Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) Program, 2001-2002: Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 Schools

Los Angeles Unified School District Specially Funded and Parent/Community Programs Division

June 2003

Research conducted by:

Michael Butler
Lisa Powell
Raena Johnson

Public *Works*, Inc.
90 N. Daisy Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91107
(626) 564-9890
(626) 564-0657 fax

Table of Contents

I. Introduction and Study Methods

Overview of CSR

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR)[1] program was created in 1998 with the passage of the federal Education Appropriations Act. The intent of CSR legislation was to fund the implementation of school reform programs that have a strong research base and have been successfully replicated at multiple school sites. As outlined in the Federal legislation, the purpose of CSR is to provide financial incentives for schools, particularly Title I schools, that need to substantially improve student achievement. Schools receive CSR funds for three years and must implement comprehensive school reform programs (known as "reform models") that are based on reliable research and evidence of effectiveness in other underperforming schools. An important aspect of CSR is its intention to stimulate *school-wide change in all aspects of school operations*, as opposed to a piecemeal, fragmented approach to reform. Thus, to be considered comprehensive, schools applying for funding must develop a plan that integrates nine specific CSR components:

1. **Effective, research-based methods and strategies**: comprehensive reform strategies for reforming student learning, teaching, and school management based on research and replication.
2. **Comprehensive design for effective school functioning**: aligned school-wide reform components that enable all students to meet challenging State content and performance standards.
3. **Professional development**: providing high-quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development and training.
4. **Measurable goals and benchmarks**: methods to document changes in student achievement and effective school functioning.
5. **Support within the school**: support from school faculty, administration, and other staff.
6. **Parent and community involvement**: meaningful involvement of parents and the local community in the planning and implementation of school improvement activities.
7. **External support and technical assistance**: high quality external support and assistance from a comprehensive reform provider and other sources.
8. **Evaluation strategies**: plans for evaluating school reforms and student outcomes.
9. **Coordination of resources**: identification of Federal, State, local, and private resources to support and sustain school reform.

CSR was reauthorized in January 2002 as part of the No Child Left Behind Act and these nine components were reformulated into eleven components[2]. Schools awarded a CSR grant prior to July 1, 2002 were required to follow the nine components up until that date. Any subsequent awards after July 1, 2002 require adherence to the new eleven components.

---

[1] Formerly known as the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration or CSRD program.
[2] The new components require that the school's comprehensive design provide support for teachers, administrators and other staff, and that the methods and strategies of the school's comprehensive reform program are based on scientifically based research that demonstrates significant improvement in academic achievement.

While the legislation does not specify that the research-based model selected by a CSR school must cover all of the above nine (eleven) components, CSR schools are accountable for showing progress in each of the areas. In other words, if a model does not address one or more of the CSR components, the school is expected to incorporate the missing component(s). As such, the evaluation of CSR's impact at an individual school is, by definition, an examination of the implementation of the school's CSR reform plan and not narrowly defined to include only an investigation of the effectiveness of a particular model reform design.

In California, CSR has been embedded into the Senate Bill 1X, the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. The first cohort of CSR schools was selected in 1999 and began implementation during the 1999-2000 school year. Of the approximately 80 California public schools selected to receive CSR funding, 14 schools were in the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). A second cohort of 47 California schools began CSR implementation in fall 2001, 18 of these schools in LAUSD. Schools in both cohorts received $200 per pupil, with the length of funding extending a maximum of three years based on progress towards program goals and benchmarks. In Fall 2002, a third cohort of CSR schools began implementation, with 22 Cohort 3 schools in LAUSD. As this report covers CSR implementation through June 2002, Cohort 3 schools are not included in this report.

CSR Schools in LAUSD

In Table 1.1, most LAUSD CSR schools during 2001-02 were elementary schools (N=24), with less representation from middle schools (N=7) and only one high school.

Table 1.1: CSR schools in Cohorts 1 & 2 by Level

Level	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
Elementary	24th St. ES	135th St. ES
	66th St. ES	49th St. ES
	68th St. ES	75th St. ES
	Carson ES	Dyer ES
	Graham ES	Ford ES
	Liggett ES	Gratts ES
	Manchester ES	Hooper ES
	Loren Miller ES	Melrose ES
	Montague Charter ES	Parmelee ES
	Richland ES	Plummer ES
	Roscoe ES	Rio Vista ES
		Vinedale ES
		Wadsworth ES
Middle	Maclay MS	Carnegie MS
	Twain MS	Northridge MS
	Markham MS	Peary MS
		Sepulveda MS
High		N. Hollywood HS

CSR schools in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 represent nine of the eleven LAUSD local districts (see Table 1.2). The highest concentrations of CSR schools during 2001-02 were in Local District I (N=8) and Local District B (N=7), with several CSR schools also found in Local Districts H (N=4), Local District K (N=4), Local District A (N=3) and Local District D (N=3).

Table 1.2: CSR Schools by LAUSD Local District, 2001-02

Local District	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Total
A	1	2	3
B	3	4	7
C	0	1	1
D	2	1	3
E	1	0	1
F	0	1	1
G	0	0	0
H	0	4	4
I	6	2	8
J	0	0	0
K	1	3	4
TOTAL	**14**	**18**	**32**

In comparison to LAUSD as a whole, CSR schools tend to have more Hispanic students, as well as a higher proportion of English Language Learners (ELLs) and students eligible for participation in the federal Free/Reduced Meal program (see Table 1.3 below). This is in line with the fact that the CSR program was designed, in part, to assist Title I schools.

Table 1.3: Demographic Characteristics of CSR Schools, 2001-02

	African American	Hispanic	White	Asian	F/R Meal	ELL	Total Enroll
Cohort 1 Average	14.3%	79.3%	2.4%	1.0%	87.9%	56.0%	17,716
Cohort 2 Average	10.4%	80.8%	4.6%	1.6%	84.5%	55.9%	27,279
District Average	12.4%	71.4%	9.6%	4.0%	72.8%	41.1%	735,058

Source: California Department of Education

During 2001-02, each of the 32 CSR schools in LAUSD was implementing a research-based reform model. As shown in Table 1.4, there were nine different reform models being implemented in LAUSD. The most prevalent reform models included Success for All (N=8), America's Choice (N=7), Urban Learning Centers (N=5), Co-nect (N=4), and Different Ways of Knowing (N=4).

Table 1.4 Summary of CSR Models in LAUSD by Cohort, 2001-02

	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Total
America's Choice	1	6	7
Co-nect	1	3	4
Core Knowledge	1	0	1
Different Ways of Knowing	3	1	4
Modern Red Schoolhouse	0	1	1
QuEST	0	1	1
Success for All	6	2	8
Urban Learning Centers	2	3	5
UCLA School Management Program	0	1	1
TOTAL	14	18	32

District Oversight for CSR

CSR implementation in LAUSD has been affected by the decentralization of LAUSD into 11 local districts in 1999-2000. This restructuring of LAUSD changed the nature of oversight for CSR as more control shifted to the local districts. Since Spring 2001, central office responsibility for SB1X programs has been under the purview of the SB1X Office, which is within the Specially Funded and Parent/Community Programs Division, consolidating all SB 1X reform programs under one central LAUSD office.[3]

The SB1X Office provides support to CSR schools on all activities specific to CSR funding, including monitoring and providing support for school budgets and school adherence to reporting requirements, quarterly informational meetings for CSR schools, as well as coordinating the district-wide evaluation. Instructional support for CSR schools comes from LAUSD's Division of Instruction and is manifest through the local districts, whose personnel work directly with schools in District-wide curricular and professional development initiatives. District support, both from the LAUSD central office and local districts is explored in more detail in Section V of this report.

Context for Evaluation

In July 2000, LAUSD first contracted with Public *Works*, Inc., a non-profit educational consulting firm specializing in program evaluation, to evaluate the CSR program. The CSR federal legislation requires that Districts evaluate the progress of all schools receiving CSR funds and provide information on school and district efforts to support and sustain school reform. At the end of each year of CSR implementation, districts with CSR schools are required to submit End-of-Year reports for each school and for the district. These reports, due to the State in August of each year, have a required format that asks for a detailed description of progress on CSR components.

---

[3] In addition to CSR, SB 1X reform programs include the state Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) and the High Priority Schools Grant (HPSG) program.

This summative report is distinct from the District's End-of-Year report in that it is a more comprehensive report bringing together evaluation findings based on a variety of school and district data gathered during the 2001-02 school year. This report covers CSR implementation at the 32 Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 CSR schools.

Evaluation Methods

Data for the 2001-02 evaluation include the following:

Case Studies (sample of six CSR schools)
- Classroom observations
- Focus groups and interviews with all stakeholder groups
- Interviews with model reform providers
- Interviews with local district staff

Surveys (all schools)
- Parent survey conducted at all CSR schools in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002
- School staff survey conducted at all CSR schools in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002
- District Support Survey administered to all CSR schools in June 2002

Achievement Data (all schools)
- Detailed analysis of CSR student achievement data and school performance outcomes at all CSR schools
- Detailed analysis of formative literacy assessment data (Open Court Reading and Success for All) for CSR elementary schools.

Case Studies

In both 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, the evaluation included an in-depth study of a sample of schools designed to showcase the implementation of different reform models being implemented throughout LAUSD. These "case studies" provide a detailed examination of the experience of schools attempting to systematically reform education as part of CSR implementation.

For the 2001-02 case study sample, schools were selected to represent the most commonly implemented models as well as the demographic and geographic diversity of CSR schools in LAUSD. The six schools included in the current report represent five reform models: America's Choice, Co-nect, Different Ways of Knowing, Urban Learning Centers, and UCLA School Management Program.[4]

Each of the six sites was visited twice during the 2001-2002 school year. At a minimum, sites participated in two full days of on-site data collection involving focus groups and interviews as well as one additional day where classroom instruction was observed.

---

[4] Success for All schools were not selected for inclusion in the 2001-02 case study sample because the model had been considered and not selected by most elementary schools as a choice under the District's Structured Reading Program. In other words, few schools were selecting SFA after 2000-01 since they had already adopted Open Court Reading.

Qualitative data (e.g., focus groups, interviews, classroom observations) was collected in five broad areas associated with CSR implementation: Curriculum and Instruction, Instructional Support, Model Reform Implementation, School Organization and Climate, and Parent and Community Involvement. Representatives of all stakeholder groups were interviewed at each school in both a Fall 2001 and Spring 2002 site visit. Copies of the site visit interview guides may be found in **Appendix A**. Model provider representatives and Local District contacts responsible for school oversight and/or CSR were interviewed in Spring of 2002. In addition, a sample of classrooms representing all grade levels was visited in March 2002 by experienced teachers trained on an observational rubric developed by Public *Works*, Inc. based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

Public *Works*, Inc. reviewed the original CSR grant application for each case study school, along with the schools' CSR budgets. End of Year reports prepared by schools and submitted to the California Department of Education in August 2000 (Cohort 1 only) and August 2001 (Cohorts 1 and 2) documenting CSR implementation accomplishments were also reviewed. For additional information on the case study component of the evaluation, please refer to *Evaluation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program: Case Studies of Schools Implementing CSRD Models*, submitted to the LAUSD SB 1X Office in September 2002.

