

**Evaluation of the
California Academic
Partnership Program (CAPP)
Standards Implementation Grants**

Final Report: Executive Summary

**John Flaherty, Project Coordinator
Rebeca Diaz-Meza
Erica Holmes
Kimberly Dailey**

September 2005



4665 Lampson Avenue
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) Standards Implementation Grants

Final Report: Executive Summary

John Flaherty, Project Coordinator

Rebeca Diaz-Meza

Erica Holmes

Kimberly Dailey

September 2005

This publication was prepared by WestEd, under contract from the Chancellors Office of the California State University. The opinions and recommendations expressed herein are the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the funding agency. For information concerning obtaining additional copies of this report, direct inquiries to:

California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP)
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90808-4275

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
THE CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (CAPP)	1
<i>The CAPP Standards Implementation Grants</i>	2
EVALUATION DESIGN	3
FINDINGS.....	5
<i>Student support: tutoring</i>	5
<i>Student support: support classes and college awareness activities</i>	7
<i>Implementing standards-based curriculum</i>	8
The Instructional Leadership Initiative	9
Standards-based curriculum versus instruction	10
<i>Partnerships</i>	11
Middle schools	12
Post secondary partners.....	13
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	15
SELECTED DATA ACROSS PROJECTS.....	18

INTRODUCTION

This is the final evaluation report for the evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) Standards Implementation Projects. The goal of the evaluation was to determine the extent to, and conditions under which, the funded schools implemented a standards-driven CAPP model program; provided professional development and support for teachers; and improved student performance. The evaluation sought to inform project staff, advisory committees, and broader audiences about the reasons programs succeed or fail, unanticipated effects, and ways to improve implementation.

This final report briefly describes the CAPP Program and the goals of the CAPP Standards Implementation Projects. This is followed by a description of the evaluation design and the data collection activities over the five years of the evaluation. We review the findings from previous annual reports to provide a context for the summative report and to highlight some of the program changes. Finally, the remainder of the report discusses the activities and partnerships across the life of the grants, and reviews the lessons learned by the sites as they reflect upon their efforts to implement standards-based reform and prepare students for college.

The California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP)

The California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) was established by the California State Legislature in 1984 for the purpose of developing cooperative partnerships between public secondary schools and postsecondary institutes and businesses with the objective of improving students academic performance and preparation for college. For the past 20 years, CAPP has supported the establishment of academic partnerships, especially between secondary schools and community colleges, public or private baccalaureate degree-granting institutions, and business enterprises. The goal of these partnerships is to (1) transform the relationships between educational institutions in ways that directly benefit students, (2) improve curricula in subject areas required for admission to college, and (3) strengthen teachers capacities to enable all students to learn the curriculum.

CAPP has funded a number of initiatives throughout California, using the partnership model to encourage secondary and postsecondary educators and business partners to recognize their common interest in public school students and work together as equals to meet these students' educational needs. The individual projects funded by

CAPP may implement different and various activities, but the overarching goal of all CAPP initiatives is to create a self-sustaining partnership between all stakeholders that does not depend on supplementary funding for continued operation and to improve the secondary school curricula so that more students are better prepared for college.

The CAPP Standards Implementation Grants

CAPP funded the Standards Implementation Projects in 1999 to demonstrate how secondary schools could implement California’s new statewide standards for English and mathematics within the CAPP partnership model. CAPP selected nine schools from districts that best reflected California demographics (Exhibit 1). Each site was funded for a period of five years, through June 30, 2004.

Exhibit 1: CAPP Standards Implementation Grant Sites

Standards Implementation Projects	District	County
A.B. Miller HS, Fontana	Fontana Unified	San Bernardino County
Hoover HS, Glendale	Glendale Unified	Los Angeles County
Jefferson HS, Daly City	Jefferson Union High	San Mateo County
Lakewood HS, Long Beach	Long Beach	Los Angeles County
Magnolia HS, Anaheim	Anaheim Union High	Orange County
Mojave HS, Mojave	Mojave Unified	Kern County
Pasadena HS, Pasadena	Pasadena Unified	Los Angeles County
Riverbank HS, Riverbank	Riverbank Unified	Stanislaus County
West HS, Bakersfield	Kern Union High	Kern County

At the outset of the grant, the Standards Implementation Projects planned many activities in support of a multitude of objectives. These objectives, while admirable, often were unrealistic within the scope of this particular grant and the timeline for implementation. Further, some objectives were difficult to measure, or schools did not indicate the data elements to use to assess their progress.

