

# **COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM: Evaluation of the CSR - High School Initiative and Improving Teaching and Learning Grant Programs**



## **Evaluation Project Staff**

Andrew Moellmer  
Li-Chin Wu  
Sonia Castañeda  
Erika Beltran

## **Program Staff**

Elvis Shoaf  
Rebecca Ligon  
Barbara Knaggs  
Tammy Kreuz

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

January 2006

**Texas Education Agency**

Shirley Neeley, Commissioner of Education

Robert Scott, Chief Deputy Commissioner

**Office of Planning, Grants and Evaluation**

Nora Ibáñez Hancock, Associate Commissioner

Joseph Shields, Deputy Associate Commissioner

The Office for Planning, Grants & Evaluation wishes to thank all agency staff who contributed to this report.

**Citation.** Texas Education Agency. (2006). Comprehensive School Reform: Evaluation of the CSR - High School Initiative and Improving Teaching and Learning Grant Programs. Austin, TX: Author.

Material in this publication is not copyrighted and may be reproduced. The Texas Education Agency would appreciate credit for the material used and a copy of the reprint.

Texas Assessment of Academic Skills™ (TAAS™) and Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills™ (TAKS™) are registered trademarks of the Texas Education Agency. Other product and company names mentioned in this report may be the trademarks of their respective owners.

Additional information about this report may be obtained by contacting the Texas Education Agency, Office of Planning, Grants and Evaluation at (512) 463-8992 or by e-mail at [opge@tea.state.tx.us](mailto:opge@tea.state.tx.us).

This report is available at the Texas Education Agency's website at <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/progeval/index.html>.

# Contents

---

List of Tables .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	vi
I. Introduction and Background.....	1
Nature of the Comprehensive School Reform Program.....	2
CSR: Previous Research and Evaluations.....	3
Organization of the Report.....	6
II. CSR – High School Initiative (HS).....	8
Characteristics of CSR – HS Initiative Students.....	8
Implementation of CSR Grant Programs: CSR – HS Initiative.....	10
Annual Evaluation.....	12
Curriculum and Instruction.....	12
Non-Academic Support Services.....	13
Professional Development.....	14
Parent and Community Involvement.....	18
Obstacles to Program Implementation.....	24
Technical Assistance.....	26
Additional Funding Sources.....	28
III. CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL).....	30
Characteristics of CSR – ITL Students.....	30
Implementation of CSR Grant Programs: CSR – ITL.....	32
IV. CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning Cycle 2 Student Achievement Results.....	36
CSR Grantees and Comparison Group Analysis.....	36
Analysis of Student Achievement and CSR Component Implementation at Cycle 2 Campuses.....	40
V. Concluding Observations.....	45
References .....	51