Survey Administration

Public *Works*, Inc. administered staff and parent surveys to the 32 LAUSD CSR schools in Fall 2001 and again in Spring 2002. These surveys were intended as a tool for assessing the level, quality and support of CSR implementation at each school.

The CSR **staff survey** was distributed to teachers and other staff members during a regularly scheduled staff meeting. Staff was asked to "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree" with statements concerning curriculum and instruction, instructional support, school culture and outreach, and implementation of the CSR model. In Fall 2001, 1,601 teachers and school administrators completed the survey, for an average response rate across schools of 87%. In Spring 2002, 1,527 completed surveys were received for an average response rate of 84%.[5]

The CSR **parent survey** was also distributed in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002 to a sample of 25% of classrooms at each school. In Fall, Public *Works*, Inc. staff randomly selected the classrooms while in Spring, the CSR contact at each school was asked to distribute surveys to classrooms. Grades K, 6, and 9 were excluded because these grade levels are the entry point at elementary, middle, and high school, respectively. As such, the parents of these students were new to the school and likely unfamiliar with the school and its programs.

All students in the selected classrooms were asked to have their parents complete the survey and return it to their teachers. To increase the response rate, students who returned completed surveys were entered into a raffle with the chance to win movie tickets. This incentive helped boost parent response rates to satisfactory levels for an average response rate of 33% in both Fall and Spring.[6] Parents were asked to respond to a set of similar

[5] Individual school response rates for Spring staff surveys ranged from 60% -100%, with one outlier at 40%.
[6] Individual school response rates for spring parent surveys ranged from 14% -59%.

statements to those on the staff survey, with a focus on parent awareness of school programs and involvement in parent activities and school decision-making. English and Spanish versions of the survey were available. In Fall 2001, 3,365 parents completed the survey and 2,874 responded in Spring 2002.

Results from these staff and parent surveys will be referenced throughout this report. The data for Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 school have been analyzed separately due to the differences in the CSR implementation timelines. Because Cohort 1 schools were in their third year of implementation and Cohort 2 schools were in the first year of implementation during 2001-02, staff perceptions and knowledge about CSR and how it is affecting their school differ considerably. For additional information on the survey component of the evaluation, please refer to *LAUSD CSRD Evaluation: 2001-2 Staff and Parent Survey Results,* submitted to the LAUSD SB 1X Office in July 2002.

Based on the four-point scale, a survey mean of 3 or above demonstrates a high level of awareness or satisfaction among respondents, while a mean of 2 or below demonstrates low awareness or satisfaction. Thus, items between 2.0 and 3.0 indicate mixed staff or parent perceptions. Copies of the staff surveys may be found in **Appendix B** while the parent survey is provided in **Appendix C**.

A **District Support Survey** was administered to all 32 CSR schools in June 2002, in order to assess the level of district support schools received during 2001-02. The individual completing the survey for each school was the principal and/or the person on-site most familiar with CSR implementation efforts and district involvement (e.g., Title I coordinator).

Respondents were asked to rank the level of support given to them by the Central District office and their Local District on survey items related to oversight, evaluation, and feedback as well as on-site involvement and support. Respondents could rank the support on a scale from 1 to 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being excellent, or respond "Not applicable" or "Don't know". Nearly all (31 of 32 schools) completed the District support survey. A copy of the District Support Survey can be found in **Appendix D.**

Analysis of Student Achievement Data

Quantitative student achievement and school performance data were collected and analyzed for all Cohort 1 CSR schools for three years (1999-00, 2000-01, and 2001-02) and all Cohort 2 CSR schools for two years (2000-01 and 2001-02). Academic Performance Index (API) data was obtained from the California Department of Education website (http://api.cde.ca.gov). Data on SAT-9 scores, ELL redesignation, attendance, and dropout rates were obtained from the LAUSD School Information Branch, a unit within the Planning, Assessment and Research Division (PARD). These data are used as district performance accountability indicators and are reported for all LAUSD schools each year.

For goals related to SAT-9 percentile rankings, a grade level proxy measure is used for this report. In other words, selected benchmark grades have been selected to represent the progress of schools on the SAT-9 exam. This was largely done as a way to simplify the display of the data in reporting school progress as opposed to displaying the SAT-9 data for all grades for each school.

This report uses grade 3 to portray the progress of elementary schools, grade 7 for middle schools and grade 9 for senior high schools participating in CSR. These grade levels are also the benchmark grade levels used by LAUSD, which were chosen because they are the grade levels one year prior to the California Department of Education's benchmark grade levels of 4, 8, and 10.

Selecting a single grade level as a benchmark may give a limited picture of student achievement at each school. The API, however, does provide a composite measure for student achievement. Although it does not provide information on the different subtests of the SAT-9, the API provides a balance to the reliance on selected grade-level data because it takes into account SAT-9 data for all grade levels at a given school.

Please see **Appendix E** of this report of achievement data for all Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 CSR schools. For additional information on the quantitative data analysis component of the evaluation, please refer to *LAUSD CSRD Evaluation: 2001-02 Data Profile Report,* submitted to the LAUSD SB 1X Office in February 2003.

Analysis of Formative Literacy Data

Student-level formative literacy assessment data from the 24 Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 CSR elementary schools were collected and analyzed from the 2001-2002 school year. Public *Works,* Inc. provided all elementary CSR schools with a Microsoft Excel database based on a file received from the LAUSD School Information Branch. Schools were required to enter assessment data for each student at the school. SFA schools were asked to enter all four assessment scores for each student throughout the year, and OCR schools were asked to enter scores for Units 1, 3, and 5 for Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, and Vocabulary.[7]

Because the nature of the assessments used to measure student literacy are quite different for OCR and SFA, separate analyses were conducted for the two reading programs. The OCR assessments are not true pre-/post-test assessments because the expectations for student literacy increase over the course of the school year. Thus, the initial (Unit 1) six-week assessment has lower expectations for student vocabulary skills than the Unit 3 (week 18) or final Unit 6 (week 36) assessments. In this sense, the OCR benchmarks are akin to a "moving target." By contrast, students participating in SFA are administered two versions (Form A and Form B) of the same assessment, alternating over the course of the school year (i.e., Form A at week 8 and 24, Form B at week 16 and 32). In other works, students in the SFA program are assessed against the same benchmark over time.

In Spring 2002, LAUSD rolled out its new online system for entering OCR assessment scores. In order to minimize the duplication of efforts, coaches at the 16 CSR elementary schools using OCR were instructed to enter their last assessment (Unit 5) into the SOAR system rather than the database provided by Public *Works*, Inc. An arrangement with the LAUSD Student Information System (SIS) was made whereby Public *Works*, Inc. would augment the Excel database containing earlier assessment data with data for the final OCR

---

[7] Because OCR assessments take place six times a year and have several content area assessments, three units were requested from schools in order to lessen the burden of data entry on schools.

assessment from the SOAR system. Public *Works*, Inc. received data from the District in July 2002 and integrated this with data obtained directly from the CSR schools.

Data was analyzed for students with "complete" information for each OCR component. For OCR schools, this was defined as students that had complete assessment data for Units 1, 3, <u>and</u> 5 for each component.[8]   In this manner, the analysis for each component - Fluency, Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary – potentially contains a different compilation of students. For CSR schools implementing SFA, students were excluded if they did not have all four assessments.[9] In addition to dropping students that were not complete cases, students without grade-level information were dropped, as were Special Education and retained 2nd grade (IAS) students.

The resulting analysis of "complete cases" included 38% of students participating in OCR at CSR schools during 2001-02. Of the eight CSR schools implementing SFA, two had data that was in a format such that it could not be recoded or integrated into the data for the other schools and another two school only completed assessments 1 through 3. Thus, this report provides data for the four CSR schools implementing SFA with available and complete data. For these four schools, complete data were obtained for 69% of the students who participated in SFA during 2001-2002.

Appendix F contains all formative literacy assessment data obtained from CSR elementary schools in Cohort 1 and Cohort 2. For additional information on the formative literacy data analysis component of the evaluation, please refer to *LAUSD CSRD Evaluation: Formative Literacy Student Achievement Results for Cohorts 1 and 2,* submitted to the LAUSD SB 1X Office in March 2003.

Report Structure

This summative evaluation report presents integrated findings based on the multiple evaluation reports produced by Public *Works*, Inc. during 2001-02. The report is organized around the five research questions:

1. To what extent has the introduction of a research-based reform model impacted the ability of schools to implement CSR?
2. What instructional strategies/methods are being used to improve student learning at CSR schools?
3. What strategies are being used to meaningfully involve parents/community in school improvement efforts at CSR schools?
4. What type of technical support/assistance is needed to help schools implement CSR?
5. To what extent has CSR implementation improved student achievement?

---

[8] Schools varied in whether they completed and submitted data for five OCR units or six units during the year. To be consistent in this analysis across all schools, data from Units 1, 3, and 5 were included because more schools collected data for Unit 5 than Unit 6.

[9] Two of the six schools analyzed had data for the first three assessments only; thus, these schools were analyzed separately.

The report is divided into five sections. Section II concentrates on examining how the implementation of an outside, research-based model has affected schools' promotion of CSR reform. Section III focuses on the curricular and instructional strategies that schools are using to improve student learning. Section IV addresses parent and community involvement at CSR schools. Section V addresses the issue of external support and technical assistance to CSR schools focusing on services from the model providers as well as district support for local CSR efforts. Section VI examines student achievement at CSR schools. Finally, Section VII provides a set of summative findings and recommendations for the future. The appendices referenced in the report are presented in Section VIII.

II. The Influence of the Model Provider on CSR

Overview

This section examines the influence of the model reform providers on the promotion of CSR. The role of the model provider in CSR is on implementing effective, models and strategies for reforming student learning, teaching and school management based on research and evidence of replication. The comprehensive design for effective school functioning at the heart of CSR intends to align school-wide reform components that enable all students to meet challenging academic standards. Because CSR schools are working in conjuction with an external model provider, CSR efforts require support within the school including school faculty, administration and other staff.

Our examination finds that model providers are focusing their efforts on working with school faculty, primarily though professional development and coaching. As a result, the CSR implementation has not been accompanied by widespread changes in other areas envisioned for change under CSR. In assessing staff support for CSR, our study highlights the importance of staff inclusion in the selection process as well as early exposure to model provider efforts. Overall, the primary accommodation of reform at the school level has been the implementation of District-mandated curricular reforms which, in turn, have tended to displace the research-based models as the focus of CSR.

Model Provider Influence at CSR Schools

Model providers serving CSR schools have largely focused on delivering professional development and providing instructional coaching. In other words, the providers working with CSR schools are involved in certain components of CSR, and exert far less influence in others aspects of school reform and restructuring.

As shown in Table 2.1, the influence of model providers is clearest in terms of providing professional development and instructional coaching to CSR schools. More than 70% of staff at Cohort 1 schools were positive about CSR model provider services linked to support of standards-based instruction and professional development/coaching. Approximately 60% of staff at Cohort 1 schools were positive about on-going feedback and support from the CSR model providers. Similarly, Cohort 2 schools in the first year of CSR implementation also rated these model provider services highest.

An additional area of model provider impact has been the increased use of assessment data at CSR schools. As part of training and coaching, model providers have often emphasized the importance of using multiple types of assessment to inform and modify instruction. These efforts from model providers have complemented District efforts to provide schools with formative literacy assessment data.