CAPP and WestEd asked the projects to organize their objectives under two goals:

- Raise academic achievement of all students in the school so a higher proportion are prepared to succeed in post-secondary education, and

- Implement a system of standards-based education in English and mathematics.

At the advice of CAPP and WestEd, the projects revised their project objectives and planned realistic, measurable activities to support each. WestEd created a worksheet to facilitate this planning, and provided sample objectives, activities and measures to help project staff understand the relationship between each. The revised objectives and activities provided the foundation for implementing standards-based reform at the project sites.

Evaluation Design

WestEd included these nine funded schools in the evaluation of the Standards Implementation Grants, although not all schools participated for the full 5 year period. Specifically, A.B. Miller High School began fully implementing their CAPP project in year two, and was included in the evaluation at that time. Also in year two, Pasadena High School was added as a replacement for Carson High School. The final evaluation includes four years of data from these schools, and five years of data from the remaining schools.

The evaluation of the CAPP Standards Projects was a formative evaluation, designed to describe the development and implementation of the projects, measure how well project objectives were being met, and track a variety of student outcomes. A variety of qualitative and quantitative data sources were analyzed as part of the evaluation. In the first three years, data sources included archival documents (e.g., CAPP proposals, program documents, objectives worksheets, etc.), classroom observation data; interview data from project staff, selected teachers, and students; and survey data from teachers and students.

The evaluation reports up to that point described the implementation of CAPP at each site during the first and second year of implementation. Subsequent reports began focusing more on broader cross-site issues, such as the success and challenges of providing academic support for students; the role of professional development in building teacher-capacity for implementing standards-based practice; and the role of post-secondary partners in implementing school reform.

In 2003, The CAPP office and WestEd created the Annual Progress Report Workbook. The workbook was designed to standardize the Annual Progress Report requirements across the Standards Projects and to align data collection across all other

CAPP Projects. Such a workbook was used in 2002 by the newly funded CAPP California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) Projects.

The purpose of the workbook was threefold:

- 1) To help projects fulfill the annual reporting requirements;
- 2) To prepare for the annual CAPP Workshops and CSULB K-16 Partnership Conference; and
- 3) To assist in data collection for WestEd evaluators.

In 2004, each project completed a Final Summative Report Workbook that described the implementation and outcomes of the CAPP Standards Implementation Project over the life of the grant. In addition to describing the project activities implemented over the past five years, and the roles of the partners in the project, the sites reflected upon the two goals of the standards projects: how they implemented standards-based reform in English and mathematics and how prepared their students were for college at the end of the grant period compared with five years ago. The sites also were asked to reflect upon student data from the past five years and explain how such data elements may reflect the change in student achievement and college preparedness as a result of the project.

Student outcome data for the workbook were collected primarily through a review of online data sources, including the Education Data Partnership website, the California Department of Education's DataQuest and Standardized Testing and Reporting websites, the California Postsecondary Education Commission website, and the CSU Analytic Studies Division Technical Support website. The student data reported for each project include: Student enrollment and ethnicity; proportion of English-language learners; percentages of graduates enrolling in and completing the A-G course sequence; college enrollment and high school dropout rates; GSE and CSU entrance exams results; API results; and CAHSEE results. In addition to commenting upon these data, sites were encouraged to provide their own data, such as course enrollment, to show the impact of CAPP on student achievement and college preparedness.

FINDINGS

As a formative evaluation, the previous annual evaluation reports described the implementation activities at each site, and provided a list of cross-site recommendations for both the project staff and the CAPP office. A review of the findings from each annual report reflects the growth of the projects, and the role the CAPP office played as a funding agent and as a provider of technical assistance and support.

Student support: tutoring

During the first two years of implementation, most of the project activities across sites were directed toward raising academic achievement (goal 1 of the CAPP Standards Grants). Some of these activities were aimed at teachers (through professional development and training), though most were targeted to students (through tutoring, support classes, and awareness activities). All sites provided tutoring for students, provided by teachers and/or university students. ‘Homework centers’ were established at several sites to provide after school assistance, although the success of these centers, in terms of the number of students served and the amount of assistance provided, varied across sites.

By the end of year three, all sites continued to provide some tutoring for students, but participation, particularly at centers after school, continued to decline. Providing tutoring or assistance during the school day was seen as more successful by some projects. In doing so, students received support in conjunction with regular classroom lessons. Students were also easier to reach during the school day, as opposed to after school. However, at one site, challenges arose when trying to find the most productive use of tutor time in the classroom. In some cases, tutors were overworked or were left without a role as students were assigned to specific independent tasks. In addition, one site noted particular challenges in finding qualified tutors and matching a tutor’s areas of expertise to the correct classroom. In some cases, new college tutors were found to be good role models for high school students (regarding the attainability of college admission) but not necessarily good tutors.

