed and updated regularly.						
95. Student behavior is generally positive in this school.						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Not Sure
96. The principal is highly visible throughout the school.						
97. Teachers use a wide range of teaching materials and media.						
98. People in this school really care about each other.						

50. Please provide any additional comments you may have pertaining to your school's climate:

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE!

**COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. Please record the name of the school and district to which you have been providing technical assistance for the comprehensive school reform (CSR) grant program:
Campus Name: _____
District Name: _____

Note: **IF YOU ARE PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL, PLEASE COMPLETE A SEPARATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH SCHOOL**

PLEASE COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE BY APRIL 28, 2006!

2. When did you begin providing CSR-related technical assistance to the school (Month/Year)? _____
- 2a. Were you the original technical assistance provider on the CSR grant for this school or did you take the position over from another provider?
- 1 Original technical assistance provider
 - 2 Took over from another provider
3. Approximately how many hours of technical assistance have you provided per year to the school since you started working with this school on implementing the CSR grant? (**INDICATE NUMBER OF HOURS PER YEAR FOR THE SPECIFIC GRANT TYPE**)

CSR-High School Grant:

Year 1 (1/1/05-12/31/05): _____

Year 2 (1/1/06-12/31/06): _____

CSR-Improving Teaching and Learning Grant:

Year 1: (7/1/04-6/30/05): _____

Year 2 (7/1/05-7/31/06): _____

4. What is the **primary** Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) model or program this school is implementing? (**SELECT ONE ONLY**)
- 1 Accelerated Schools
 - 2 America's Choice
 - 3 ATLAS Communities
 - 4 Coalition of Essential Schools
 - 5 Community for Learning
 - 6 Co-nect

- 7 Core Knowledge
 - 8 Different Ways of Knowing
 - 9 Direct Instruction Model
 - 10 Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound
 - 11 First Things First
 - 12 High Schools That Work
 - 13 High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to Education
 - 14 Literacy Collaborative
 - 15 Middle Start
 - 16 Modern Red SchoolHouse
 - 17 More Effective Schools
 - 18 Onward to Excellence
 - 19 Quantum Learning
 - 20 QuEST
 - 21 School Development Program
 - 22 School Renaissance
 - 23 Success For All/Roots & Wings
 - 24 Talent Development High School with Career Academies
 - 25 Talent Development Middle School
 - 26 Turning Points
 - 27 Urban Learning Center
 - 28 Combination of different models
 - 29 Other (**PLEASE DESCRIBE**):
-

5. Comprehensive School Reform has 11 components, listed below. At what stage of implementation is this school? Please rate each component on a 0 to 4 point scale, where “0 – not implementing,” “1 – Planning,” “2 – Piloting,” “3 – Implementing,” and “4 – Fulfilling.”

0—Not Implementing. No evidence of the strategy.

1—Planning. The school is planning to or preparing to implement.

2—Piloting. The strategy is being partially implemented with only a small group of teachers or students involved.

3—Implementing. The majority of teachers are implementing the strategy, and the strategy is more fully developed in accordance with descriptions by the team.

4—Fulfilling. The strategy is evident across the school and is fully developed in accordance with the design teams’ descriptions. Signs of “institutionalization” are evident.

- 1 The program uses effective, research-based methods and strategies
- 2 The program uses comprehensive design for effective school functioning that aligns the school’s curriculum, technology, and professional development into a school-wide reform plan
- 3 The program provides continuing professional development to teachers and staff

- 4 The program has measurable goals and benchmarks
- 5 The program has the support of school faculty, administrators, and staff
- 6 The program provides support for teachers and staff through shared leadership and teamwork
- 7 The program provides for parental and community involvement in planning and implementing school improvement activities
- 8 The school utilizes high quality external support and assistance
- 9 The program includes a plan to evaluate implementation of the school reforms and the results
- 10 The program identifies how federal, state, and local resources will be used to coordinate services to support and sustain school reform
- 11 The program includes strategies to improve student academic achievement

6. Please check whether or not you have assisted the school with each of the following CSR components. **(INDICATE YES OR NO FOR EACH COMPONENT)**

	Yes	No
Research-based methods and strategies	1	2
Comprehensive design	1	2
Continuing professional development	1	2
Measurable goals and benchmarks	1	2
Generating school faculty, administrators, and staff support	1	2
Shared leadership and teamwork	1	2
Parental and community involvement	1	2
External support and assistance	1	2
Evaluation of school reform implementation and results	1	2
Coordination of resources to sustain school reform	1	2
Strategies to improve student academic achievement	1	2

7. How did you gather information from the school and the district on their implementation of the CSR grant? **(SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)**