Table 2.1: Selected Survey Items on Scope of Model Reform Implementation (% School Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
The reform model selected by this school supports standards-based instruction.	72.2%	77.4%	5.2%	66.1%	69.6%	3.5%
This school's reform model serves the educational needs of ELL students.	55.1%	58.2%	3.1%	34.7%	36.9%	2.2%
The CSR reform model includes assessments that provide teachers with useful feedback on student achievement.	57.2%	62.9%	5.7%	34.5%	38.0%	3.5%
The school's CSR model has an intervention component for students unable to meet academic standards.	42.7%	49.3%	6.6%	21.9%	25.0%	3.1%
Teachers and other staff are receiving professional development and coaching from the CSR model reform provider.	71.1%	74.7%	3.6%	57.1%	61.1%	4.0%
Teachers and other staff are receiving on-going support and feedback from the school's model provider.	60.1%	58.3%	-1.8%	41.7%	44.1%	2.4%

Staff satisfaction in the areas of assessment grew over the 2001-02 school year, and assessment was the third-ranked survey area for Cohort 1 schools (ranked fifth by Cohort 2 schools). Approximately 70% or more of staff members at Cohort 1 schools indicated high levels of agreement with survey statements about school-level assessment practices (see Table 2.2). Survey responses at Cohort 2 schools were lower, as might be expected after only one year of implementation. Nonetheless, Cohort 2 schools were also largely positive about assessment practices.

Table 2.2: Selected Survey Items on Assessment (% School Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
There is a clear, connected and comprehensive model for monitoring student progress.	69.6%	73.0%	3.4%	55.0%	62.5%	7.5%
Teachers use common standards and criteria for evaluating student progress.	79.3%	76.9%	-2.4%	64.5%	72.1%	7.6%
Teachers regularly use student assessment results to modify and shape instruction.	77.0%	77.7%	0.7%	66.7%	70.8%	4.1%
Multiple assessments are used to measure student progress.	79.4%	87.9%	2.5%	77.0%	77.6%	0.6%
Grade level/department meetings usually include discussion of assessment results.	64.1%	68.7%	4.6%	55.8%	56.5%	0.7%

Annual accountability reporting required of CSR schools has also helped to prioritize the examination of assessment data. Aware of the need to raise student achievement or face

sanctions, most case study schools reported increased consistency of assessment data review by staff, use of assessment data to develop appropriate academic intervention and diagnose student needs, and development of rubrics and formative assessments in 2001-02. Although often still in the beginning stages, information from the case studies suggests that CSR schools are moving in the direction of data-driven school reform.

In general, CSR model providers have tended not to become involved in restructuring school management or governance. Moreover, awareness and involvement in CSR efforts has not tended to extend to larger school governance bodies (e.g., Local School Leadership Council, School Site Council, etc.).

In many cases, school principals prefer that model providers refrain from involvement in school governance. For example, the case study school implementing Urban Learning Centers deliberately chose not to employ the governance component of the model. In the one case study school (Co-nect) where school governance was modified through the development of a CSR "design team," the school spearheaded this effort rather than the outside provider. Created to oversee reform implementation, this team has proven to be an effective structure for integrating reform efforts with school-wide instructional decisions.

For the majority of CSR schools, school governance and climate issues consistently are rated low on staff surveys. This area was the lowest-ranked for Cohort 1 staff in Spring 2002 and next-to-last for Cohort 2 staff. While staff members at CSR schools report high levels of understanding about school improvement goals, survey responses (see Table 2.3) indicate room for improvement in terms of communication and providing staff with input into school decisions.

Table 2.3: Selected Survey Items on School Climate/Collaboration (% School Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
School improvement goals are well understood by staff.	69.7%	69.5%	-0.2%	61.5%	65.3%	3.8%
The overall school budget reflects school-wide improvement goals.	56.4%	57.2%	0.8%	46.8%	46.9%	0.1%
All staff members have a potential say in school decisions.	53.2%	52.2%	-1.0%	46.1%	46.0%	-0.1%
The results of major school decisions are communicated to all staff.	69.2%	70.5%	1.3%	60.2%	59.7%	-0.5%
This school encourages teacher leadership and initiative.	67.5%	70.2%	2.7%	62.4%	59.4%	-3.0%
This school has a strong leadership team that guides instruction and the implementation of reform.	63.6%	64.1%	0.5%	55.2%	54.7%	-0.5%

Student intervention services and parent involvement are other areas where little to no model provider impact has occurred. For example, more than 50% of staff at Cohort 1 CSR schools (i.e., schools in their third year of CSR implementation) did not know or did

not think that their school's CSR model included an intervention component. Site visits at case study schools confirmed that model providers have not influenced student intervention programs before or after-school or during intersession (see Section III for more information on this aspect of model provider influence). Similarly, parent involvement (the subject of Section IV of this report) has been minimally impacted by the introduction of CSR reform models.

Staff Support of CSR

Staff survey results show relatively low levels of staff support for CSR models. While involvement levels were high at Cohort 1 schools, support for the models remained low even after three years of implementation. Thus, 72% reported that most school staff members are involved in the implementation of the CSR model, but only 55% indicated that most teachers are supportive of the reform model selected by the school. After one year of implementation, staff at Cohort 2 schools also reported moderate levels of staff involvement (53%) with lower levels of support (37%) for the CSR model (see Table 2.4).

Table 2.4: Selected Survey Items on Staff Involvement and Support for Model Reform Implementation (% Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
Teachers and other school staff were involved in the selection of the CSR model provider.	54.5%	55.4%	0.9%	41.6%	42.5%	0.9%
The reform model selected by this school is appropriate for the student population.	58.6%	62.0%	3.4%	44.5%	46.3%	1.8%
Most school staff members are involved in the implementation of the CSR model.	69.1%	72.0%	2.9%	49.1%	53.3%	4.2%
Most teachers are supportive of the implementation of this school's CSR reform model.	52.5%	54.9%	2.4%	36.5%	36.8%	0.3%

Case studies findings indicate that the model provider selection process may explain the lukewarm support for CSR model providers. In many cases, the principal or a small group of staff selected the school's model without a significant amount of involvement from the staff as a whole. In some local districts, all schools were required to work with the same model provider. Similarly, parents were rarely involved in selection of model providers. At most of the case study schools, a significant proportion of staff expressed limited awareness of the impact of the model's influence. In some cases, faculty members were clearly resistant to some or all of the model's reform initiatives. In all cases, the terms under which the model was selected played a major role in shaping perceptions and subsequent implementation of the model.

At most schools, there is a "core" group of staff members most involved in CSR efforts, lead by the principal and Title I coordinator. The level to which responsibility and

knowledge of reform efforts is spread across the school tends to be narrower. In one model, for example, conducts off-site training for a small group of school leaders responsible for taking back the lessons of training to the faculty as a whole. While the group of trained individuals tends to be well versed about the model, the case studies indicate that the level to which this knowledge is effectively transferred to other staff members varies.

The timing and extent of involvement staff members have with CSR reforms also appears to play a role in staff buy-in and support of the reforms. Some models use a phased in approach to reform, involving staff on a voluntary basis with plans for full staff involvement by the third year of implementation. For example, one model in a case study school first involved teachers on a voluntary basis in the first year. More teachers volunteered during the second year of CSR implementation. However, by the third year, there were no more "volunteers" to draw on. Instead, staff members least inclined to become involved in the reform were required to implement the model.

By contrast, other models involve many or most staff members from the outset. For example, the elementary case study school implementing America's Choice required teachers at all grade levels to participate in professional development and training linked to the model during year one. Similarly, the school-wide reorganization of language arts at the heart of the Success for All model requires all staff to become involved from the outset.

Although the more gradualist approach often helps create buy-in for reform, the lesson from the case studies is that schools experience fewer long-term difficulties by involving most or a large cross-section of staff early on in implementation of the reform model. Involving more staff up-front helps establish a more overt model provider presence. At these schools, staff members were more likely to share a common vision and/or expectation of reform.

Regardless of approach, there is often confusion about the model provider's role, with many staff members unaware that the model provider may only be providing a piece of what is required by CSR, and that it is up to the school to address the other CSR components. Thus, staff may have unrealistic expectations for the outside model providers. Finally, staff turnover certainly plays a role in staff buy-in and support of CSR reforms. At many LAUSD schools, turnover rates are high. Each year brings in a new crop of teachers that must be brought up to speed on CSR and model provider activities, further complicating plans for institutionalizing the reforms instituted under CSR.

Balancing Model and District Reform Priorities

Many CSR schools in both cohorts have struggled with balancing the need for implementing their CSR plan and implementing District reform initiatives simultaneously. In light of the increased District priorities in LAUSD during the past couple of years, the competing demands schools face have provided considerable challenges and have affected how and to what extent CSR is being implemented.

All of the 2001-02 case studies demonstrate to some extent the conflict between model provider activities and District reform priorities. District-adopted curricular programs in

language arts and mathematics tended to dominate the time and attention of teachers and other school and local district staff. For CSR schools, such conflicts often resulted in competing demands for time on schools' professional development calendar. Allocating time for coaching between both model provider coaches and District-funded coaches was another area characterized by competing agendas.

Based on the experiences of the case study schools, there is a strong need for integrating the work of model reform providers with District instructional priorities. As schools develop reform plans and negotiate contracts with outside reform organizations, it will become increasingly critical to proactively address the need for coordination and cooperation at the school and local district levels. For example, the work of CSR model providers needs to be coordinated with District plans for instituting common grade level and departmental pacing plans in English/language arts and mathematics. Similarly, District priorities for mandated professional development on banked time Tuesdays need to be integrated with training required of schools implementing particular CSR models. Heightened District awareness and understanding of what CSR schools are attempting to do, and assisting schools upfront in the integration of CSR plan and District priorities, will likely help ease the implementation process.

Some LAUSD local districts have begun to look for ways to better integrate the district priorities with reform plans. Some local districts now require all schools applying for CSR grants to contract with the same model provider. Although this mandate has the potential to negatively affect school staff buy-in and support, it also has allowed the local district to become more involved in working with the model provider to ensure alignment of reform activities with District curricular programs and consistency across schools. Additional aspects of District support for CSR schools will be addressed in Section V.

III. CSR Influence on Instruction

Overview

This section of the report examines the influences on curricula and instruction at CSR schools, particularly the role of professional development in changing classroom teaching practices. As such, this section is focused on the combinations of instructional and curricular strategies are being used to improve student learning by providing high-quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development and training. In addition, this section examines school plans for evaluating school reforms and student outcomes.

Schools participating in CSR have largely benefited from increased access to professional development and coaching. Staff at CSR schools are especially positive about support aimed at helping teachers align classroom instruction to State content standards. The implementation of research-based models under CSR has not, however, resulted in significant changes to either instruction for English Language Learners or intervention programs for students. School and school district influence remains the dominant influence on these instructional components of school reform.

Instructional Impact of CSR

As set forth in Section II, CSR model provider influence is most clearly seen in the provision of augmented professional development and coaching. With CSR, schools have funds to provide different types of professional development for staff, including training and support from model providers, as well as additional funds to give staff additional release time for professional development purposes. As shown in Table 3.1, a clear majority of staff is positive about professional development at their school site.