One site made participation in tutoring mandatory. Attendance at five tutoring sessions per semester was required of CAPP students. Participation counted for 5 percent of a student’s grade. At another site, students earned extra credit for coming to tutoring after school. Many schools however, did not have the resources for in-class tutoring, or did not have a large enough pool of tutors to staff all the targeted classrooms.

Throughout the life of the project, CAPP sites have explored various options to after-school tutoring, trying to find the best fit for their students and their school (see box). Incentives have been provided, such as extra credit, in hopes of encouraging participation. In most cases however, the tutoring programs continued to reach a small fraction of the student population. One site planned to discontinue tutoring services at the end of the 2002-2003 school year and search for other alternatives to student academic support.

"The greatest obstacle to the tutoring lab has been deciding its function. There are so many ways to run it. It could operate as a homework lab, only for one-on-one daily tutoring, it could be optional or mandatory, there are many possibilities. Over the past four years we have tried many combinations. We like the way it is running now; it's an optional service available every day after school for two hours. Students sign-in, receive the tutoring, and then sign out. It's open to everyone every day of the week. We would, however, like more teacher support and special workshops."

By year five, seven of the nine project sites provided some tutoring to students through CAPP, although this was no longer seen as the focus of the project. In some cases, funds were no longer available to pay for college tutors. One project paid for tutoring services with another grant. At another site however, the University program was cut, so University tutors were unavailable. Instead the project hired 25 senior AP and honors students to work as tutors. This was true at other sites as well as University students were no longer available as tutors for the high schools

More projects began using tutors for targeted intervention by year five. For example, instead of providing tutoring to all students on all subjects in the library or in a homework center, projects used tutors in AVID classes, or with students at particular grade levels, or to provide remediation in specific subject areas. This was in keeping with previous evaluation recommendations, which encouraged sites to focus on their project's successes. For example, previous reports suggested that a tutoring center that does not serve students should be eliminated and resources aimed at other viable student support activities.

By the fifth year of implementation, projects broadened their student support activities beyond after-school tutoring and moved toward changing the core curriculum, first through support classes and eventually, for some sites, through the implementation of a standards-based curriculum.

Student support: support classes and college awareness activities

The CAPP projects implemented special classes, such as AVID or Freshman Focus or Steps to College, to provide academic support to students and familiarize them with college entry requirements. In addition, nearly all sites provided test-preparation courses in the first few years, aimed at the SAT-9 or the college placement exams. In the early years of implementation, several sites identified their CAPP program chiefly through these support and awareness programs, while others saw them as complementary to the larger goal of implementing standards-based practice.

The number of participating students varied. Some projects built a SAT-9 preparation period into the master schedule. Others provided the service as an option that students could choose. At least three high schools cited their SAT prep or review classes, and two schools reported that practice ELM and EPT exams (CSU entry-level mathematics and English placement tests) were administered to students.

Other activities centered on increasing student awareness of college. Field trips and college fairs were common and sometimes included middle school students. College fairs or career days were cited by most sites as one way to involve local IHEs, but these were usually not directly sponsored by CAPP, and the outcomes associated with such events were not easily defined by project staff. The measures used to assess the effectiveness of such activities generally were attendance records or anecdotal evidence from students and parents regarding their satisfaction with such events.

Initial feedback from students indicated that most did not recall college fairs or career days at their school, especially ninth grade students. Even when students did attend however, increased college enrollment was not guaranteed (see box).

"Twenty families visited the CSU and began the on-line aid application with the help of a math teacher, a Spanish-speaking English teacher and a financial aid representative from (the community college). ... Many of our students seemed to have applied but they didn't go to CSU because (the local community college) still seems more cost-effective and/or they don't have the grades for CSU."

While these classes and activities were designed to support students as they prepared to master college level material, they were sometimes in conflict with the requirements of a standards-based curriculum. For example, at one site, the support classes were cancelled because they were not part of the A-G course requirement. One other school was unable to invite middle school students to the local college campus

because of travel restrictions imposed as a result of the school's II/USP status. Staff from the second school – the only CAPP high school designated as underperforming through the II/USP program – was unsure if their programs were complementing one another or competing for limited staff time and resources. In some ways, this conflict reflected the tension sites faced as they attempted to provide academic support for students while raising expectations and aligning coursework with the new state standards.