- 1 School visits
- 2 Classroom observations
- 3 Interviews with district administrators
- 4 Interviews with school administrators
- 5 Interviews with teachers and staff
- 6 Interviews with students
- 7 Teacher and staff surveys
- 8 Student surveys
- 9 Compilation and review of assessment data
- 10 Other: **(PLEASE DESCRIBE):** _____

8. How would you rate board, district administration, school administrator, teacher, and staff support for the CSR program? Use the following scale where “1” refers to “Not at all supportive,” “10” refers “Very supportive,” and “0” refers to “Unsure/Don’t Know (DK).” (SELECT ONE NUMBER FOR EACH)

	Not At All Unsure/ Supportive					Very Supportive				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
School Board	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
District Administration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
School Administrator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9. Which of the following describe the types of support the district provided to the school in implementing the CSR program? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 District staff helped the school apply for the grant
- 2 District staff attended staff development associated with the grant
- 3 The district notified all schools about the grant award
- 4 The district web page has updates about grant implementation
- 5 The district supplemented the grant with additional funds
- 6 The superintendent invited the principal to give a presentation to the Board about the grant
- 7 District provided staff to support grant activities
- 8 Don’t know/Not sure
- 9 Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE): _____

10. Based on your experience with the CSR program at this school, are each of the following resources allocated by the school sufficient for the effective implementation of the grant? (SELECT ONE NUMBER FOR EACH. IF NO RESOURCES WERE ALLOCATED, SELECT “0”)

	Yes	No	Unsure/ Don’t Know	Did Not Allocate Resource
Appropriate materials	1	2	3	0
Staffing	1	2	3	0
Planning time	1	2	3	0

13. Have these changes been made by all teachers, at all grade levels, and across all content areas?

	All Teachers		All Grade Levels		All Content Areas	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Teachers are teaching to standards	1	2	1	2	1	2
Teachers aligned their instructional practices with the program goals	1	2	1	2	1	2
Increased use and integration of technology in instruction	1	2	1	2	1	2
Teachers use worksheets and workbooks to a lesser extent	1	2	1	2	1	2
Lessons are more interdisciplinary and project-based	1	2	1	2	1	2
Teachers cooperate and team teach more often	1	2	1	2	1	2
Teachers developed and use authentic assessments	1	2	1	2	1	2
Other	1	2	1	2	1	2

13a. If not all teachers, about what percent of teachers have made these changes? _____

13b. If not all grade levels, at what grade level(s) have these changes been made: **(SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)**

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

13c. If not all content areas: in which content area(s) were changes made? **(SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)**

- 1 Reading/ English Language Arts
- 2 Mathematics
- 3 Social Studies
- 4 Science
- 5 Other **(PLEASE DESCRIBE)**:

14. In your judgment, to what extent has the CSR program **affected students** in each of the following areas? If you don't know, please leave the item blank. (SELECT ONE NUMBER FOR EACH)

	Not At All	A Little	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Students are more interested in learning	1	2	3	4
Students are more motivated	1	2	3	4
Students do their homework more often	1	2	3	4
Students' quality of work has improved	1	2	3	4
Students attend school more regularly	1	2	3	4
Students' conduct has improved: fewer disciplinary problems	1	2	3	4
Students perform better academically on school tests	1	2	3	4
Students perform better on standardized tests	1	2	3	4
Students have more respect for their teachers	1	2	3	4

15. In your judgment, to what extent has the CSR program had an impact **on students overall**? (SELECT ONE ONLY)

- 1 Not at all
- 2 A little
- 3 To a moderate extent
- 4 To a great extent

16. In your judgment, to what extent has the CSR program **affected teachers** in each of the following areas? If you don't know, please leave the item blank. (SELECT ONE NUMBER FOR EACH)

	Not At All	A Little	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Teachers have become more motivated	1	2	3	4
Teachers show greater enthusiasm in class	1	2	3	4
Teachers work more often in teams	1	2	3	4
Teachers spend more time planning projects with other teachers	1	2	3	4
Teachers feel a great sense of responsibility for implementing the reform program successfully	1	2	3	4
Teachers are very supportive of the school reform effort	1	2	3	4
Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE): _____				

17. To what extent has the CSR program had an impact **on teachers overall** (SELECT

ONE ONLY)

- 1 Not at all
- 2 A little
- 3 To a moderate extent
- 4 To a great extent

18. What types of professional development did the school provide to teachers, staff, and administrators in connection with the CSR grant? **(SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)**

- 1 Whole school training
- 2 Conferences
- 3 Workshops
- 4 Coaching/Mentoring
- 5 Study groups
- 6 Other **(PLEASE DESCRIBE)**: _____