# List of Tables

---

Table 1. Distribution of CSR – HS Campuses by Campus Type .....	8
Table 2. Grade Level of Students Attending CSR – HS Campuses .....	9
Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Students Attending CSR – HS Campuses.....	10
Table 4. Most Common CSR Models Implemented by CSR – High School Initiative Campuses.....	10
Table 5. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses with an Active Leadership Team for Implementation of the CSR Model .....	11
Table 6. Participating Members of Active Leadership Teams at CSR – HS Campuses.....	12
Table 7. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Conducting Ongoing Project Evaluation/Progress Monitoring to Assess Implementation of the CSR Model.....	12
Table 8. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Offering Curriculum and Instruction Activities.....	13
Table 9. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Offering Non-Academic Support Services .....	14
Table 10. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Offering Professional and Staff Development Activities .	15
Table 11. Frequency of Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS High Schools .....	16
Table 12. Frequency of Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses.....	16
Table 13. Average Number of Teachers, Administrators, and Staff Participating in Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS Campuses .....	17
Table 14. Average Number of Teachers, Administrators, and Staff Participating in Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses .....	18
Table 15. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Offering Parent and Community Involvement Activities	19
Table 16. Average Number of Parents Participating in Parent and Community Involvement Activities Offered at CSR – HS Campuses .....	20
Table 17. Degree of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS High Schools.....	20
Table 18. Location on Timeline of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS High Schools .....	21
Table 19. Difficulty of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS High Schools .....	22
Table 20. Degree of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses .....	22
Table 21. Location on Timeline of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses.....	23
Table 22. Difficulty of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses ....	23
Table 23. Top Five Obstacles to Program Implementation, All CSR Campuses .....	24
Table 24. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses that Resolved Obstacles to Implementation.....	25
Table 25. Top Five Resolutions to CSR Program Implementation Obstacles.....	26
Table 26. Frequency that CSR – HS Campuses Received Technical Assistance.....	26
Table 27. Major Areas of Reform in which Technical Assistance Providers Offered Guidance to CSR – HS Campuses.....	27
Table 28. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses that Reported an Instance where a Technical Assistance Provider Failed to Provide Adequate Assistance.....	28
Table 29. Additional Sources of Funding Used by CSR – HS Campuses to Support their CSR Programs	28
Table 30. Additional Sources of Funding that CSR – HS Campuses are Actively Seeking to Support their CSR Programs .....	29
Table 31. Distribution of CSR – ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3 .....	30
Table 32. Grade Level of Students Attending CSR – ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3 .....	31

Table 33. Demographic Characteristics of Students Attending CSR – ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3.....	32
Table 34. Percentage of CSR – ITL Campuses that Fully Implemented a CSR Component, Cycle 2.....	33
Table 35. Percentage of CSR – ITL Campuses that Fully Implemented a CSR Component, Cycle 3.....	34
Table 36. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Standards, by CSR Group and Degree of CSR Implementation.....	38
Table 37. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Standards in Reading and Math between 2001 and 2005, by CSR Group and Degree of CSR Implementation.....	40
Table 38. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Reading Standards, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component .....	41
Table 39. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Math Standards, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component .....	42
Table 40. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Reading Standards between 2001 and 2005, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component.....	43
Table 41. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Math Standards between 2001 and 2005, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component.....	44

## Executive Summary

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program established by Congress is authorized through Title I, Part F of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The program was developed to help high-poverty and low-achieving schools address common obstacles to improved student achievement through effective school-wide reform. CSR programs are intended to cover all aspects of high poverty and low-achieving schools' operations through curriculum changes, sustained professional development and enhanced involvement of parents, rather than focusing on improving programs selectively or adopting a piecemeal approach to reform.

Grants are awarded to local education agencies (LEAs)<sup>1</sup> in Texas through two different programs: 1) the CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL) grant program; and 2) the CSR – High School Initiative (HS) grant program. The CSR – ITL grant program is the initial CSR grant program through which federal funds were distributed to Title I eligible campuses seeking to implement the 11 required CSR components. The CSR – HS is a new grant program that was first implemented for the 2004-05 school year. The CSR – HS program distributes funds to other eligible Title I Part A schools serving high school students (including open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses) that are not currently receiving CSR funds, or that did not already receive CSR funds prior to the 2004-05 school year.

This evaluation report examines implementation results for the first reporting period of the CSR – HS program and the first reporting period of Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program. Both of these programs were in the early stages of implementation when they reported the results covered in this evaluation. The first reporting period for the CSR- HS program occurred between January 1, 2005 and May 31, 2005 (i.e., five months). The first reporting period for the CSR – ITL Cycle 3 program occurred between August 1, 2004 and July 31, 2005 (i.e., 12 months). Therefore, the differences in reporting time

---

<sup>1</sup> LEAs include school districts and open-enrollment charter schools.

frames should be considered carefully when reviewing implementation progress for these two programs.

This report also examines final implementation results for Cycle 2, which concluded its fourth and final year of implementation during the 2004-05 school year. The reporting period for the final year of Cycle 2 was July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. However, the CSR – ITL Cycle 2 grant program was funded over the July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2005 period. Implementation data reported for the final year of Cycle 2 should be viewed as an indication of where grantees were on each of the CSR components after four years of program implementation. This report also presents findings from a statistical analysis that examines the relationship between levels of CSR implementation and student performance results as measured by performance on standardized state assessments such as the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) and the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS).