Implementing standards-based curriculum

Efforts aimed at implementing a system of standards-based education in English and mathematics and aligning courses to district and/or state standards met with varied levels of success in the first and second year. While some sites provided limited professional development and planning time for teachers designed to improve articulation and increase awareness of standards and standards-based instruction, these activities were limited to identifying standards and matching standards to current lesson.

Revising course content and developing assessment measures that were aligned with standards were more difficult tasks at the outset of the project. Some sites did not have the leadership in place to coordinate such efforts, and others were unable to allocate the time necessary for such a labor-intensive effort. Sites also noted that some teachers were resistant to such changes and were not inclined to use new rubrics or scoring guides, for example.

In some cases however, schools did make structural changes designed to increase articulation. A few sites changed course offerings, deleted remedial courses, and created “paths” for students to provide extra algebra classes or language arts classes, based upon students needs and postsecondary plans. These changes supported academic achievement and articulation efforts.

At the end of the first year of implementation however, standards-based practice did not trickle down to the classroom. Teacher’s perceptions of standards-based instruction, and their own reported instructional practices, were not aligned. Teachers often reported that standards-based instruction was an important part of the school, and that lessons and assessments were aligned to state standards. However, large-scale changes in instructional practice had not occurred. The majority of teachers did not commonly assess student work based on standards, and infrequently referred to standards when communicating to students and parents. Even fewer reported planning standards-based instruction with colleagues or middle school teachers.

The Instructional Leadership Initiative

By year two, CAPP sites reported moving closer to a system of standards-based instruction in English and mathematics. Six of the nine sites participated in the Western Assessment Center's (WAC) Instructional Leadership Initiative, which helped sites develop standards-based lessons and align coursework with the state standards in mathematics and English/language arts. The WAC project was met with great success by participating teachers (see box). By year three, one site even began sharing their WAC lessons with other schools in the district.

Our biggest success is covering more algebra and geometry standards in the classroom. From a teachers' perspective, we are covering more material because everyone feels accountable to the schedule. Our most significant success has been bringing awareness of the California Content Standards and the process of standards-based lesson planning and implementation to the math and English departments. Through the grant and the WestEd Instructional Leadership Initiative: Implementing Standards-based Instruction (WAC), we have trained all English and math teachers in the backward planning process. It has become the way of doing business. Teachers constantly collaborate on assessments, units, and daily plans.

Sites that did not participate in the WAC reported that information was provided to teachers to assist them in identifying and addressing the standards within their lesson plans. Usually these were lists or "binders" encompassing the standards that teachers could use to ensure the appropriate topics were being covered. In two cases, this information came from the district, which provided standards-based curricula in one case and set requirements for mathematics and language arts courses in the other.

By year four, all sites claimed some success in identifying standards and aligning curriculum to the standards. However, finding time to gather staff to discuss standards and assessments became more difficult as the project progressed. Although Department wide meetings still occurred regularly at many sites, those discussions centered on logistical and procedural requirements and did not provide the time to discuss project objectives. Another site indicated that the lack of substitute teachers within the district inhibited large teacher gatherings within or across schools.

This was true for WAC teachers as well. WAC department teams were expected to develop units at their school following each WAC training. However, teachers and WAC staff reported that it was very difficult to schedule such meeting time, and that the

‘infrastructure’ was not present in many schools that would allow for ongoing teacher planning.

At one site that did not participate in the WAC, project staff did not seek out such professional development and meeting time for staff after the second year of the project. They believed that these discussions in the first two years were sufficient to orient staff to the California content standards. Further, this site noted that professional development was being imposed upon teachers who were unprepared or unwilling to participate in such training or leave the classroom for any extended period of time. Thus, this site focused on student support activities for the remainder of the project.

Standards-based curriculum versus instruction

By the end of year five, four of the nine projects were no longer engaged in any activities related to implementing a standards-based curriculum, nor providing specific time devoted to planning lessons and designing assessments, as was true earlier in the implementation process. Three of these projects reported that their districts were completely aligned with the standards, so they used CAPP to provide student support services. The fourth noted that another grant now addressed standards at the school site, so CAPP funds were geared toward tutoring and support classes.

When asked to report on changes in instruction over the course of the CAPP project, these same sites all reported that instruction become more uniform across teachers. One site said that all teachers now “teach the same thing” and even provide the same scripted remediation for students who need assistance. Another noted that the change in instruction took the shape of common curriculum maps, assessments and end-of-course exams. This was useful for this district because there was a high mobility rate and students could receive consistent instruction across schools.