Table 3.1: Selected Survey Items on Professional Development (% Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
Professional development is aligned with school-wide improvement goals.	79.8%	80.0%	0.2%	78.8%	75.7%	-3.1%
Professional development highlights effective teaching practices.	70.4%	74.5%	4.1%	71.3%	71.1%	-0.2%
Professional development promotes greater alignment of instruction with standards.	76.6%	79.8%	3.2%	77.7%	77.7%	0.0%

Whether prompted by the District or the CSR model provider, much of the focus on professional development at CSR schools has centered on helping teachers deliver standards-based instruction. The vast majority of both Cohort 1 (77%) and Cohort 2 (70%) staff survey respondents agreed in Spring 2002 that their CSR model provider supported standards-based instruction (see Table 3.2). This influence, coupled with an

increased District focus, has improved staff awareness and understanding of standards-based instruction.

Table 3.2: Selected Survey Items on Standards Based Instruction (% Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
Most teachers understand the State content standards for their subject area or grade level.	84.5%	88.8%	4.3%	71.4%	83.9%	12.5%
The linkage between curriculum and State standards is well understood by teachers.	75.0%	82.0%	7.0%	55.6%	72.1%	16.5%
Classroom instruction follows a standards-based pacing plan.	79.4%	79.1%	-0.3%	68.9%	75.4%	6.5%
Students understand classroom expectations (i.e., they understand what standards they are being held accountable for).	63.2%	73.5%	10.3%	50.8%	63.1%	12.3%

As shown in Table 3.2, staff perceptions of standards-based instruction are mostly positive. Standards-based instruction has been one of the highly ranked areas since the first administration of CSR evaluation surveys in Fall 2000. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that both cohorts ranked this area highest in Spring 2002. The biggest change among Cohort 1 schools since Fall 2000 has been the increased proportion of staff positive about the teachers' ability to link curricula and standards, from 77% in Fall 2000 to 82% in Spring 2002. A similar development is occurring at Cohort 2 schools where the percentage of staff indicating that they understand the linkage between standards and curriculum has increased nearly 17% during the first year of CSR implementation. The introduction of outside model providers appears to reinforce and deepen the existing emphasis on standards-based instruction.

There is, however, a continued need for work in the area of standards-based instruction on communicating standards and expectations to students. Interviews with teachers and administrators as well as classroom observations at the case study schools indicate that many teachers struggle with how to communicate the standards to students. Moreover, there is on-going debate about whether and why such communication benefits student learning.

In addition, there is little evidence that CSR model providers have trained teachers on topics such as differentiated instruction and SDAIE techniques. Site visits to the sample of six case study schools as well as survey results (see Table 3.3 below) suggest that these are areas where teachers may need additional support. Indeed, given the high proportion of ELL students at CSR schools, the lack of emphasis placed on targeting SDAIE strategies and other differentiation techniques as part of CSR implementation was an area of concern.

Table 3.3: Selected Survey Items on English Language Development (% Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
English language development is a primary focus at this school.	78.8%	78.0%	-0.8%	69.8%	73.0%	3.2%
School-wide decisions usually take into account the needs of ELL students	68.5%	67.1%	-1.4%	53.7%	58.9%	5.2%
Most teachers regularly use SDAIE and ELD techniques in daily classroom instruction.	58.7%	62.5%	3.8%	46.8%	50.0%	3.2%

Although survey responses were high for both Cohort 1 (78%) and Cohort 2 (73%) in rating that English language development is a primary focus on the school, there was limited evidence from qualitative case study methods that CSR models have exerted an influence on services for ELLs. None of the CSR model providers at the case study schools were directly involved in helping teachers modify instruction for ELLs. All of the case study schools reported gaps in the levels of SDAIE training teachers have received, with few reporting any recent training offered on-site. Some school leaders reported that even those teachers trained in SDAIE were not using the techniques regularly or effectively, even in schools where more than 80% of the students were ELLs.

Student Intervention Programs

Another area where CSR implementation has not appreciably influenced instruction or student learning is intervention. CSR reform models do not seem to have significant influence or impact on academic intervention programs (e.g., before and after-school programs as well as intersession support for struggling students).

Table 3.4: Selected Survey Items on Intervention (% Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
There is a clear set of criteria for identifying students in need of intervention.	62.0%	62.7%	0.7%	49.3%	52.7%	3.4%
There is a clear process for referring a student to intervention.	67.9%	71.0%	3.1%	55.7%	58.0%	2.3%
Teachers who refer students to intervention receive information on student progress.	43.4%	49.5%	6.1%	31.3%	33.6%	2.3%

Intervention programming was a low-rated survey area in both Fall 2001 and Spring 2002 for both Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools (see Table 3.4 above). In particular, teachers report a weak linkage between intervention activities and the regular classroom, with less than half of Cohort 1 staff and only one-third of Cohort 2 staff indicating that teachers referring students to intervention receive information on student progress from intervention staff. However, a high percentage of respondents in Cohort 1 (71%), reported

that there is a clear process for referring a student to intervention. The intervention itself is unclear.

The case studies reflect the minimal impact of research-based model providers CSR in these areas as well. At all six schools, model providers were not directly involved in planning or administering intervention programs. In one case, teachers reported using the model provider curriculum for intervention purposes in-class, after-school, and during intersession. At another school, the model provider was involved in coordinating some of the intervention programming provided by other outside partners. For the most part, intervention offerings at the CSR schools provide support to a relatively small number of students. Case study schools were uniform in suggesting that District mandates for intervention are confusing and subject to fluctuation due to inconsistent funding, resulting in a fragmented approach to intervention.

In light of these findings, it is not surprising that the opinions of staff and parents at CSR schools in regards to CSR's impact on teachers and students are mixed (see Tables 3.5 and 3.6). After three years of CSR implementation, approximately 60% of the staff at Cohort 1 schools credited CSR for changes to classroom teaching and improvements in student achievement (see Table 3.5). Perceptions of staff at Cohort 2 schools became more positive over the course of year one of CSR implementation.

Table 3.5: Selected Survey Items on CSR Model Impact (% Staff in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=619	Spring 2002 N=680	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=982	Spring 2002 N=847	Net Change
The implementation of the CSR reform model is changing classroom teaching practices.	62.1%	63.9%	1.8%	38.5%	47.4%	8.9%
The implementation of the CSR reform model is producing improvements in student achievement.	58.7%	61.8%	3.1%	30.7%	35.8%	5.1%

For their part, about half of parents of students attending Cohort 1 schools feel that CSR has changed classroom learning. Parents at Cohort 2 schools where the reforms have had less time to develop are slightly less optimistic, but more positive than school staff. Parents are also more positive about the impact CSR has had on student achievement at Cohort 1 schools, and nearly half of the parent survey respondents at Cohort 2 schools indicated a tangible benefit of participation in CSR after one year. In this respect, parents were more positive than school staff.

Table 3.6: Selected Survey Items on CSR Model Impact (% Parents in Agreement)

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Fall 2001 N=1279	Spring 2002 N=1275	Net Change	Fall 2001 N=2086	Spring 2002 N=1599	Net Change
The implementation of the CSR reform model is changing classroom teaching practices.	54.3%	56.0%	1.7%	43.7%	44.6%	0.9%
The implementation of the CSR reform model is producing improvements in student achievement.	61.1%	63.5%	2.4%	48.4%	48.6%	0.2%

IV. Parent/Community Involvement

Overview

Parent involvement is the focus of this section of the report. Specifically, this section examines the extent to which CSR schools are taking steps to meaningfully involve parents and the local community in the planning and implementation of comprehensive school reform at LAUSD CSR schools.

Our report concludes that the implementation of CSR has had little influence on parent or community involvement at CSR schools. To the extent that schools have focused on this area, these efforts are school rather than model-driven. Moreover, most outreach and training of parents at CSR schools predates the implementation of CSR.

Priority Attached to Parent Involvement

In general, model providers have not become involved in efforts to improve parent involvement at CSR schools. To the extent that schools have focused on parent education or outreach, schools have undertaken these changes independent of the model providers. When asked, the model providers acknowledge the need for parent involvement efforts but outline few concrete recommendations or provide direct assistance to schools in this area.

All of the evaluation data suggest that little progress has been made in the area of parent/community involvement at CSR schools. Overall, survey responses from staff and parents showed little or no change over the 2001-02 school year. However, the response from parents in relationship to parent involvement are quite high, especially for Cohort 2.

More striking are the contrasting perceptions of staff members compared to parents. As shown in Table 4.1, parents are much more positive about parent involvement than school staff. Whereas two-thirds of school staff say that parent involvement is an important component of school reform efforts, more than 85% of parents expressed agreement with this item at the end of the 2001-02 school year. Similarly, parents are more likely to say that the school encourages parents to become involved and that parents attend school events and activities.

Table 4.1: Selected Survey Items on Parent Involvement (% in Agreement), School Staff Compared to Parent Respondents, Spring 2002

	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
Survey Item	Staff Spring 2002 N=680	Parent Spring 2002 N=1275	Difference	Staff Spring 2002 N=847	Parent Spring 2002 N=1599	Difference
Improving parent involvement is an important focus of this school's reform effort.	66.7%	89.0%	22.3%	65.9%	86.1%	20.2%
This school encourages parent leadership and initiative.	64.1%	80.6%	16.5%	56.3%	77.1%	20.8%
There is a strong parental presence at school activities and events.	45.2%	63.8%	18.6%	38.4%	59.7%	21.3%

Parent Education

School efforts to deliver parent education varied considerably. In a few cases, CSR implementation coincided with a renewed emphasis on parent education. More typically, schools continued to offer the same parent education and training after adopting a CSR reform model as before. For instance, one case study school has had a parent center delivering parent education for nine years.

Survey results in Table 4.2 indicate that parents are more positive than staff in their perception of parent education. However, staff members seem to slightly overestimate parent awareness of health and social services available through the school.

Table 4.2: Selected Survey Items on Parent Education (% in Agreement), School Staff Compared to Parent Respondents, Spring 2002

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Staff Spring 2002 N=680	Parent Spring 2002 N=1275	Difference	Staff Spring 2002 N=847	Parent Spring 2002 N=1599	Difference
This school offers information and training designed to help parents support learning at home.	64.7%	80.2%	15.5%	59.1%	77.3%	18.2%
I am familiar with the programs and activities offered through the school's parent center.	47.7%	60.9%	13.2%	38.3%	51.8%	13.5%
Students and their families can access information about health and social services through the school.	68.4%	64.3%	-4.1%	69.0%	59.8%	-9.2%

There is some evidence that CSR schools have begun providing more parent education geared towards instructional topics. Some schools reported parent workshops on issues such as school curricula and understanding student report cards. In addition, some schools have begun to focus on increasing parental awareness and understanding of school-based literacy efforts. One case study school, for example, had made consistent efforts to inform parents about changes to student learning due to the need for aligning instruction to State content standards.

Table 4.3: Parent Priorities for School Improvement, Spring 2002 (N=1599)

Rank	Area	%
1	School Safety	55.2%
2	Student Reading Skills	32.6%
3	Parent Teacher Relationships	26.4%
4	Student Math Skills	25.5%
5	School Cleanliness/Appearance	24.5%

Parent survey results (see Table 4.3) indicate that parents are interested in educational topics including student reading and math skills. However, over half of the parents (55%) ranked school safety as their number one priority for school improvement.