19. Overall, please assess how helpful this professional development has been to the implementation of the CSR program. Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all helpful” to “10 – very helpful.” **(SELECT ONE ONLY FOR EACH)**

	Not At All								Very	
	Helpful									
Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Administrators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

20. Has the school provided staff development related to the implementation of the CSR program to new teachers?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 Unsure

21. How has the school informed the community about the CSR program it is implementing? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 The principal gave a presentation about the program during Parent Night or at PTO meetings
- 2 The school paper features information and updates about the program and how it will benefit students
- 3 The principal and teachers call on parents and community members to help with program implementation
- 4 The school organized an open house dedicated to the program and invited all parents and community members
- 5 Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE): _____

22. Which of the following describe the type of parental and community involvement activities offered through the CSR program? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

- 1 Home visits
- 2 Parental involvement in decision-making
- 3 Parent education or training
- 4 Parent/community volunteer programs
- 5 Parent involvement in implementing school improvement activities
- 6 Parent involvement in evaluating school improvement activities
- 7 Other (DESCRIBE): _____

23(1). Please indicate how supportive the community has been of the CSR program this school is implementing? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all supportive” to “10 – very supportive.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All									Very
Supportive									Supportive
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

23(2). Please indicate how supportive the school has been of you as the technical assistance provider? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all supportive” to “10 – very supportive.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All									Very
Supportive									Supportive
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

24 (1). To what extent has school management changed to align the school’s curriculum, technology, and professional development because of the CSR program? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all” to “10 – to a great extent.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All										To A Great Extent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

24(2). To what extent has leadership been shared with teachers and staff because of the CSR program? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all” to “10 – to a great extent.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All										To A Great Extent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

24(3). To what extent has the school integrated the CSR program with other programs or efforts? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all” to “10 – to a great extent.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All										To A Great Extent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

24(4). To what extent has the school implemented the CSR program as designed? Use a 10-point scale ranging from “1 – not at all” to “10 – to a great extent.” (SELECT ONE ONLY)

Not At All										To A Great Extent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

25. To what extent has this school experienced the following difficulties or barriers in implementing the CSR program? (SELECT ONE NUMBER FOR EACH)

	Not At All	A Little	Moderate Extent	Great Extent
Lack of teacher buy-in or support of the program	1	2	3	4
Insufficient staff development	1	2	3	4
Lack of district support	1	2	3	4
Lack of parent and community support	1	2	3	4
Inadequate financial resources	1	2	3	4
Lack of staff time	1	2	3	4
Lack of administrative support	1	2	3	4

Lack of coordination with other programs	1	2	3	4
Teacher, staff, and administrator turnover	1	2	3	4
Other (PLEASE DESCRIBE): _____	1	2	3	4

30. Any other comments you wish to make about the CSR program in this school?

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE!

**COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM
IMPLEMENTATION REPORT
SAS-E208-06**

INSTRUCTIONS:

This form is to be completed by each CSR Improving Teaching and Learning grantee campus for activities implemented during the period from **February 1, 2006, through July 31, 2006**. The report is due **Tuesday, August 15, 2006 via postal mail or fax**.

- **Part 1: Signed by the Superintendent and Campus Principal**
- **Part 2: Rating by Campus Principal**
- **Part 3: Signed and Rating by the External Technical Assistance Provider(s)**. If the campus has more than one provider, copy the number of Part 3's as needed, and have each provider complete and sign.

KEY Ratings (rubric) PART 2 and PART 3 (See example below)	
1= No implementation	No evidence of the component.
2= Planning	The school was planning or preparing to implement.
3= Piloting	The component was being partially implemented with only a small group of teachers or students involved.
4= Implementing	The majority of teachers were implementing the component, and the component was more fully developed in accordance with the program description in the application for funds.
5= Fulfilling	The component was evident across the school and was fully developed in accordance with the program description in the application for funds. Signs of institutionalization were evident

EXAMPLE					
County District # & Campus # 123-456-789					
Rating (Check only 1 box)					
1. Research-based Methods	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EXAMPLE

County District # & Campus # 123-456-789

Explanation of Ratings: Administration is implementing new teaching strategies.
 Barriers: New teachers have not had the opportunity for training.
 Facilitators: Staff was open to incorporating new teaching strategies.

CSR Component & Indicators

Use this section as a resource for completing the eleven component ratings found in Parts 2 and 3.