The emphasis on standards-based instruction was very different at two other schools however, and this was reflected in the changes in instruction described by project staff. Both projects described implementing standards-based curriculum at their school as a process of “unpacking” or “unwrapping” which moved beyond matching standards to the text (see box).

School 1:

Before the work of this grant, teachers taught well, some addressed standards, but many times teachers had "projects" they wanted to teach (especially in English Language Arts where we had the specific novel or piece of literature to "teach"). At the first introduction of standards, it was quite normal to hear teachers say, "Of course I teach the standards," but when questioned, the teacher did not know which standard was being addressed in which lesson. Next, teachers began to "post" the standards, but again, they still did not tie lessons to specific standards.

Now, math and English teachers have unpacked so many standards, and created assessments and lessons to achieve those standards, that they can easily indentify which standards are being addressed where and when. School-wide, teachers use a "white board configuration" to post the agenda, homework, and objective for the day. Teachers have learned that the objective must be directly tied to a content standard and ESLR, which are also posted.

School 2:

The most difficult thing for our English department was aligning standards to the curriculum. There were two ways on viewing this:

- 1) Have a lesson or unit and apply as many standards to it as possible (throw and stick method) or*
- 2) Take a standard and try to create a lesson based on what it was trying to get across to the student (unwrapping)*

I remember one CAPP meeting in 2001 with all the level leaders and representitives from the feeder schools in attendance. We were going over newly created curriculum focusing on state standards. All level leaders had worked hard all summer at creating courses of study. The freshmen teacher passed out a tome, about a foot thick, to each of us. It was massive. She had done the throw and stick method, which is what a lot of teachers did when the standards first started being used. Now that we know more about unwrapping the standards and backwards mapping, that huge tome would probably be cut in half.

Not surprisingly, these two projects still provided planning time for teachers to review student data, discuss state standards, and review standards-based instruction and rubrics with new staff. Also, teachers continued to create new lessons and adapt existing ones as they shifted the focus from standards-based *curriculum* to standards-based *instruction*.

Partnerships

The CAPP model incorporates a number of principles and components including partnerships among high schools, middle schools and institutions of higher education (IHEs). The establishment of academic partnerships was designed to improve curriculum

in subject areas required for college admission and to strengthen teachers' capacities to enable all students to learn the curriculum. In addition, postsecondary partners, through their work at the secondary schools, would increase their understanding of students' needs as they entered college.

Although the CAPP model includes partnerships across many levels, each project site developed partnerships based upon the needs of their teachers and students, and the availability and proximity of potential partners. As a result, some projects had stronger ties to middle schools or IHEs and some included partners in the leadership team while others maintained more centralized control of project activities.

At the outset of the grant, CAPP sites recognized the importance of partnerships with colleges, universities, district offices, junior high schools, and even elementary schools. However, it was not always clear what roles partners would play, or what the outcomes would be for each institution.

Middle schools

Feeder schools were a part of the CAPP project six of the nine sites. In the other cases, relationships with the local middle schools deteriorated in the first two years of the project due to changes in staffing and a decreased funding, which necessitated the elimination of AVID classes at some middle schools. Four of the other sites maintained relationships with a single feeder school for the duration of the project.

The CAPP project provided tutoring and support classes for the middle schools, and sometimes enlisted middle school teachers and administrators to help align the curricula across the institutions and manage the CAPP project. Most of the projects reported that efforts toward curriculum alignment, and meetings and professional development seminars involving staff from the middle and high schools, increased teacher understanding of student needs and teacher expectations at each grade level. One site allowed middle school teachers to place incoming freshmen in appropriate high school math and English classes. Yet another site, however, reported increased articulation and understanding of the coursework at each grade level, but an ongoing inconsistency regarding how students were assessed at the middle school versus the high school.

Four of the projects shared AVID classes with their middle school partners and two projects provided tutoring at the middle school level. At sites where the partnership was strongest between the high school and middle school, teachers worked together to develop assessments or whole units and worked to ensure that students were placed in the correct classes in high school. Only one site included middle school staff as co-director or

leader of the CAPP project, although another was planning to involve middle school staff in leadership roles following staff turnover at the high school. One site that had a less productive relationship with feeder schools did not include any middle school teachers in the decision making process. Although a “point-person” was assigned from each feeder school, these people were not directly involved in planning activities. Not surprisingly, teachers at these feeder schools perceived the CAPP project to be a “high school project” and were less inclined to participate in professional development or cross-site meetings.