Parent Outreach and Communication

Based on data from the six case study schools, parental outreach is primarily coordinated by a community representative(s) funded by Title I. In only one case had a school used CSR funds to involve teachers in parent outreach. A large aspect of outreach consists of efforts to increase parent attendance and participation at advisory council meetings tied to categorical funds. These efforts to involve parents in school governance are intended to enhance parents' role as educational partners both with the school and with their students.

The primary methods used to convey information to parents about school activities and events include monthly newsletters, bulletins, fliers, signs, and in a few cases, automated telephone dialing systems. To bridge language barriers, schools typically provide information (especially school newsletters) in both Spanish and English. One case study middle school tried to use a student organizer as a tool for home-school communication. The organizer includes a section for teachers and parents to write notes to one another about student progress, homework assignments, concerns, etc. Interviews with teachers, however, suggest teachers inconsistently use the organizers and that their potential as a tool for teacher-parent communication is underutilized.

Survey results (see Table 4.4) indicate that parents and school staff are quite positive about schools' communication and outreach efforts. For example, more than 85% of staff and parents agree that communication is regularly provided and that teachers are accessible to interested parents. There are large differences in parent's comfort levels of discussing concerns and interacting with teachers versus staff's perceptions of parent's comfort. Parents are more comfortable than staff believe in both Cohort 1 and 2.

Table 4.4: Selected Survey Items on Parent Communication/Outreach (% in Agreement), School Staff Compared to Parent Respondents, Spring 2002

Survey Item	Cohort 1			Cohort 2		
	Staff Spring 2002 N=680	Parent Spring 2002 N=1275	Difference	Staff Spring 2002 N=847	Parent Spring 2002 N=1599	Difference
Parents receive communication from the school at least monthly.	85.1%	87.1%	2.0%	86.1%	85.8%	-0.3%
Teachers are available to meet with parents to discuss student progress.	88.6%	93.7%	5.1%	88.2%	91.3%	3.1%
Parents feel comfortable discussing concerns and interacting with teachers at this school.	57.5%	90.8%	33.3%	47.2%	88.5%	41.3%

Despite high levels of parent satisfaction with home-school communication, it is important to point out that survey results also indicate that only half of all parents reported receiving information about the CSR model reform provider at their child's school. As shown in Table 4.5, smaller numbers (approximately 40% at Cohort 1 schools and 30% at Cohort 2 schools) reported participating in a meeting or training devoted to helping parents understand the reform model selected by the school.

Table 4.5: Selected Survey Items on Parent Awareness/Receipt of Information Regarding CSR Models (% in Agreement), Parent Respondents, Spring 2002

Survey Item	Cohort 1 Parent Spring 2002 N=1275
I have received written information about the reform model selected by the school.	70.0% N=893
I participated in an orientation meeting and/or training on the purpose of the reform model.	41.8% N=533

V. External Support and Technical Assistance

Overview

This section examines the type of technical support/assistance needed to help schools implement comprehensive school-wide reforms. In particular, this section of the report is focused on assessing the level and quality of support for CSR schools emanating from both external (contracted model providers) and internal (local and central district) sources. The CSR components of external support and technical assistance as well as the coordination of resources are embedded in this section.

Our examination centers on the acknowledgement that successful school reform efforts require a range of outside support. With CSR, school support through an outside model provider is a built-in requirement. Although model providers have focused on a narrow set of the CSR components, school stakeholders (at least those familiar with their model provider) are generally satisfied with the services provided. Schools report mixed levels of satisfaction with the support that they have received to date from both central and local district sources. In addition, coping with the simultaneous implementation of CSR and District mandated curricular reforms is an on-going challenge for CSR schools.

Model Provider Support

As discussed in Sections II and IV, support from model providers has focused on professional development and coaching, with some added impetus to schools in the area of using assessment results to modify instruction. CSR model providers in LAUSD have played little role in other aspects of CSR implementation, including school governance, parent involvement, and student intervention programs. Model providers also have had little if any direct involvement with ELL instruction.

Nonetheless, when asked about the support received from outside entities, model provider support was the area of outside support most frequently named as most helpful and useful by CSR schools on the June 2002 District Support Survey (named by 32% of schools). This survey, typically completed by the key CSR contact at the school (i.e., principal or Title I coordinator) indicates that those in school leadership positions tend to be satisfied with the support they receive from the model provider. In other words, those most knowledgeable and involved with the model providers are largely positive. This finding contrasts with the perceptions of rank-and-file teachers and other staff members, who are not as clear about the impact of model providers on school reform or student achievement.

Direct District Support

District support for schools takes two primary forms: that offered by the local districts and the support that comes from the central district. Local districts are expected to have more face-to-face contact with school staff as well as regular, hands-on knowledge about the goings-on at a particular school. Each local district has designated a person who acts as CSR contact, while central district support for CSR schools comes from the SB 1X Office in the Specially Funded and Parent/Community Programs Division.

School satisfaction with district support was measured via a District Support Survey administered in June 2002. At a point close to the end of the 2001-02 school year, principals (or the school contacts most familiar with CSR and related District support) were asked to rate the quality of district support (both local and central) on a scale from 1 (unsatisfactory) to 5 (excellent). Completed surveys were received for 31 of 32 CSR schools.

Survey results are presented below as a mean (average) satisfaction score based on the 1-5 rubric (i.e., scores of 3.0 and higher indicate satisfaction). Based on the results (see Table 5.1) the central office has succeeded in coordinating the District CSR evaluation (mean 3.4), providing access to outcome data (mean of 3.1), and giving schools feedback on accountability reports due to the State and on CSR budgets (means of 3.0). The high ratings for the central district are likely due to the fact that the SB1X Office held quarterly district support meetings for CSR schools and local district personnel during 2001-02 to respond to questions and concerns about district policy, state mandates, and other issues of importance to all CSR schools. Also, at each meeting, the evaluation team from Public *Works*, Inc. presented preliminary evaluation data (e.g., survey results) aimed at helping schools benefit from evaluative information along the way. This support was named by 29% schools as a major source of helpful and useful outside support, second only to model provider support.

Table 5.1: District Support Survey Results (Mean Satisfaction Score) N=31

Category of Support	Central District	Local District
Review and provide feedback on End of Year report due to State.	3.0	2.7
Review alignment of school plans to State/District requirements.	2.5	2.8
Answer questions about State or federal requirements, policies, or procedures.	2.7	2.6
Review and provide feedback on CSR budgets.	3.0	2.9
Coordinate District CSR evaluation.	3.4	2.9
Provide access to data on student outcomes and school performance.	3.1	3.4
Meet with school teams or stakeholders to discuss CSR reform implementation.	2.3	2.6
Discuss strategies for meeting CSR benchmarks.	2.3	2.9
Provide guidance on integrating CSR with other District mandates.	2.5	2.9
Provide guidance on sustaining reforms beyond grant period.	2.2	3.0

Local districts received the highest ratings for providing support to CSR schools in terms of access to data (mean of 3.4) and helping schools plan for reform sustainability (mean of 3.0). Interestingly, schools feel least supported by the central office in terms of guidance on reform sustainability (mean of 2.2). Local districts also received high ratings for budget review, evaluation coordination, strategic planning to meet performance benchmarks, and helping schools integrate CSR with District mandates (means of 2.9). According to CSR schools, local districts are less likely to answer questions about CSR policies and procedures or to meet with schools about CSR implementation.

Overall, the survey findings show that CSR schools expect and desire more knowledge of CSR by LAUSD local district staff. Interviews with the CSR contacts at local districts in spring 2002 corroborate this finding. Most of the designated CSR contacts had little if any knowledge about the CSR program, model providers, and specifics regarding the CSR schools in their districts. In terms of coordinating site-based reforms, local district contacts

were helpful but prioritized LAUSD curricular reforms, with CSR reform taking a very distant position in terms of visibility or importance.

The District also worked at providing schools with more information regarding CSR model providers during the 2001-02 school year. In response to findings from the 2000-01 CSR evaluation, the SB 1X Office sponsored a fair in February 2002 that schools were asked to attend in order to learn about various model providers. Although this information was too late for the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools already implementing CSR, such information was intended to help schools applying for Cohort 3. Additional district support during 2001-02 included resource directories, presentations from model providers, and assistance in contract negotiations.

Influence of District Curricular Reforms

The discussion of District support to CSR schools during 2001-02 cannot ignore the District initiatives that have affected curriculum and instruction at CSR schools. Many of these initiatives are fairly new, such as the adoption and expansion of District-wide literacy and math programs during the past two years. For example, the District's Structured Reading Program mandated that all elementary schools select a language arts curriculum to implement during the 2000-01 school year and gave schools three programs to choose from. In 2001-02 approximately 380 schools were implementing Open Court Reading (OCR), about 32 were implementing Success For All (SFA), and one chose Reading Mastery. Beginning in 2001-02, all LAUSD elementary schools were required to implement either the Harcourt Brace or Scott Foresman mathematics textbook series. In addition, the District has provided schools with out-of-classroom literacy and math coaches responsible for helping schools via on-site professional development and coaching.

LAUSD also expanded its literacy reform efforts to secondary schools in Fall 2002. Middle and high schools have begun implementing the Developing Readers and Writers (DRW) program which established language arts intervention classes in grades 6-9**.** Using the Language! curriculum, students participating in the DRW program are enrolled in an extra language arts elective aimed at helping them read and write on grade level. LAUSD has also rolled out Highpoint at all secondary schools. This intervention curriculum targets the literacy needs of ELL students. All secondary schools also received out-of-classroom literacy and math coaches.

Another District initiative affecting CSR schools is district-wide allocation of "banked time" for professional development. By adding additional minutes to the school day four days per week, LAUSD has been able to "add" an hour of banked time for district-wide professional development. These sessions are held on Tuesday afternoons throughout the District, providing teachers with time for training, common planning and other instructional purposes.

LAUSD is also pioneering the use of "Learning Walks" as a means of examining classroom teaching practices. Based on training from the University of Pittsburgh's Institute for Learning, the Learning Walks involve teachers, administrators, and district staff in focused observations of classroom teaching. Looking for evidence of "clear expectations" in classroom displays of student work and alignment of lessons to State content standards

were typical areas of focus used during scheduled Learning Walks in the 2001-02 school year.

LAUSD provides additional support for CSR schools through funding for a variety of after-school, intersession, and summer enrichment programs. These programs are intended to provide focused academic support for students who are struggling academically. Intervention is funded through a variety of programs. For example, during the 2001-02 school year, LAUSD funded intervention programs targeting students at-risk for grade retention (prioritizing 2nd graders). In addition, federal bilingual funds were used to implement an Early Immigrant Education Program (EIEP) targeting upper-grade (4th and 5th grades) ELL students who were not ready for redesignation.