CSR – HS campuses and CSR – ITL Cycle 3 campuses were both in the early stages of CSR implementation when they submitted their first progress reports. It is to be expected that at this stage, compared to CSR – ITL Cycle 2, relatively few of the required activities would be fully implemented.

Key findings for the first reporting period (i.e., January 1, 2003 – May 31, 2005) at CSR – HS campuses include:

- The typical CSR – HS student was enrolled in grade 9 or 10, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged;
- All but one (98%) of the high schools receiving grant funds, and all (100%) of the open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses reported establishing an active leadership team on the campus. Especially among the high school campuses, leadership teams represented a wide cross-section of school staff, with school principals, teachers, curriculum specialists, and department chairs well represented;
- Although grantees had implemented a wide range of CSR-funded activities, in each reported activity area only 33% or less of campuses reported that the activity was either ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’;
- The most common obstacle to successful implementation was the lack of parental involvement, as cited by 51% of campuses that reported an obstacle. The most common means to resolve obstacles was to hire additional staff (23%).

Approximately 13% reported adopting or changing parental outreach programs to address obstacles;

- Open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses were much more likely than high schools to establish a range of Parent and Community Involvement activities by the end of the first reporting period. Open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses were much more likely than high schools to establish Parental Involvement in Decision-Making (73% vs. 58%), Parent Education/Training (67% vs. 44%), and Parent Volunteer Programs (60% vs. 28%);
- A majority of high schools reported that implementation of activities related to improving Curriculum and Instruction (94%), Professional Development (88%), Non-Academic Support Services (84%) and Annual Evaluation (78%) were ‘on schedule’ or ‘ahead of schedule’. An even higher percentage of charter schools/all-grade campuses (93% or more for each activity) reported that these activities were on schedule;
- Parent and Community Involvement was the most common activity reported by high schools as ‘behind schedule’, with 28% of high schools reporting this to be the case. None of the charter schools/all-grade campuses reported this activity to be behind schedule;
- Nearly half (48%) of the high schools reported that Parent and Community Involvement was a ‘very difficult’ or ‘difficult’ activity to implement. None of the charter schools/all-grade campuses reported this to be the case;
- Campuses received technical assistance in a large number of reform areas by the end of the first reporting period. The most common areas of assistance were Professional Development, Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Assessment;
- Only 34% of the high schools, compared to 60% of the charter schools/all-grade campuses, received technical assistance in the area of Parent and Community Involvement;
- A somewhat higher percentage of high schools (11%) than charter schools/all-grade campuses (7%) reported dissatisfaction with their technical assistance provider; and
- The most common source of additional funding used to supplement federal CSR funds at high schools was local funds (52%). The most common source of additional funding for charter schools/all-grade campuses was state funds (60%).

CSR – ITL campuses share similar characteristics that distinguish them from CSR – HS campuses. Most notable is the fact that CSR – ITL grant funds are available to all campus types. Key findings for the first reporting period (July 1, 2004 – June 30, 2005) for Cycle 3 and for the fourth year of the grant program for Cycle 2 include:

- The typical CSR – ITL student in 2005 was enrolled in an elementary or middle school, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged;
- Technical assistance providers indicated that between 71% and 91% of Cycle 2 campuses had mostly implemented or fully implemented all of the required CSR components by the end of the grant period.



- The three components implemented by the lowest percentage of Cycle 2 campuses were: Comprehensive Design (84%), Student Achievement (83%) and Parent and Community Involvement (71%);
- Technical assistance providers indicated that between 60% and 88% of Cycle 3 campuses had mostly implemented or fully implemented eight of the 11 required CSR components by the end of the first reporting period.
- The three components implemented by the lowest percentage of Cycle 3 campuses were: Research-Based Methods (59%), Annual Evaluation (58%), and Parent and Community Involvement (44%).