Post secondary partners

CAPP sites relied on IHE partners to provide training for teachers and college awareness activities for students. The degree of communication and collaboration with partners varied. In some cases there was confusion regarding who was responsible for maintaining the partnership and assigning roles. Another CAPP coordinator even expressed doubt about the effectiveness of IHEs in providing professional development that defined standards-based instruction.

IHE partners participated in CAPP in several ways. Most provided some form of professional development to teachers, and some facilitated staff meetings designed to increase understanding of content standards. College students from participating IHEs tutored students at the high schools and feeder schools and also served as “ambassadors” and guides when students visited the campus. One site noted that the presence of local college and university staff at the high school “validated” their work and reminded staff and students of the importance of college.

The involvement of IHEs varied as the projects evolved, but generally was stronger than the link to feeder schools. All projects listed one or more IHEs as a partner in CAPP, but some of the IHEs were minimally involved in the project. Two sites had little or no involvement with IHEs by year four. In one case, staff turnover led to the dissolution of the advisory relationship between IHE and high school staff. At another, the high school staff was unable to establish a connection to local IHEs from the outset of the project, so no partnership existed.

The most common partnerships existed between CAPP high schools and local CSU campuses. Four project sites included the local CSU campus as a partner (and one cited an additional partnership with the local UC campus) while three others indicated a partnership with a local community college. At three sites, project staff reported IHE staff met with teachers and school staff to “provide advice and guidance” on the state standards and to assist with articulation efforts. These projects saw IHE staff as experts in

content standards and used their expertise to inform staff of the standards required by the state, as well as those important for college success. Three other projects looked to partners to provide academic assistance to students, primarily by providing college students as tutors.

Two projects counted IHE staff among the CAPP leadership team, and these sites maintained the strongest relationship between high school and IHE in year five. At both sites, the IHE staff person was considered a co-director of the CAPP project, and provided direct assistance with coordinating the project activities budget. These sites still looked to IHEs for professional development, although the focus had moved beyond standards-based instruction. Instead, in year five the IHEs provided professional development for teachers to improve content knowledge (usually in English or writing).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the strengths of the CAPP project is the flexibility it provides schools as they strive to improve the secondary school curricula so that more students are better prepared for college. Indeed the nine projects funded under the CAPP Standards Implementation Grants have taken many forms across the five years of implementation. While they focused primarily on increasing achievement and implementing a standards-based curriculum, the activities they planned and their partnering institutions reflected the different needs of the schools and the different reforms being implemented in their districts.

Defining the characteristics necessary for a “successful CAPP project” is complicated due to the fact that the strengths and needs of the sites vary. Some expended great time and resources to provide teacher professional development, while others invested in AVID classes or AP computer labs to diversify the offerings available to students. These efforts were more or less integrated with similar initiatives across sites, depending upon the goals of each and the leadership structures established to implement the projects. Despite their differences, some of the most successful CAPP projects shared several characteristics, including:

- **Strong leadership across partners.** Strong leadership existed among administrators or teachers. Most importantly, leaders shared a common vision of the project’s objectives. When leaders worked across institutions, the partnerships were strengthened and buy-in was increased. At sites where teachers directed the project, it was important to have some administrative support, if not active involvement. This helped the CAPP project operate within the many other school activities and initiatives. Sites with stronger leaders were also more likely to effectively monitor program implementation and outcomes and make necessary adjustments before resources were drained.
- **Targeted, effective professional development.** Nearly all sites provided professional development to teachers through CAPP at formal professional conferences and in informal meetings with peers and colleagues from partnering institutions. The training or planning time that was specifically geared toward standards-based instruction was described as the most useful and the most likely to lead to permanent change at the school. In this regard, the WAC training served as the model. At one high school, teachers were taking lessons learned through WAC to train teachers at the feeder schools.
- **Coordinated efforts across the school.** At most sites, CAPP was but one of many initiatives designed to support teachers and students. The most successful CAPP sites were able to integrate these projects into a larger, more

comprehensive school improvement effort. At a few sites, money from other initiatives was directed specifically at professional development, while CAPP funds were used to grant release time to teachers to coordinate efforts and work towards improving articulation. Such coordination also allowed CAPP to focus on structural changes, such as augmented course offerings, that would extend beyond the CAPP funding cycle.

- **Clear understanding of standards-based instruction.** Several sites claimed to have implemented a standards-based curriculum, which meant they were teaching common units and linking lessons to standards. Real change in the classroom occurred when teachers moved beyond content standards and embraced performance standards and planned lessons based on the desired student outcomes, and not the definition of a particular standard.
- **Integrated data management system.** Schools that had access to student data were better able to analyze the performance of their students and understand the strengths and weaknesses they needed to address through CAPP. Further, by examining trends across years, these projects could tailor their CAPP activities accordingly. However, most sites are still having trouble thinking critically and drawing conclusions from the data.