As indicated in Section II of this report, CSR schools have struggled with the simultaneous implementation of CSR and multiple District reform initiatives. In nearly all cases, District reform initiatives took precedence over localized reform plans linked to CSR implementation. While not always at odds with one another, the emphasis on District reforms served to limit the visibility of CSR among teachers and other staff. In particular, professional development time tended to be taken up by District reform priorities, limiting the time available for training specific to CSR models. Allocating time for coaching between both model provider coaches and District-funded coaches was another way in which competing reform agendas influenced the scope and pace of CSR implementation.

VI. Student Achievement

Overview

This section assesses the extent to which CSR schools have succeeded in improving student achievement and school performance. This section aligns with the required CSR components of measurable goals and benchmarks to document changes in student achievement and effective school functioning.

The three years of data from Cohort I schools demonstrate that CSR is a gradual and incremental process with fluctuations occurring in key measures. Schools that experienced growth one year did not necessarily show improvement the next year. CSR Schools in Cohort 2 show progress after one year of implementation, although there is clearly room for improvement. Overall, elementary CSR schools in both cohorts were more successful than secondary schools in meeting CSR student achievement benchmarks.

CSR Benchmarks

The main goal of CSR is to improve student achievement. This section examines student and school progress in terms of the measurable goals and benchmarks established in the District's CSR application. Although these schools are implementing diverse school reform programs, we can compare the progress of each school in terms of key student achievement and school performance goals. Note however, because Cohort 1 schools are two years ahead of Cohort 2 schools in CSR implementation, it is inappropriate to compare cohort performance against one another. The baseline for assessing progress is considered the last school year before CSR schools began implementation, thus the baseline is 1998-99 for Cohort 1 and 2000-01 for Cohort 2 schools. At the onset of the CSR program, the schools were at different levels of achievement for all student achievement and school performance indicators. For this reason, it is inappropriate to compare CSR schools to one another in terms of absolute achievement levels based on current year performance. Instead, this report focuses on comparing the schools in terms of the relative change or progress over time in terms of common achievement indicators. Table 6.1 presents the goals and benchmarks each CSR school has set out to achieve:

Table 6.1: CSR Goals and Benchmarks

Goal	Annual Benchmark
1) Improve overall student achievement	• Achievement of state mandated growth targets for the Academic Performance Index (API) • Achievement of state mandated growth targets for all significant subgroups
2) Improve student achievement in reading	• 5 percentile point increase in the average national percentile rank on the SAT-9 reading exam • 5 point increase in the percentage of students who achieve the 50th percentile or above on the SAT-9 reading exam
3) Improve student achievement in language arts	• 5 percentile point increase in the average national percentile rank on the SAT-9 language arts exam • 5 point increase in the percentage of students who achieve the 50th percentile or above on the SAT-9 language arts exam
4) Improve overall student literacy	• 5 point increase in percentage of 3rd graders who achieve the 50th percentile or above on both the reading and language arts components of the SAT-9 exam *
5) Improve student achievement in mathematics	• 5 percentile point increase in the average national percentile rank on the SAT-9 mathematics exam • 5 point increase in the percentage of students who achieve the 50th percentile or above on the SAT-9 mathematics exam
6) Improve English attainment and educational opportunities for English Language Learners (ELL)	• 2 point increase in the percentage of ELL students with up to 3 years of LAUSD instruction who are redesignated during the school year
7) Improve school attendance and student retention	• 1 point increase in attendance rate • 1 point decrease in dropout rate**

*Elementary schools only
** Middle and high schools only

Academic Performance Index

The API measures student achievement in all SAT-9 subject areas for all grades by weighting the subtests and computing a score based on a scale from 200 to 1000. The State of California mandates that all schools must meet annual growth targets for the API school-wide, plus 80% of the school-wide growth target for all numerically significant ethnic subgroups and socio-economically disadvantaged students.[10]   In 2001-02, the majority of schools in both cohorts met their school-wide and subgroup growth targets; however, elementary schools were much more likely to meet their targets than were secondary schools.

Cohort 1: Overall, CSR schools have shown improvement in API scores since reform implementation began three years ago (see Table 6.2). Performance of elementary schools has typically been better than that of middle schools. In Year One, all schools showed growth in their API, and all but one showed growth in Year Two. Nine out of the 14 schools met school-wide growth targets both of these years.   In Year Three, twelve of the 14 schools in met school-wide growth targets. Every elementary school in Cohort 1 met both their school-wide and subgroup growth targets after the third year of implementation. Middle schools have experienced less progress. Only one middle school in Cohort 1 met its school-wide growth targets while none met their subgroup growth targets in the third year of implementation.

---

[10] Numerically significant is defined as either 1) 15% of the total student population and at least 30 pupils, or 2) at least 100 students regardless of percentage of school's total population.

Table 6.2: API and Growth Targets for Cohort 1 Schools

	Local District	1999 Base API	2000 Base API	2001 Base API	2002 Growth API	met 2002 school-wide growth targets	met all 2002 subgroup growth targets
Elementary Schools							
24th Street	E	409	466	533	573	✓	✓
66th Street	I	425	433	494	543	✓	✓
68th Street	I	444	477	508	556	✓	✓
Carson	K	553	575	591	683	✓	✓
Graham	I	365	387	436	469	✓	✓
Liggett	A	447	499	582	634	✓	✓
Manchester	I	375	384	443	471	✓	✓
Loren Miller	I	354	417	447	507	✓	✓
Montague Charter	B	444	505	585	639	✓	✓
Richland	D	539	542	559	665	✓	✓
Roscoe	B	421	457	553	613	✓	✓
Middle Schools							
Maclay	B	397	414	536	442		
Markham	I	385	402	417	410		
Twain	D	524	546*	519	537	✓	

* Mark Twain's 2000 API score was determined invalid.

Cohort 2: Of the 18 CSR schools in Cohort 2, fourteen met their school-wide growth targets and subgroup growth targets after their first year of CSR implementation (see Table 6.3) . Twelve of these schools were elementary schools and two were middle schools. Every school but one experienced some growth in their API score even though they did not all meet their growth targets.

Table 6.3: API and Growth Targets for Cohort 2 Schools

	Local District	2001 Base API	2002 Growth API	Met 2002 school-wide growth targets	Met all 2002 subgroup growth targets
Elementary Schools					
135th Street	K	499	577	✓	✓
49th Street	H	434	494	✓	✓
75th Street	I	444	474	✓	✓
Dyer	B	555	592	✓	✓
Ford	H	539	592	✓	✓
Gratts	F	430	442		
Hooper	H	444	500	✓	✓
Melrose	D	656	698	✓	✓
Parmelee	I	445	513	✓	✓
Plummer	A	490	557	✓	✓
Rio Vista	B	620	637	✓	✓
Vinedale	B	569	587	✓	✓
Wadsworth	H	480	548	✓	✓
Middle Schools					
Carnegie	K	580	584		
Northridge	C	503	542	✓	✓
Peary	K	541	562	✓	
Sepulveda	A	508	510		✓
Senior High Schools					
North Hollywood	B	571	566		

Student Literacy Achievement

This section examines the progress in literacy skills of students at Cohort 1 and 2 CSR schools using several indicators. These indicators include SAT-9 Reading scores, SAT-9 Language scores, the third grade literacy rate (i.e., the percentage of 3rd grade students at or above the 50% percentile on both SAT-9 Reading and SAT-9 Language), and formative assessment data results from the Open Court Reading and Success For All literacy curricular programs. Although considerable progress has been made in literacy by CSR schools, with gains that tend to mirror District-wide gains, growth has been limited primarily to elementary schools. Moreover, gains have not lifted the average student to grade level performance.

SAT-9 Reading Achievement

The majority of schools in both cohorts have improved their SAT-9 reading scores since CSR implementation began. While a few schools experienced substantial gains, many other schools increased by fewer points. Secondary schools were much less likely to show gains than elementary schools, and any growth experience was minimal.

Cohort 1: Over the three year period of CSR implementation from 1999 to 2002, all 14 Cohort 1 schools increased their SAT-9 Reading scores except for one school, which stayed stable. While elementary schools' increases ranged from 5 to 23 NPRs (4-15 NCEs), with an average growth of 12 NPRs (8 NCEs), the three middle schools saw minimal growth ranging from 0 to 4 NPRs (0-3 NCEs).[11] This reflected the District-wide growth for seventh graders over the same period of time, although the average District-wide middle school NPR for SAT-9 Reading in 2002 is considerably higher than that of two of the three Cohort 1 middle schools. Growth over the three years for elementary schools District-wide was 13 NPRs (8 NCEs), which five of the eleven elementary schools matched or exceeded.

Cohort 2: Exactly half (nine schools) of all the Cohort 2 CSR schools experienced gains from 2001 to 2002, or Year One of implementation, while two remained stable. Of the 13 elementary schools, almost 40% (five schools) declined to some degree in their SAT-9 reading scores. Two elementary schools made gains of 10 or more NPRs (7 or more NCEs), while eight of the 13 Cohort 2 elementary schools matched or exceeded the District's 2-point growth (1 NCE). Only one secondary schools in Cohort 2 made improvements, and two schools declined (1-2 NCEs). Two additional schools matched the District average of no growth.

---

[11] Because CSR benchmarks for SAT-9 were expressed as NPRs, we have presented data this way in the evaluation report. The reader should be aware, however, that gain in student scores on standardized tests are more properly expressed as Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores. Statistically, it is possible to represent "actual" gain with NCEs because it uses an equidistant interval scale. For this reason, we have included NCE scores next to NPRs. In addition, complete school level tables with NCE results are in Appendix E.

Table 6.4: Average NPR SAT-9 reading for Cohort I (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	Change
	Avg. NPR	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools					
24th Street – E	16	20	28	30	2
66th Street – I	12	18	21	26	5
68th Street – I	21	24	21	26	5
Carson Street – K	36	34	36	47	11
Graham – I	14	16	21	19	-2
Liggett Street – A	18	25	31	35	4
Manchester Ave. – I	14	12	17	20	3
Loren Miller – I	11	13	16	21	5
Montague – B	19	24	28	33	5
Richland Ave. – D	30	29	26	39	13
Roscoe – B	15	22	33	38	5
Middle Schools					
Maclay – B	13	17	17	16	-1
Markham – I	14	14	17	14	-3
Mark Twain – D	30	27	29	34	5
District					
Elementary*	23	28	34	36	2
Middle School*	26	42	29	29	0

* grade 3   ** grade 7

Table 6.5: Average NPR SAT-9 reading for Cohort II (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	2001	2002	Change
	Avg. NPR	avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools			
135th Street – K	22	37	15
49th Street – H	18	28	10
75th Street – I	16	21	5
Dyer – B	36	35	-1
Ford – H	27	29	2
Gratts – F	15	14	-1
Hooper - H	18	21	3
Melrose Ave. – D	47	41	-6
Parmelee – I	18	20	2
Plummer – A	22	29	7
Rio Vista – B	47	39	-8
Vinedale – B	31	26	-5
Wadsworth – H	18	24	6
Middle Schools			
Carnegie – K	36	32	-4
Northridge – C	23	23	0
Peary – K	29	33	4
Sepulveda – A	24	24	0
Senior High Schools			
North Hollywood – B	26	24	-2
District			
Elementary*	34	36	2
Middle School*	29	29	0
Senior High*	23	23	0

* grade 3 ** grade 7 *** grade 9

SAT-9 Language

In terms of SAT-9 language scores, Cohort 1 CSR schools showed greater overall growth than in Reading, as demonstrated by both the average growth rates and the number of schools meeting or exceeding District growth rates.   Growth in Language scores from 2001 to 2002 among Cohort 2 schools was very similar to that of Reading score growth.