Component	Indicators
1. Research-based Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reform approach is fully implemented according to developer's specifications ▪ Fidelity to reform approach is measured and monitored
2. Comprehensive Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School plan integrates curriculum, instruction, assessment, governance and technology <p>Reform approach involves whole school—across grade levels, subjects, students and teachers</p> <p>Reform approach is connected to state standards and ensures that all children meet the standard</p>
3. Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of staff training in the reform approach ▪ Number of staff receiving training ▪ Staff implementation of instructional strategies is measured ▪ Professional development linked to school goals ▪ Frequency, duration, continuity of professional development activities ▪ Availability of time and resources for staff to participate
4. Goals and Benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measurable goals and benchmarks for student outcomes are specified and data collection and analysis plan exists ▪ Goals are linked to state and district standards ▪ Staff, parents, and community have input into developing goals and benchmarks

Component	Indicators
5. Support of School Staff for Reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of staff involvement (in developing school plans, participating in professional development, implementing reform approach) is measured ▪ Staff members have clearly defined roles & responsibilities related to the reform approach ▪ Procedures are in place to encourage staff support and to train new staff
6. Support Provided for Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of staff morale, school climate ▪ Availability of resources necessary for staff to implement reform approach (materials, training, time) ▪ Level of staff collaboration in planning, implementing reforms, and addressing issues/concerns
7. Parent and Community Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategies developed for parent/community involvement ▪ Level of parent/community participation in developing school plan, implementing reform approach ▪ Quality of parent/community activities and organizations ▪ School strategies address diversity in languages and cultures ▪ Quality of school's communication with parents/community about goals, programs, and outcomes
8. Annual Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comprehensive plan exists to monitor program implementation and student outcomes ▪ Quality of data available to measure implementation and outcomes ▪ School has mechanisms in place to review evaluation results and make changes ▪ Evaluation results are available to school staff, parents, and community
9. External Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of external assistance and type of providers ▪ Amount of assistance provided ▪ Level of assistance provided by model developer

Component	Indicators
10. Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordination of resources from federal, state and local sources ▪ Level and quality of district support
11. Student Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TAKS results disaggregated by appropriate student subgroups ▪ Other student outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) • State-Developed Alternative Assessment • Completion Rate • Dropout Rate • Gold Performance Acknowledgments

COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM—IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

PART 1: Campus and District Information <i>(enter the following information):</i>		
1. COUNTY DISTRICT NUMBER:	6. ENTER THE NAME(S) OF THE Reform Model(s): <i>(Examples: Accelerated Schools, Plato etc.. List the models proposed in the RFA.)</i>	
2. DISTRICT NAME:	Reform Model 1:	EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER(S) NAME (Company Name and/or Individual(s) printed name):
3. DISTRICT PHONE NUMBER:	Reform Model 2:	EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER PHONE NUMBER:
4. CAMPUS NAME:	Reform Model 3:	EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER PHONE NUMBER:
5. CAMPUS PHONE NUMBER:	7. CAMPUS PRINCIPAL NAME:	8. SUPERINTENDENT NAME:
CSR IMPLEMENTATION REPORT—(PAGES 4-13) DUE: AUGUST 15, 2006 RETURN DOCUMENT VIA POSTAL MAIL TO: TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY DIVISION OF NCLB PROGRAM COORDINATION Attention; CSR Program Specialist 1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVE. AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1494	9. CAMPUS PRINCIPAL EMAIL:	10. SUPERINTENDENT EMAIL:
	11. CAMPUS PRINCIPAL SIGNATURE	12. SUPERINTENDENT SIGNATURE:

OR VIA FAX: 512-305-9447

County District # & Campus #

PART 2: RATING BY CAMPUS PRINCIPAL

1. Research-based Methods	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
2. Comprehensive Design	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
3. Professional Development	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	implementation				
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

County District # & Campus #

PART 2: RATING BY CAMPUS PRINCIPAL

4. Goals and Benchmarks	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

5. Support of School Staff for Reform	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No support	2 = Knowledge of implementation	3 = Minimal support	4 = Most support	5= Full staff support & involvement
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
6. Support Provided for Staff	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
County District # & Campus #					
PART 2: RATING BY CAMPUS PRINCIPAL					
7. Parent and Community Involvement	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No support	2 = Knowledge of implementation	3 = Minimal involvement	4 = Mostly involved	5= Full parent & community involvement
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
8. Annual Evaluation	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				

	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
9. External Assistance	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= Not applicable	2 = Has not happened	3 = Just getting started	4 = Occasionally	5= Ongoing & regular
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
County District # & Campus #					
PART 2: RATING BY CAMPUS PRINCIPAL					
10. Resources	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					
11. Student Achievement	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No analysis	2 = Planning analysis	3 = Analysis of some disaggregate groups	4 = Analysis of most disaggregate groups	5= Data used towards programming decisions
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					