These findings indicate that by the end of the grant period, a high percentage of Cycle 2 campuses had implemented all 11 CSR components, in keeping with program goals. Not surprisingly, CSR – HS campuses and CSR – ITL Cycle 3 campuses reported lower levels of implementation, since each group of campuses had only concluded its first reporting period when it submitted its progress reports. Even so, CSR-ITL Cycle 3 campuses reported implementing each CSR component at a higher level than CSR – HS campuses. It is likely that this is due to the fact that the first reporting period for each group differed, with CSR – HS campuses reporting implementation during the first five months of the grant period, and Cycle 3 campuses reporting implementation for the entire first year of the grant.

A statistical analysis was conducted on Cycle 2 final evaluation data to determine whether CSR programs implemented over four years were related to improved student academic achievement. Comparisons of student performance were made between CSR campuses and non-CSR campuses, between non-CSR campuses and high-implementing CSR campuses, and between non-CSR and low-implementing CSR campuses. Several positive findings were found relating to the effectiveness of CSR reforms on student achievement, as measured by the percentage of students meeting state reading and math standards at each campus:

- CSR campuses that implemented program components at a higher level outperformed low-implementing campuses as measured by the amount of improvement in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005;
- High-implementing CSR campuses also outperformed non-CSR campuses as measured by the amount of improvement in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005;

- Five of the 11 CSR components were found to be related to improvement in the percentage of students meeting state reading passing standards between 2001 and 2005: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks, Support Provided for Staff, Parent and Community Involvement, Annual Evaluation and Coordination of Resources;
- Four of the 11 CSR components were found to be related to improvement in the percentage of students meeting state math passing standards between 2001 and 2005: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks, Professional Development, Coordination of Resources and Student Achievement;
- CSR campuses implementing the Coordination of Resources component at a high level were found to outperform low-implementing campuses in the percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS math passing standards;
- Across each of the 11 CSR components, no significant differences were found between high-implementing and low-implementing CSR campuses in the percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS reading passing standards;
- No significant differences were found between CSR campuses and non-CSR campuses in the percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS reading and math assessments.

These results show some evidence for concluding that the implementation of CSR reforms are related to improved student performance over time. Overall, these findings are somewhat encouraging and suggest that CSR reforms may be having the intended effect, at least as measured by results for Cycle 2.

One area of concern that emerges from the analysis is the comparatively low implementation levels for parental involvement activities among CSR – HS and CSR – ITL Cycle 3 campuses. Given difficulties reported regarding parent participation, this result suggests the importance of taking steps to establish more parent participation and outreach activities at CSR campuses, particularly at CSR – HS high schools. It is early enough in that grant program’s implementation period that such steps may have a positive effect on the success of CSR programs.

## Section I. Introduction and Background

The Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) program was first established by Congress in 1998 as a demonstration project for the U.S. Department of Education (USDE), and was reauthorized in 2001 through Title I, Part F of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. The CSR program was developed to help high poverty and low-achieving schools address common obstacles to improved student achievement through effective school-wide reform.

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

Funding for CSR implementation is targeted toward schools most in need of reform and improvement, such as schools with a high percentage of economically-disadvantaged students and low student test scores.<sup>2</sup> In FY 2004 Congress allocated approximately \$308 million for schools pursuing comprehensive school reform. A total of \$205 million was appropriated for FY 2005. States receive CSR funding based on their Title I formula. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) awards grants of no less than \$50,000 and up to \$150,000 per year to schools whose CSR programs meet the 11 criteria specified by the NCLB Act.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Borman, G. D., Hewes, G.M., Overman, L.T., and Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*. Baltimore, MD: CRESPAR/Johns Hopkins University, Retrieved on March 28, 2005, from <http://csos.jhu.edu/CRESPAR/techReports/Report59.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Comprehensive School Reform: Texas High Schools Initiative, Announcement [http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/disc/csr\\_thsi/announce.pdf](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/disc/csr_thsi/announce.pdf)

Grants were awarded in Texas through two different programs. The CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL) grant program was the initial CSR grant program through which federal funds were distributed to Title I eligible campuses seeking to implement the 11 CSR components. Beginning in 2001, CSR funds were distributed to 188 schools for Cycle 2 of the CSR – ITL program. Another 86 schools received funds in 2004 for Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program.