Cohort 1: Over the three year period of CSR implementation from 1999 to 2002, all 14 Cohort 1 schools increased their SAT-9 Language scores except for one school, which decreased 1 NPR (1 NCE). While elementary schools' increases ranged from 8 to 25 NPRs (5-15 NCEs), the three middle schools again experienced less growth ranging from -1 to 8 NPRs(-1-4 NCEs). Only one of the three middle schools matched or exceeded the District-wide growth for seventh graders of 7 NPRs (4 NCEs). Growth over the three years for elementary schools District-wide was 17 NPRs (11 NCEs), which six of the eleven elementary schools matched or exceeded.

Table 6.6: Average NPR SAT-9 language arts for Cohort I (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	Change
	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools					
24th Street – E	22	27	37	47	10
66th Street – I	16	23	28	34	6
68th Street – I	26	41	33	36	3
Carson Street – K	45	47	49	60	11
Graham – I	17	23	30	26	-4
Liggett Street – A	20	31	37	44	7
Manchester Ave. – I	20	16	28	28	0
Loren Miller – I	13	19	22	29	7
Montague – B	25	31	34	44	10
Richland Ave. – D	26	36	35	48	13
Roscoe – B	22	30	39	45	6
Middle Schools					
Maclay – B	16	21	21	19	-2
Markham – I	20	19	21	19	-2
Mark Twain – D	35	46	37	43	6
District					
Elementary*	30	37	44	47	3
Middle School*	33	37	37	40	3

* grade 3
** grade 7

Cohort 2: Out of eighteen CSR Cohort II schools, 13 have improved in terms of SAT-9 language arts scores since implementing CSR reforms. Two elementary schools' scores declined, however, by –12 and –14 NPRs (-6 and –8 NCEs), which was greater than these two schools' declines in SAT-9 Reading scores. Secondary level schools experienced growth ranging from 1 to 4 NPRs (1-2 NCEs), with two of the five Cohort 2 secondary schools matching or exceeding the district level's growth averages for secondary schools.

Table 6.7: Average NPR SAT-9 language arts for Cohort II (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	2001	2002	Change
	Avg. NPR	Avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools			
135th Street – K	26	44	18
49th Street – H	32	40	8
75th Street – I	25	27	2
Dyer – B	42	46	4
Ford – H	39	44	5
Gratts – F	26	21	-5
Hooper - H	25	28	3
Melrose Ave. – D	56	54	-2
Parmelee – I	24	27	3
Plummer – A	30	38	8
Rio Vista – B	56	44	-12
Vinedale – B	47	33	-14
Wadsworth – H	27	34	7
Middle Schools			
Carnegie – K	44	48	4
Northridge – C	32	34	2
Peary – K	38	41	3
Sepulveda – A	32	31	-1
Senior High Schools			
North Hollywood – B	39	40	1
District			
Elementary*	44	47	3
Middle School*	37	40	3
Senior High*	38	38	0

* grade 3
** grade 7
*** grade 9

Third Grade Literacy Rate

Eighteen of the 24 CSR elementary schools in Cohorts 1 and 2 improved their percentage of students at or above the 50th percentile on both the reading and language arts portion of the SAT-9 since beginning CSR implementation. Please refer to **Appendix E** for achievement data for individual CSR schools.

Cohort 1: Over the three year period of CSR implementation from 1999 to 2002, all 11 Cohort 1 elementary schools had an increase in their SAT-9 third grade literacy rate. These increases ranged from 4% to 23% with an average growth of 14%. The percentage of students at or above the 50th percentile in both reading and language arts in 2002 ranged from 11% to 41%.

Cohort 2: Of the 13 elementary schools in Cohort 2, eight of them experienced growth from 2001 to 2002. Two schools made gains of 10% or higher. Five schools experienced declines in the percentage of students at or above the 50th percentile in both reading and language arts. The percentage of Cohort 2 students at or above the 50th percentile in 2002 ranged from 6% to 35%.

Formative Literacy Assessment Data

The analysis of 2001-02 literacy assessment data of 16 OCR schools and 4 SFA schools undertaken by Public *Works*, Inc. consisted of an analysis of percentage of students reading at grade level at various points throughout the year, as measured by the unit assessment scores of OCR students and the SFA level placement for SFA students. Additionally, means and median scores were calculated for each grade level for each assessment, with a breakdown comparing ELL student performance to non-ELL students. This analysis resulted in the following key findings. Please refer to **Appendix F** for formative literacy assessment data for all CSR elementary schools.[12]

  ➢ In general, students in the lower grades (grades 1-2) experienced more progress in literacy skills over the school year than did upper grades (grades 3-5).
  ➢ English Language Learners (ELLs) in the lower grades made more progress than upper grade ELL students. However, ELL students at lower ELD levels (ELD 1 and 2 in particular) performed considerably lower than students with higher levels of English language proficiency (ELD level 3-5).
  ➢ Although students tended to improve over the school year, in most cases literacy gains were insufficient to bring the average student to grade level proficiency or to the benchmark score.

Thus, despite the growth seen by both SAT-9 scores and formative literacy data, students at CSR schools largely continue to read below grade level. Because of the deficiencies in literacy skills of so may students at CSR schools, literacy curricula must accelerate learning so that the gaps between grade level and expected levels of competence are closed. Although Cohort 1 SFA schools have now been implementing SFA for three years, the implementation of structured consistent reading programs at most CSR schools is more recent. As these programs become more institutionalized, hopefully growth will continue and more students will be able to close the achievement gap**.**

Student Math Achievement

The only consistent measure currently available for assessing the math achievement of CSR students is SAT-9 Math scores, which is reported in this section. Please refer to Appendix E for achievement data for individual CSR schools.

SAT-9 Math

Overall, students experienced substantial growth in student achievement in mathematics with greater overall increases for elementary schools in both cohorts than Reading and

---

[12] It is important to note that incomplete formative literacy assessment data were available to the evaluators. The data set analyzed contained complete data for 38% of the students at the CSR schools implementing OCR. Similarly, of the four SFA schools (4 schools were excluded), complete data were available for 63% of students. Incomplete data was the result of incomplete data entry on the part of schools, errors in administration of assessments, and the pilot nature of the district's SOAR database. Please see "Formative Literacy Student Achievement Results for Cohorts 1 & 2" 2001-2002 CSR Program Evaluation, prepared by Public *Works*, Inc. for LAUSD Specially Funded and Parent/Community Programs Division, SB 1X Office (January 2003).

Language scores. Similar to other subjects, secondary schools experienced less progress than elementary schools, with many experiencing little or no change.

Cohort 1: Over the three-year period of CSR implementation from 1999 to 2002, all 11 Cohort 1 elementary schools increased their SAT-9 math score. These increases ranged from 6 to 32 NPRs (4-18 NCEs) with an average growth of 20 NPRs (12 NCEs). Growth over the three years for elementary schools District-wide was 19 NPRs (10 NCEs), which seven of the eleven elementary schools matched or exceeded. Middle schools did not reflect the growth of elementary schools, with two of the three middle schools experiencing negative growth over the three-year period. In addition, none of the CSR middle schools in Cohort 1 met the District-wide average growth for middle schools of 3 NPRs (2 NCEs). 2001-02 was the first year of CSR implementation in which no Cohort 1 middle school experienced a decline in scores, however.

Table 6.8: Average NPR SAT-9 mathematics for Cohort I (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	Change
	avg. NPR	avg. NPR	Avg. NPR	avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools					
24th Street – E	24	32	34	46	12
66th Street – I	27	36	41	53	12
68th Street – I	34	47	36	44	8
Carson Street – K	47	47	39	64	25
Graham – I	20	24	27	26	-1
Liggett Street – A	36	46	49	55	6
Manchester Ave. – I	21	20	27	31	4
Loren Miller – I	18	22	26	38	12
Montague – B	30	48	56	60	4
Richland Ave. – D	34	38	47	63	16
Roscoe – B	22	30	43	54	11
Middle Schools					
Maclay – B	23	25	23	25	2
Markham – I	22	19	21	21	0
Mark Twain – D	34	32	31	31	0
District					
Elementary*	35	42	49	54	5
Middle School*	32	33	34	35	1

* grade 3
** grade 7

Cohort 2: In their first year of CSR implementation, ten of the 18 Cohort 2 schools matched or exceeded average District growth rates. Five elementary schools more than doubled the District's 5-point NPR (3 NCEs) growth. Elementary schools' net change in scores ranged from -11 to 18 NPRs (-6-10 NCEs), with an average growth of 6 NPRs (3 NCEs). Although two middle schools improved more than middle schools District-wide, the other three secondary schools all experienced negative growth.

Table 6.9: Average NPR SAT-9 mathematics for Cohort II (Benchmark Grade Levels)

	2001	2002	Change
	avg. NPR	Avg. NPR	2001-02
Elementary Schools			
135th Street – K	31	49	18
49th Street – H	37	48	11
75th Street – I	27	35	8
Dyer – B	49	49	0
Ford – H	45	52	7
Gratts – F	26	27	1
Hooper - H	29	39	10
Melrose Ave. – D	53	51	-2
Parmelee – I	28	41	13
Plummer – A	38	50	12
Rio Vista – B	60	52	-8
Vinedale – B	48	37	-11
Wadsworth – H	37	50	13
Middle Schools			
Carnegie – K	37	40	3
Northridge – C	32	30	-2
Peary – K	32	34	2
Sepulveda – A	35	33	-2
Senior High Schools			
North Hollywood – B	42	40	-2
District			
Elementary*	49	54	5
Middle School*	34	35	1
Senior High*	39	39	0

* grade 3   ** grade 7   *** grade 9

Other Achievement Indicators

Additional achievement indicators collected by LAUSD and included in the District's CSR application to the state are ELL redesignation rates, attendance rates, and dropout rates. Dropout rates have not been included for analysis in this report, as the data for 2001-02 is not yet available and the dropout data tend to be somewhat unreliable in general. Issues surrounding ELL instruction are explored in further depth at the end of Section III.

ELL Redesignation

In 2002, all CSR schools saw a decline in redesignation rate from 2001, perhaps due to the fact that 2001 redesignation rates were particularly high for most schools. This measure typically experiences large fluctuations, as a school's ELL population fluctuates from year to year. Thus, even when the number of students redesignated increases from one year to the next, the rate of redesignation can decrease.

Cohort 1: All Cohort 1 CSR schools experienced declines in redesignation rates in 2001-02 and thus none reached the expected growth of 2 percentage points. Ten of the 14 schools saw declines greater than 10%. These results contrast sharply with prior year results where 7 CSR schools showed growth of more than two percentage points in their redesignation rate in 2000-011, compared to five schools the previous year. Indeed, the District average

redesignation rate of 21.7% was exceeded at six CSR schools during Year Two of CSR implementation.

Cohort 2: All Cohort 2 CSR schools experienced declines in redesignation rates from 2001 and thus none reached the expected growth of 2 percentage points. Eight of the 18 schools saw declines greater than 10%.