PART 3: RATING BY EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER

LEA Name: Campus Name:

1. SEC. 1606. LOCAL USE OF FUNDS.

(a) USES OF FUNDS- A local educational agency or consortium that receives a subgrant under this part shall provide the subgrant funds to schools that are eligible for assistance under part A and served by the agency, to enable the schools to implement a comprehensive school reform program that —

(8) uses high quality external technical support and assistance from an entity that has experience and expertise in schoolwide reform and improvement, which may include an institution of higher education; (<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg13.htm>)

Part 3 is to be completed and signed by the External Technical Assistance Provider(s). If the campus has more than one provider photocopy additional sections of Part 3's as needed, and have each provider complete and sign.

1. External Technical Assistance Provider(s) Name (individual person and/or company names):	
2. Date:	3. External Technical Assistance Provider email address:
4. External Technical Assistance Provider area code + phone number(s):	
5. External Technical Assistance Provider Signature(s):	
County District # & Campus #	

PART 3: RATING BY EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER

1. Research-based Methods	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

2. Comprehensive Design	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

3. Professional Development	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

County District # & Campus #

PART 3: RATING BY EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER

4. Goals and Benchmarks	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

5. Support of School Staff for Reform	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No support	2 = Knowledge of implementation	3 = Minimal support	4 = Most support	5= Full staff support & involvement
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

6. Support Provided for Staff	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

County District # & Campus #

PART 3: RATING BY EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER

7. Parent and Community Involvement	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No support	2 = Knowledge of implementation	3 = Minimal involvement	4 = Mostly involved	5= Full parent & community involvement
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

8. Annual Evaluation	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

9. External Assistance	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box.)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

County District # & Campus #

PART 3: RATING BY EXTERNAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDER

10. Resources	<i>Rating (Check only 1 box)</i>				
	1= No implementation	2 = Planning	3 = Piloting	4 = Implementing	5= Fulfilling
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Ratings:
 Barriers:
 Facilitators:

11. Student Achievement	Rating (Check only 1 box.)				
	1= Not applicable	2 = Has not happened	3 = Just getting started	4 = Occasionally	5= Ongoing & regular
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explanation of Ratings: Barriers: Facilitators:					

B. Comprehensive School Reform - Texas High School Initiative

C. 3rd Progress Report

Please note: This report should be completed by EACH campus participating in the Comprehensive School Reform - High School program. The fiscal agent is responsible for ensuring that each campus participating in the program submits an individual campus progress report. Please submit only report per campus. The data collected in this report should include activities from **January 1, 2006 through July 31, 2006.**

Unfortunately, because of the program used to collect data, you cannot fill out part of the report and save it to come back later and make modifications before submitting. Therefore, it is recommended that you print out a hard copy of the report, complete it in paper form, and then sit down at the computer to enter the information and submit it.

This report is due to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) no later than 5:00PM on August 30, 2007.

Section 1: Organizational and Contact Information	
District name:	<input type="text"/>
Campus name:	<input type="text"/>
County-District-Campus number:	<input type="text"/>
NOGA ID number:	<input type="text"/>

Contact Information for Person Completing Report	
First name:	<input type="text"/>
Last name:	<input type="text"/>
Title:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone:	<input type="text"/>
Email:	<input type="text"/>

Contact Information for Authorized Official

First name:	<input type="text"/>
Last name:	<input type="text"/>
Title:	<input type="text"/>
Telephone:	<input type="text"/>
Email:	<input type="text"/>
Date submitted:	<input type="text"/>

Section 2: Model Used

Please select the primary CSR model that your school is implementing. If it is not listed, select "other" and specify the model name.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/> If other please specify and explain:
<input type="text"/>	

If applicable, please select the secondary CSR model that your school is implementing. If it is not listed, select "other" and specify the model name.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/> If other please specify and explain:
<input type="text"/>	

If applicable, please select the tertiary CSR model that your school is implementing. If it is not listed, select "other" and specify the model name.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="button" value="▼"/> If other please specify and explain:
<input type="text"/>	

Section 3: Overall CSR Grant Progress

KEY for Ratings	
1 = No implementation	No evidence of the component.
2 = Planning	The school was planning or preparing to implement.
3 = Piloting	The component was being partially implemented with only a small group of teachers or students involved.
4 = Implementing	The majority of teachers were implementing the component, and the component was more fully developed in accordance with the program description in the application for funds.
5 = Fulfilling	The component was evident across the school and was fully developed in accordance with the program description in the application for funds. Signs of institutionalization were evident