Cycle 2 campuses have had their programs in effect since July 1, 2001. Cycle 2 campuses' fourth and final year of program implementation occurred during the 2004-05 school year (July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005). Implementation data reported for the final year of Cycle 2 should be viewed as an indication of where grantees were on each of the CSR components after four years of program implementation. Cycle 3 campuses recently concluded their first year of program implementation (August 1, 2004 through July 31, 2005), and the first report covers activities implemented during this time frame.

The CSR – High School Initiative (HS) is a new grant program, first implemented for the 2004-05 school year, that distributes funds to 86 eligible Title I Part A schools serving high school students that are not currently receiving CSR funds, or that did not already receive CSR funds prior to the 2004-05 school year. The first year of implementation covers the period between January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2005. However, the first progress report covers activities occurring during the first semester of the program's implementation (January 1, 2005 through May 31, 2005).

#### *Nature of the Comprehensive School Reform Program*

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

1. Proven **research-based methods** and strategies for student learning, teaching and school management;
2. A **comprehensive design** integrating instruction, assessment, classroom management, professional development, parental involvement and school management;

3. **Professional development** that involves high-quality proven, innovative strategies and provide continuous training;
4. **Measurable goals and benchmarks** for student achievement;
5. **Support of school staff for reform**, including teachers, principals, administrators and other school staff;
6. **Support provided for staff** through the creation of shared leadership and broad responsibility for reform efforts;
7. **Parent and community involvement** in planning, implementing and evaluating reform program;
8. **External assistance** and support provided to teachers for school-wide reform from high-quality external entities;
9. **Annual evaluation** of the implementation of the school reforms and student achievement;
10. **Coordination of resources** including Federal, State, local and private financial and other resources that support and sustain the reform model; and
11. Strategies that improve **student achievement** that meet one of the following requirements: the program has to be found, through scientifically-based research, to significantly improve the academic achievement of participating students; or the program has been found to have strong evidence that it will significantly improve the academic achievement of participating students.<sup>4</sup>

To facilitate the implementation of these components, Texas schools are utilizing many different CSR models.<sup>5</sup> Schools have the option of developing their own reform models that include each of the above mentioned components; however, many schools turn to external sources for the development and implementation of their particular reform model. External CSR models are developed by groups such as universities, educational centers and labs. Each external model must include the 11 components for CSR but all differ widely in their methods and strategies. In every external case, the developers provide some type of initial training to begin the schoolwide implementation.

#### *CSR: Previous Research and Evaluations*

CSR grants are designed to provide financial incentives to schools to encourage them to implement comprehensive reform programs that are based on reliable and effective

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Education, 2005.

<sup>5</sup> Watt, K M., Yanez, D., Cossio, G., *AVID: A Comprehensive School Reform Model for Texas*. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, vol. 10 (2002-2003); Smith, E., (1998) *Breaking Ranks: A High School Restructuring Initiative*, U.S. Department of Education; Sugar, W., (2001) *Evaluation Series, Forest Grove High School, Forest Grove, Oregon*, PLATO Learning, Inc.; Kim, L., Zitzer, M., (1999) *Powerful Learning Framework for Teachers*, U.S. Department of Education; Frome, L., (2001) *High Schools that Work: Findings from the 1996-1998 Assessments*, Research Triangle Institution.

practices. Research on the effectiveness of CSR falls mainly into two categories: implementation research and outcome research.