The CAPP office and Advisory Committee supported the implementation of standards at the sites in a variety of ways during the life of the project. The CAPP liaisons provided informal support and advice to sites on an ongoing basis, while the CAPP-sponsored statewide K-16 Partnership conference provided cross-site meeting time and the opportunity to learn more about facilitating partnerships across institutions. Further, when CAPP saw that sites were struggling with the concept of standards based instruction, they introduced the WAC initiative which provided hands-on, directed learning towards the development of standards-based lessons and the instructional practices associated with such. As CAPP continues to fund initiatives designed to increase student achievement through the partnership model, the CAPP office should consider the following recommendations drawn from the analysis of findings across all sites.

- **Define what the ‘partnership’ means for each initiative.** Some CAPP Standards sites were unclear of the role IHEs should or could play in their project, especially with regard to implementing standards-based instruction. CAPP should strive to make sure that all partners understand their role as stakeholder in the project, and what the specific benefits are for their institution. Perhaps a conference at the beginning of the grant period that included all partners would provide this opportunity.

- **Consider the district as a potential partner.** Schools must operate within the policy realm of their district. Many activities or reforms hinge upon approval of the district and may even be in place in one form or another at other schools in the district. If district can't function as partners, they at least must be included in the conversation when schools propose changes to their curriculum or program. Further, district involvement could also increase institutionalization of project objectives and activities.
- **Insist on shared leadership across partners.** Sites with the strongest partnerships placed IHE staff in real leadership positions. Further, the stronger sites distributed leadership within each institution across staff. This helped build a community of professionals among the high school staff, and helped combat the effects of staff turnover, especially at the high school where turnover was greater. Such shared leadership will allow projects to continue even when a teacher leader or administrator leaves a school.
- **Help projects use CAPP funds in conjunction with other related programs.** Recently, the Academic Preparation Program Reference and Information System (APPRIS) website began offering information about the various academic preparation programs operating throughout California's public education system. CAPP should work with APPRIS to develop a strategy for coordinating such funds at the school level. Many CAPP Standards projects received funding from many of these programs, and need guidance to be sure they are leveraging the funds most effectively and not duplicating efforts.
- **Look for creative ways to provide technical assistance to sites.** For the Standards Projects, teachers and administrators believed that the WAC initiative was the best activity in which they engaged. CAPP should direct funding toward a district, university or other TA provider at the outset of the project – as opposed to letting sites find their own TA – if they believed the experience was worthwhile and relevant for all sites.
- **Continue to communicate openly with projects and help them network with one another.** The CAPP Liaisons provide a valuable service to the school sites – even as sounding boards for ideas and advice – and should continue to be utilized by CAPP as a way of connecting with the project sites. Although travel restrictions may inhibit on-site meetings, each site should have a liaison who can be contacted when questions or issues arise. Further, the Partnership conferences offer a networking opportunity that does not exist elsewhere. Staffs from projects continue to attend conferences, and CAPP should continue the conferences as a vehicle for technical assistance and an opportunity for projects to network.

SELECTED DATA ACROSS PROJECTS

Selected Student Outcome Data at the End of Year Five (2003-04) and the Change from 1998-99 School Year

(Note: Value in parentheses indicates change in percentage points from 1998-99 to 2003-04, unless otherwise indicated.)