Component	Indicators
1. Research-based Methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reform approach is fully implemented according to developer's specifications ▪ Fidelity to reform approach is measured and monitored
2. Comprehensive Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ School plan integrates curriculum, instruction, assessment, governance and technology ▪ Reform approach involves whole school—across grade levels, subjects, students and teachers ▪ Reform approach is connected to state standards and ensures that all children meet the standard
3. Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of staff training in the reform approach ▪ Number of staff receiving training ▪ Staff implementation of instructional strategies is measured ▪ Professional development linked to school goals ▪ Frequency, duration, continuity of professional development activities ▪ Availability of time and resources for staff to participate
4. Goals and Benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Measurable goals and benchmarks for student outcomes are specified and data collection and analysis plan exists ▪ Goals are linked to state and district standards ▪ Staff, parents, and community have input into developing goals and benchmarks
5. Support of School Staff for Reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of staff involvement (in developing school plans, participating in professional development, implementing reform approach) is measured ▪ Staff members have clearly defined roles & responsibilities related to the reform approach ▪ Procedures are in place to encourage staff support and to train new staff


Component	Indicators
6. Support Provided for Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of staff morale, school climate ▪ Availability of resources necessary for staff to implement reform approach (materials, training, time) ▪ Level of staff collaboration in planning, implementing reforms, and addressing issues/concerns
7. Parent and Community Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategies developed for parent/community involvement ▪ Level of parent/community participation in developing school plan, implementing reform approach ▪ Quality of parent/community activities and organizations ▪ School strategies address diversity in languages and cultures ▪ Quality of school's communication with parents/community about goals, programs, and outcomes
8. Annual Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comprehensive plan exists to monitor program implementation and student outcomes ▪ Quality of data available to measure implementation and outcomes ▪ School has mechanisms in place to review evaluation results and make changes ▪ Evaluation results are available to school staff, parents, and community
9. External Assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of external assistance and type of providers ▪ Amount of assistance provided ▪ Level of assistance provided by model developer
10. Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coordination of resources from federal, state and local sources ▪ Level and quality of district support
11. Student Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TAKS results disaggregated by appropriate student subgroups ▪ Other student outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) State-Developed Alternative Assessment Completion Rate Dropout Rate Gold Performance Acknowledgments

Please rate your school's implementation of each CSR component in terms of: a) progress made on implementation and b) meeting your project timelines from August 1, 2006 through December 31, 2006.


Research-based Methods

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and a horizontal scrollbar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.


Comprehensive Design

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Professional Development

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Goals and Benchmarks

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.

Barriers:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.


Facilitators:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable area for text input.


Support of School Staff for Reform

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Support Provided for Staff

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom.

Barriers:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom.


Facilitators:

An empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It includes a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom.


Parent and Community Involvement

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Annual Evaluation

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


External Assistance

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a scroll bar on the right side and a horizontal scroll bar at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Resources

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling

Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.


Student Achievement

- 1 = No implementation
- 2 = Planning
- 3 = Piloting
- 4 = Implementing
- 5 = Fulfilling


Explanation of Ratings:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Barriers:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Facilitators:

A large, empty rectangular text box with a light beige background and a thin black border. It features a vertical scrollbar on the right side and horizontal scrollbars at the bottom, indicating it is a scrollable text area.

Section 4: Curriculum and Instruction

Please indicate the type of curriculum and instruction activities offered from August 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

- Creation of CSR Grant Leadership Team (campus and/or district)
- Campus Self-Assessment (to determine areas for improvement)
- Individual Student Assessments (to reveal curriculum areas that need intervention)
- Upgrading C&I: Teacher curriculum review and improvement projects
- Upgrading C&I: Changes in methods of instruction
- TEKS alignment
- Other #1 (please specify)
- Other #2 (please specify)
- Other #3 (please specify)

Section 5: Non-Academic Support Services

Please indicate the type of support services activities offered from August 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

- After-school programs
- Mentoring
- Tutoring
- Counseling
- Transportation
- Other #1 (please specify)
- Other #2 (please specify)
- Other #3 (please specify)

Section 6: Professional and Staff Development

Please indicate the type of professional and staff development activities offered from August 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006, the frequency with which they were offered, and the number of teachers, administrators and staff who have participated in each.

PD Activity	Frequency of Activity	# Teachers who Participated	# Administrators who Participated	# Other Staff who Participated
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Section 7: Parental and Community Involvement

Please indicate the type of parent and community involvement activities offered from August 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006, the frequency with which they were offered, and the number of parents who participated in each.