Because many of the CSR models are relatively “young,” implementation research dominates the literature. Also, because the majority of CSR models are implemented in K-8 sites, much of the research excludes high schools. Although research into the effectiveness of CSR models is limited, four critical components that contribute to success of the models have been identified: (1) Schools that implement a model with the “greatest fidelity” to the model’s prescriptions experience the most positive results; (2) Reforms that are more clearly defined and have more prescriptive designs tend to be implemented more successfully than those that are less clearly defined; (3) Successful reforms utilize strong professional development techniques and have effective follow-up to address teachers’ specific problems; and (4) Stakeholders have significant “buy-in” in successful reform models.<sup>6</sup>

One of the first CSR research reviews was conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR), which reviewed the effectiveness of 24 CSR models in elementary schools. The study concluded that only three met the AIR criteria for ‘strong evidence of positive effects on student achievement,’ while five programs were determined to show ‘promising evidence’.<sup>7</sup>

More recent research corroborates the limited number of external CSR models that seem to produce statistically-significant, positive results. In 2002, a comprehensive synthesis of existing research was conducted by Geoffrey Borman at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Using meta-analysis to categorize existing CSR models by levels of effectiveness, Borman identified 29 of the most widely discussed and disseminated CSR models and researched how many of these models had been effectively evaluated.

---

<sup>6</sup> Borman, 7.

<sup>7</sup> Holdzkom, D., (2002) *Effects of Comprehensive School Reform in 12 Schools: Results of a Three Year Study*. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C.

Based on the combination of the quality and quantity of independent evaluations, and the statistical significance of positive results in evidence, Borman grouped the 29 CSR models four different categories:<sup>8</sup>

- 1) the **strongest evidence of effectiveness** was found for only three models, with statistically-significant, positive results in evidence and findings based on a large number of independent studies and observations across the United States;
- 2) **highly promising evidence of effectiveness** was found for three models, with statistically-significant, positive results in evidence, but findings were based on a much smaller research base;
- 3) **promising evidence of effectiveness** was found for six models based on at least one indication of positive results, but the number of evaluations were still too few to generalize from their conclusions; and
- 4) the **greatest need for additional research** was for the remaining 17 CSR models that did not show evidence of statistically-significant, positive results and had an insufficient number of independent evaluations.

Based on his findings, Borman concluded that the research base for many of the programs examined in the literature was “weak, inconsistent, or conducted by internal program staff.”<sup>9</sup>

In another study, David Holdzkom looked at 12 schools using CSR models and compared them to matched schools to examine the degree to which reforms brought about change in student outcomes, teacher practices and teachers’ perceptions that characteristics of the school had changed.<sup>10</sup> In developing a series of surveys, Holdzkom used terms taken from the School Climate Inventory (SCI), which utilizes the following seven dimensions that are logically linked with factors associated with effective school organizational climates:

- **Order** – the extent to which the environment is ordered and appropriate student behaviors are present;

---

<sup>8</sup> Borman, 28-33.

<sup>9</sup> Husbands, J., Beese, Stacy, (2001) *Review of Selected High School Reform Strategies*. Aspen Program on Education.

<sup>10</sup> Holdzkom, 4.



- **Leadership** – the extent to which the administration provides instructional leadership;
- **Environment** – the extent to which a positive learning environment exists;
- **Involvement** – the extent to which parents and the community are involved in the school;
- **Instruction** – the extent to which the instructional program is well developed and implemented;
- **Expectations** – the extent to which students are expected to learn and be responsible; and
- **Collaboration** – the extent to which the administration, faculty and students cooperate and participate in problem solving.<sup>11</sup>

Holdzkom also utilized an instrument called the Comprehensive School Reform Teacher Questionnaire (CSRTQ), which was developed in 1996 to evaluate the Memphis City Schools' restructuring program. The CSRTQ focused on the following four dimensions:

- **Support** – the value of support given to the schools;
- **Capacity** – the presence of available material, time and human resources;
- **Pedagogy** – changes in classroom practices; and
- **Outcomes** – impact on student achievement and enthusiasm, parent/community involvement, and collaboration.