	A.B Miller High School	Hoover High School	Jefferson High School	Lakewood High School	Magnolia High School	Mojave High School	Pasadena High School	Riverbank High School	West High School	Statewide
Enrollment	3,727 (238)	2,670 (-359)	1,289 (-121)	4,306 (250)	1,706 (-22)	590 (22)	2,530 (462)	843 (-270)	2,397 (199)	6,298,774
% non-white	87.6 (7.9)	39.8 (0.3)	96.0 (-0.9)	67.3 (3.0)	83.0 (9.3)	40.5 (-3.0)	76.7 (2.8)	64.8 (6.7)	68.3 (15.9)	25.4
%LEP	19.1 (2.4)	25.6 (-8.4)	15.9 (3.0)	12.0 (-6.5)	26.8 (-3.7)	3.9 (-3.5)	16.4 (3.5)	34.6 (8.2)	6.5 (0.6)	66.1
Number of graduates	596 (-8)	555 (-81)	262 (13)	785 (3)	299 (10)	94 (-9)	436 (35)	176 (-33)	421 (-32)	343,479
% of grads. completing A-G sequence	8.7 (-21.4)	26.7 (-11.2)	46.5 (3.5)	34.5 (20.2)	30.8 (11.4)	29.8 (4.6)	71 (31.2)	20.5 (-11.1)	12.1 (-6.4)	33.7
% of minority grads. completing A-G sequence	6.8 (-22.1)	29.6 (-11.8)	40.9 (-3.2)	33.2 (16.9)	32.6 (15.3)	18.2 (-6.8)	65.5 (29.8)	16.8 (-18.6)	10.9 (-3.2)	29.6
Graduation rate	92.4 (2.8)	97.2 (0.4)	96.3 (8.0)	95.3 (12.3)	96.1 (1.0)	93.1 (5.8)	86.9 (10.7)	87.1 (-11.5)	90.0 (-2.4)	85.3
SAT: Average total score	899 (19)	990 (-8)	882 (13)	957 (-8)	913 (-15)	969 (55)	941 (55)	1,032 (37)	915 (-72)	1015
% of students taking test	22.3 (-1.6)	36.4 (-4.4)	26.5 (1.3)	27.8 (0.3)	38.9 (7.3)	34.3 (6.0)	40.7 (-2.1)	18.5 (-2.0)	18.4 (-16.3)	35.3
% of test-takers scoring >1000	27.1 (4.1)	45.0 (-3.5)	26.0 (6.7)	39.6 (-3.8)	30.5 (-2.9)	42.9 (18.7)	37.0 (9.9)	52.8 (0.6)	38.0 (-7.2)	52.9
Total CSU Freshman	40 (10)	64 (-12)	40 (17)	80 (17)	36 (3)	10 (4)	59 (18)	11 (-12)	46 (20)	38,859
Proficient in math (ELM)	26 (14)	37 (-14)	4 (-4)	58 (13)	19 (5)	3 (-6)	30 (12)	6 (-1)	34 (15)	23,018
Proficient in English (EPT)	12 (-9)	17 (-13)	4 (-3)	33 (-3)	16 (7)	6 (-5)	18 (2)	5 (-2)	29 (9)	19,686
UC enrollment	18 (-14)	32 (-20)	8 ()	29 (5)	23 (12)	3 (1)	18 (-1)	5 (3)	12 (-5)	26,333
CSU enrollment	48 (8)	64 (-15)	29 (-9)	80 (12)	39 (6)	9 (3)	62 (16)	18 (-5)	42 (8)	38,877
CCC enrollment	200 (129)	283 (93)	56 (-21)	222 (201)	104 (19)	34 (8)	256 (97)	53 (-26)	100 (-68)	120,322
Total enrolled	266 (123)	379 (58)	93 (-30)	331 (218)	166 (37)	46 (12)	336 (112)	76 (-28)	154 (-65)	185,671
% of graduates enrolled	44.6 (21.0)	68.3 (17.8)	35.5 (-13.9)	42.2 (27.7)	55.5 (10.9)	48.9 (15.9)	77.1 (21.2)	43.2 (-6.6)	36.6 (-11.8)	54.0
2004 API ¹	642 (133)	714 (100)	620 (78)	702 (101)	617 (81)	689 (41)	628 (60)	594 (43)	571 (60)	670 (32)
2003-2004 Growth	17	6	2	38	9	44	26	28	-9	NA
CAHSEE 10 th grade pass rate: ELA ²	73 (-2)	79 (-1)	71 (-4)	83 (-2)	66 (-12)	81 (-4)	72 (-5)	64 (1)	65 (-5)	75 (-3)
CAHSEE 10 th grade pass rate: Math ²	78 (14)	86 (11)	74 (21)	84 (14)	71 (20)	84 (21)	65 (10)	67 (29)	56 (14)	74 (15)
CST ELA Test: % of 11 th graders scoring proficient or advanced ³	26 (9)	36 (3)	20 (-3)	33 (8)	25 (2)	36 (14)	27 (2)	14 (-4)	20 (2)	32 (1)

¹ Change value compares 2004 API Growth score with 2000 API Growth score, except for Riverbank which had no API data in 2000. For that school, the 2001 API Growth score was used as a baseline. The statewide API figure is the median 2004 API Growth score for all high schools in California.

² Change value compares 2003-04 pass rate with 2002-03 pass rate for 10th grade students.

³ Change value compares percent of students scoring at proficient or advanced on the California Standards Test English/Language Arts test on 2004 compared with 2002.