Parent/Community Involvement Activity	# Parents who Participated
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/> If other please specify and explain: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Section 8: External Technical Assistance and Support

Please specify the entity providing technical assistance for the implementation of your CSR model.

How frequently does your school receive technical assistance?

If other please specify and explain:


In what areas of reform has the technical assistance provider offered the most guidance? (Check all that apply.)

- Curriculum
- Instruction
- Technology
- Professional development
- Classroom management
- School management
- Support services
- Parental involvement
- Student assessment
- Other (please specify)


Has there been an instance where you felt that your technical assistance provider failed to provide adequate assistance?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the situation or program implementation area in which the technical assistance provider failed to provide adequate assistance.



Please describe, if applicable, how the situation described above is currently being addressed or was ultimately resolved.



Section 9: Current Evaluation Procedures

Is your campus conducting ongoing project evaluation/progress monitoring to assess the implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform model at your school?

- Yes
- No

If yes, based on the information provided in your ongoing project evaluations/progress monitoring, what conclusions can you make about the progress of implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Initiative on your campus?

Section 10: Staff Support

Does your school have an active leadership team for the implementation of the CSR model?

- Yes
- No

If your school has a leadership team, please indicate the participating members. (Check all that apply.)

- Principal
- Vice-Principal(s)
- Curriculum Specialist(s)
- Community Member(s)
- Department Chair(s)
- Teacher(s)
- Other 1 (please specify)
- Other 2 (please specify)

Section 11: Use of Other Resources

Please check any other sources of funding your school has used to fund its CSR program from August 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006. (Check all that apply.)

Funding source

- Federal
- State
- Local
- Private
- None
- Other (please specify)

If your school is actively seeking other resources to support its CSR plans, please identify the type of funding it is seeking. (Check all that apply.)

Funding source

- Federal
- State
- Local
- Private
- Not actively seeking funding
- Other (please specify)

Does your regional education service center (ESC) provide technical assistance and/or other support for CSR-related activities?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please describe the type of support provided.

[Click Here to Send Information](#)

Return to the [Home Page](#), without sending answers.

Survey Said by Marketing Masters © 1991-2002 All Rights Reserved

Appendix B

Comparison Campus Selection

To evaluate CSR program effects on campus-level academic performance, it is crucial to have a reference group similar to the CSR program participants. Because CSR participants were selected with certain criteria and do not represent the Texas school population, random sampling from the population would not result in an ideal reference group selection. To correct the selection bias, the comparison group was selected by the sample matching method.

The comparison campuses were selected based on similarities in demographics and academic performance observed before the CSR program implementation (at baseline). The similarity was measured by Mahalanobis distance, which takes into account correlation among nine variables used for matching. The variables utilized to compute Mahalanobis distance are listed in Table B.1. In the matching process, six THSI campuses and three CSR ITL Cycle 3 campuses were excluded due to missing data, resulting in 78 matched pairs for the THSI sample and 83 matched pairs for the ITL Cycle 3 sample for the statistical analyses.

After the comparison campus selection, the compatibility of the comparison group was assessed. Mean differences between the CSR program campus and the comparison campus were compared for the matching variables by using the paired t-tests. The results showed that there were still significant mean differences in 2004 TAKS mathematics passing rate, percent of economically disadvantaged students, and percent of white

students for the THSI sample (Table B.1). To control these observed differences, these three variables were included in the analysis model as covariates. The results of the paired t-tests indicated that the comparison campus for the ITL Cycle 3 program was comparable in all variables used for matching (Table B.2).

Table B.1
THSI Program Mean Comparison
Between CSR Campus and the Comparison Campus

Variable	Group Mean after Matched Sampling		Mean Difference	t Value	DF	p
	CSR THSI Program	Comparison Group				
2004 TAKS Reading Passing Rate	74.40	75.45	-1.05	-1.46	77	0.1490
2004 TAKS Mathematics Passing Rate	54.22	56.40	-2.18	-2.92	77	0.0046*
Mobility Rate	28.34	26.52	1.81	2.44	77	0.0168
Percent of LEP Students	9.90	9.90	0.00	0.00	77	0.9972
Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students	63.37	60.30	3.06	3.28	77	0.0015*
Percent of African-American Students	17.06	15.70	1.37	2.21	77	0.0301
Percent of Hispanic Students	54.96	53.29	1.67	1.52	77	0.1331
Percent of White Students	26.91	30.06	-3.15	-3.34	77	0.0013*
Total Number of Students	1006.86	1005.10	1.76	0.05	77	0.9582

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A α value was adjusted by using Bonferroni correction for the multiple comparison tests.