Student Attendance

Both cohorts of CSR schools experienced minimal growth in terms of student attendance since beginning CSR implementation, with average growth rates of 1.1% (Cohort 1 and 0.56% (Cohort 2). However, 24 of the 32 CSR schools met or exceeded the District's overall 2001-02 attendance rate of 93.6%.

Cohort 1: Most CSR Cohort 1 schools experienced small but gradual growth in their attendance rates over the three years of CSR implementation. Eight of the 14 schools, all of them elementary, achieved or were within one percentage point of meeting the District attendance goal of 95%.

Cohort 2: In 2001-02, every Cohort 2 CSR school improved its attendance rate from the previous school year. Twelve of the 18 schools, all of them elementary, have also surpassed or are within one percentage point of matching the District's attendance goal of 95%.

Student Achievement Summary

Cohort 1: CSR elementary schools have shown growth in SAT-9 scores and other indicators since beginning CSR implementation in Fall 1999. Approximately half or more of the elementary schools exceeded the District growth rates in SAT-9 Reading, Language, and Math. The three middle schools were not as successful in matching District-wide middle school averages. Middle school math performance over the three-year period was weak, with only one of the middle schools making any growth from 1999 to 2002.

The three years of data from Cohort 1 schools demonstrate that comprehensive school reform is a gradual and incremental process with fluctuations occurring in key measures. Schools that experienced growth one year did not necessarily show improvement the next year. Such ups and downs are clearly seen in **Appendix E**, which lays out the three-year results for all Cohort 1 schools in meeting the benchmark indicators.   The overall success of many Cohort 1 schools – elementary schools in particular - is encouraging, as these gains tend to reflect the gains of LAUSD schools District-wide. Additionally, these three years of data illuminate the lack of influence CSR reforms seem to have had on secondary schools.

Cohort 2: Overall, CSR Schools in Cohort 2 are faring relatively well, although there is room for improvement. Cohort 2 schools had the most success in achieving the API annual benchmark. The vast majority of elementary schools met both their school-wide and subgroup growth targets. On the other hand, fewer of these schools achieved the other academic benchmarks. Similar to Cohort I schools, secondary schools have been less successful in achieving annual benchmarks. In fact, with the exception of one school, elementary school results in academic benchmarks like reading, language arts, and math are

mixed yet noticeable. In comparison, no secondary level schools met the benchmark on any of these academic indicators.

VII. Conclusions and Recommendations

In the section below we offer a number of key conclusions regarding the implementation of CSR at the Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools in LAUSD. These findings are based on two years of evaluation data (2000-01 and 2001-02) collected on Cohort 1 schools (i.e., schools in their third year of CSR in 2001-02) and one year of evaluation data (2001-02) for the Cohort 2 schools (i.e., schools completing the first year of CSR implementation in 2001-02). Based on our evaluation findings, we offer a set of recommendations, linked to the study's research questions, aimed at helping LAUSD enhance the implementation and coordination of CSR throughout the District now that a new cohort (Cohort 3) made up of 22 new schools began implementing CSR in Fall 2002.

Scope and Influence of CSR Implementation

CSR schools have benefited from professional development and coaching. The introduction of new curricular reform initiatives as well as partnerships with model providers has brought more focus to professional development. In addition, teachers are positive about the coaching and support provided by CSR models and District-funded curricular coaches. At many CSR schools, there is more sharing of effective teaching techniques and greater "transparency" of classroom instruction.

Assessment practices are changing at CSR schools. CSR schools appear more likely to use assessment data as a tool for school-wide and classroom planning as part of CSR implementation. At the urging of both model provider representatives and District-funded curricular coaches, CSR schools are increasingly examining summative and formative assessment data during professional development and in grade level and departmental meetings. In addition, the heightened accountability and reporting required of CSR schools has pushed the examination of assessment data to the forefront.

Little to no impact of CSR model reform providers is evident in a number of areas including: school governance, student intervention services, and parent/community involvement. The reform models in place at CSR schools are less "comprehensive" than commonly believed. Although there are nine (now eleven) components of CSR, model providers have largely focused on delivering professional development and providing instructional coaching. Model providers have tended not to become involved in restructuring school governance, or helping schools in the areas of parent involvement. The influence of model providers is also largely absent in terms of student intervention programs and/or instruction targeting student subgroups such as English Language Learners. In practice, however, the areas not covered by model providers are often the CSR components where little has changed.

Conditions related to the selection of reform models play a key role in shaping staff buy-in and support for CSR. In many cases, the principal or a small group of staff selected model providers without a significant amount of involvement from the staff as a whole. Parents were rarely involved in selection of model providers. At many schools, a significant proportion of staff expressed limited awareness of the impact of the model's influence. In some cases, this has triggered resistance to reform efforts. Regardless, the terms under which the model was selected played a major role in shaping implementation of the model.

Staff support for and involvement in CSR appear to be correlated with the pace of reform implementation. Overall, staff support for CSR models lags levels of staff involvement. The lukewarm nature of staff support for CSR models is related, in part, to the degree to which the model involves a significant number of teachers and other staff early in the CSR process. Some models use a phased in approach to reform, involving staff on a voluntary basis with plans for full staff involvement by the third year of implementation. Other models involve many or most staff members from the outset. Although the more gradual approach often helps create buy-in for reform, schools that involved most or a large cross-section of staff early on in implementation of the reform model experienced less long-term difficulties. In addition, schools with a more overt model provider presence and greater direct staff involvement in reform were more likely to share a common vision and/or expectation of reform.

- **Recommendation 1:** CSR schools should first clarify the balance of reform responsibilities that the model reform provider is responsible for and then allocate other reform tasks among school staff and other partners.
- **Recommendation 2**: LAUSD should develop guidelines for how schools select outside reform models with lessons learned.
- **Recommendation 3:** CSR schools should take steps to involve most or a large cross-section of staff early on in implementation of site-based reform models.

Influence of Curriculum and Instruction

CSR schools have not implemented reforms in a number of instructional areas, including academic intervention programs. In large part, school intervention programs suffer from lack of coordination, complicated by multiple funding streams and programmatic priorities. Model providers have not become involved in reshaping extended day and extended year offerings. Nearly all CSR schools exhibited serious shortcomings in terms of student identification, referral, and assessment practices of school intervention programs. Linkages between intervention programs and the regular school day curriculum were quite weak, reflecting low levels of teacher awareness on the purposes and goals of intervention as well as a generally piecemeal approach to serving struggling students, many of whom are English Language Learners.

CSR schools have implemented few changes in terms of serving ELL students. Although CSR schools were largely positive about standards-based instruction and professional development, instructional services for ELL students have not been affected by the introduction of research-based models. During 2001-02, professional development CSR schools focused on linking standards and curricula, developing curricular pacing plans, and examining student assessment results. Now that this foundation has been laid, it may be appropriate to shift professional development into other area such as differentiated instruction and/or SDAIE methods aimed at helping teachers effectively serve ELL student needs.

- **Recommendation 4**: CSR elementary schools should focus on refining and/or developing academic intervention programs. Now that intervention curricula have been developed for secondary schools, the focus should be on training teachers and monitoring school efforts during 2002-03.

- **Recommendation 5:** Going forward, CSR schools focus on a wider range of support and training including professional development on instructional differentiation and SDAIE strategies.

Impact of CSR on Parent/Community Involvement

CSR reform has not resulted in fundamental changes to parent/community involvements. Parent involvement has only been minimally affected by the implementation of research-based reform models at CSR schools. As noted earlier, nearly all of the reform model providers have remained limited in terms of parent involvement efforts. As a result, most schools are doing what they have always done, albeit with some additional urgency. Indeed, many of the CSR schools have not really defined what they would like to accomplish in terms of improving parent involvement. There is little evidence that parent involvement is linked to CSR plans or grants. In most cases, school staff members are overwhelmed with instructional priorities and/or simply have no new ideas for increasing parent involvement.

- **Recommendation 6:** Given the lack of innovative parent involvement at CSR schools, schools and local districts should revisit expectations for parent involvement in the context of site-based, comprehensive reform.

External Support for CSR Schools

District curricular initiatives have largely overshadowed model reform implementation. At many CSR schools, District-adopted curricular programs in language arts and mathematics tended to monopolize the attention of teachers and other school and local district staff during 2001-02.   These conflicts tended to become manifest in terms of competing demands for time on schools' professional development calendar. Allocating time for coaching between both model provider coaches and District-funded coaches was another area characterized by competing agendas. As such, there is a strong need for integrating the work of model reform providers with District instructional priorities. As schools develop reform plans and negotiate contracts with outside reform organizations, it will become increasingly critical to proactively address the need for coordination and cooperation at the school and local district levels. Heightened District awareness and understanding of what CSR schools are attempting to do, and assisting schools upfront in the integration of CSR plan and District priorities, will help ease the CSR implementation process.

Plans for sustainability are lacking at CSR schools. With funding in the amount of $200 per pupil, schools have been able to finance personnel, materials, and training. However, CSR funds are available for only three years, after which schools must leverage other funding to continue reform. In general, CSR schools have not adequately planned for the expiration of outside funds. Apart from statements about the need to reallocate categorical monies, neither the State nor the District has articulated a clear vision for sustaining CSR beyond the life of the grant. At the school level, there are few indications that outside funds have been aggressively pursued or that categorical funds are, in fact, being reallocated to sustain reform. In addition, delays in the disbursement of CSR funds by the State have resulted in schools not receiving CSR funds until December or January. The late disbursement of

funds is particularly hard for year-round schools (the majority of CSR Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 schools) that begin the school year in July. In effect, the timetable for implementing reform is squeezed into 6-8 months. With a worsening State budget climate, concerns about disbursing funds in a timely fashion and helping schools plan for the sustainability of reforms are more salient than ever.

With the elimination of carryover provisions, these funding constraints have become especially difficult to cope with.

- **Recommendation 7:** Schools need on-going assistance from local districts in integrating model provider activities with District priorities.
- **Recommendation 8:** CSR schools need both central and local district support in developing plans for reform sustainability.

Impact of CSR on Student Achievement

CSR elementary schools have been much more successful in meeting benchmarks for student achievement than secondary CSR schools. Most CSR elementary schools have shown growth in SAT-9 scores and other indicators since beginning CSR implementation in Fall 1999. Approximately half or more of the Cohort 1 elementary schools exceeded the District growth rates between 2001 and 2002 in SAT-9 Reading, Language, and Math. Similarly, the vast majority of Cohort 2 elementary schools met API targets in 2002. Secondary schools have been much less successful. Middle school performance over the three-year CSR grant period was particularly weak among the three Cohort 1 middle schools. Cohort 2 secondary schools have scored mixed results after one year of CSR implementation.

There are a number of possible explanations for the lack of progress at the secondary level. First, District curricular initiatives for secondary schools are newer. Stronger results for CSR elementary schools may reflect the fact that reading and math curricular programs have been in place for 2-3 years. In addition, elementary schools have benefited from guided professional development and coaching support. Interventions at the secondary level are currently in the beginning stages, both in terms of curricular reforms and provision of on-site coaching. Additionally, it is important to note that CSR model provider expertise is less extensive at the secondary level, with many model designed initially for elementary schools and then adapted to middle and high schools.