* $p < .006$

Table B.2
ITL Cycle 3 Program Mean Comparison
Between CSR Campus and the Comparison Campus

Variable	Group Mean after Matched Sampling		Mean Difference	t Value	DF	p
	ITL Cycle 3 Program	Comparison Group				
2004 TAKS Reading Passing Rate	79.58	80.17	-0.59	-1.49	82	0.1389
2004 TAKS Mathematics Passing Rate	68.30	70.11	-1.81	-2.55	82	0.0125
Mobility Rate	24.61	23.43	1.18	2.67	82	0.0091
Percent of LEP Students	21.85	21.62	0.22	0.48	82	0.6356
Percent of Economically Disadvantaged Students	74.79	72.83	1.97	2.15	82	0.0343
Percent of African-American Students	16.81	16.73	0.07	0.09	82	0.9311
Percent of Hispanic Students	60.10	58.03	2.07	2.17	82	0.0326
Percent of White Students	21.79	24.00	-2.21	-2.28	82	0.0254
Total Number of Students	736.04	729.42	6.61	0.39	82	0.7011

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A α value was adjusted to .006 by using Bonferroni correction for the multiple comparison tests.

Appendix C

Statistical Analysis Methods and Results

The relationship between CSR program participation and the campus-level passing rate of 2006 TAKS was investigated by employing the mixed-model. The mixed-model was fit to the matched-pair samples because the matched pairs were not independent and the analysis model needs to take into account this dependence. In the mixed-model for this analysis, campuses were nested within matched pairs and the residual observations within matched pairs were correlated through the compound symmetry variance-covariance structure.

The outcomes of analyses were passing rates of 2006 TAKS reading and mathematics at the campus. Grantee indicator variable and campus rate of economically disadvantaged students were included as explanatory variables. In addition, the interaction effect between CSR program effect and economically disadvantaged rate was examined. The campus average passing rate of 2004 TAKS was included as a covariate to control for the academic achievement difference existed before CSR program was implemented. In addition, dichotomized campus grade type (elementary or secondary), and campus instruction type (regular instructional unit or other type) were also included as covariates. Because the percent of white students was significantly different between CSR high school campus and its comparison campus, it was included as a covariate for CSR high school analysis model. The results of the mixed-model analyses are presented in the tables below.

THSI Grant Program Results

Table C.1
Results from the Mixed-Model
2006 TAKS Reading (THSI)

Variable	DF Numerator	DF Denominator	F Value	p
CSR Program	1	71	2.234	0.139
CSR Program X Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	71	4.053	0.048*
Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	71	4.970	0.029*
2004 TAKS Reading	1	71	26.982	<.001**
Campus Instruction Type	1	71	0.537	0.466
Campus Grade Type	1	71	16.500	<.001**
Percent of White Students	1	71	0.769	0.384

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A p-value of less than .05 establishes statistical significance.

* p<.05

** p<.001

Table C.2
Results from the Mixed-Model
2006 TAKS Mathematics (THSI)

Variable	DF Numerator	DF Denominator	F Value	p
CSR Program	1	71	3.119	0.082
CSR Program X Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	71	3.709	0.058
Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	71	1.703	0.196
2004 TAKS Mathematics	1	71	91.142	<.001*
Campus Instruction Type	1	71	29.180	<.001*
Campus Grade Type	1	71	12.848	<.001*
Percent of White Students	1	71	3.726	0.058

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A p-value of less than .05 establishes statistical significance.

** p<.001

ITL Cycle 3 Grant Program

Table C.3
Results from the Mixed-Model
2006 TAKS Reading (ITL Cycle 3)

Variable	DF Numerator	DF Denominator	F Value	p
CSR Program	1	78	3.080	0.083
CSR Program X Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	78	2.482	0.119
Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	78	8.026	0.006*
2004 TAKS Reading	1	78	53.932	<.001**
Campus Type	1	78	0.481	0.490
Campus Grade Type	1	81	17.582	<.001**

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A p-value of less than .05 establishes statistical significance.

* p<.01

** p<.001

Table C.4
Results from the Mixed-Model
2006 TAKS Mathematics (ITL Cycle 3)

Variable	DF Numerator	DF Denominator	F Value	p
CSR Program	1	78	0.978	0.326
CSR Program X Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	78	0.604	0.439
Economically Disadvantaged Rate	1	78	0.852	0.359
2004 TAKS Mathematics	1	78	115.648	<.001**
Campus Type	1	78	7.930	0.006*
Campus Grade Type	1	81	3.872	0.053

Source: Academic Excellence Indicator System, Texas Education Agency, 2006.

Note: A p-value of less than .05 establishes statistical significance.

* p<.01

*p<.001