Through the use of data collection, classroom observation, surveys and interviews with teachers and principals, Holdzkom found that: (1) Achievement gains became evident in the third year of implementation; (2) Faculty and staff at schools implementing comprehensive reforms perceived some elements of school climate to be more positive; (3) Emerging differences in instructional practices seemed to be related to selected school reform models; and (4) Different models evidenced different aspects of instruction, classroom practice and teacher-student-knowledge relationships.

### *Organization of the Report*

This evaluation report examines implementation and student performance outcomes related to the CSR – ITL grant program. To address the dearth of information on high school implementation, the report also includes an analysis of the CSR - HS grant

---

<sup>11</sup> Holdzkom, 4.



program, which targets funds exclusively toward improvements for high schools that did not receive Title I funds under CSR – ITL.<sup>12</sup>

Following the introduction, Section II of this evaluation report describes implementation data for the CSR – HS grant program, both for public high schools and for open-enrollment charter schools and campuses serving all-grade levels. Results presented in this section are based on progress reports submitted by 79 grantees: 64 high schools and 15 open-enrollment charter schools/all-grade campuses.

Section III describes implementation data for Cycle 2 and Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL grant program. This section updates previous research on Cycle 2 conducted in 2004 by Academic Information Management (AIM) on behalf of the TEA. This section describes year four implementation results for each of the 11 CSR components for Cycle 2 of the grant program, which began in 2001, and provides new implementation data for Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program. Results in this section are based on progress reports submitted by 153 Cycle 2 campuses and 85 Cycle 3 campuses.

Section IV presents an analysis of student performance results for Cycle 2. This section updates previous research conducted by AIM by using final evaluation report data to conduct statistical analyses of associations between levels of CSR implementation and student performance on standardized state assessments such as the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) and the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS).

A final section of this report provides concluding observations and suggestions for further research on Comprehensive School Reform programs.

---

<sup>12</sup> Copies of the grantee progress reports used to collection data for this evaluation are available upon request.

## II. CSR – High School Initiative (HS)

Given the nature of the CSR – HS program, only campuses serving high school students, including high schools, all-grade campuses (e.g. schools enrolling students in grades K-12), and open-enrollment charter schools enrolling students in grades 9-12, were eligible to receive grant funds. Table 1 shows the distribution of CSR – HS campuses by campus type at the end of the first reporting period. Consistent with the goals of the grant program, all of the CSR – HS campuses enrolled high school students. Most were high schools (80%), with only one in five (20%) campuses classified as open-enrollment charter schools or campuses serving multiple grade levels (e.g., K-12, hereafter referred to as “all-grade campuses”).

**Table 1. Distribution of CSR – HS Campuses by Campus Type**

Campus Type	Number of Campuses	Percent
High School	69	80.2%
All-grade Campus	17	19.8%
Total	86	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Since high schools and all-grade campuses possess distinctive characteristics, this section of the report presents separate findings on CSR implementation experiences for each campus type.

### *Characteristics of CSR – HS High School Students*

The typical CSR – HS student in 2005 was enrolled in grade 9 or 10, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged. Approximately 61% of all students attending high schools were enrolled in grades 9-10, with 39% enrolled in grades 11-12 (Table 2). At all-grade campuses, approximately 28% were enrolled in Early Education (EE) through Grade 5, 13% were enrolled in grades 6-8, 37% were enrolled in grades 9-10, and 23% were enrolled in grades 11-12.

**Table 2. Grade Level of Students Attending  
CSR – HS Campuses**

Grade Level	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent
EE	--	--	84	1.2%
PK	--	--	638	8.8%
KG	--	--	275	3.8%
1	--	--	225	3.1%
2	--	--	203	2.8%
3	--	--	181	2.5%
4	--	--	191	2.6%
5	--	--	189	2.6%
6	--	--	189	2.6%
7	--	--	290	4.0%
8	--	--	450	6.2%
9	24,793	33.1%	1,436	19.9%
10	20,962	28.0%	1,246	17.2%
11	15,258	20.3%	1,097	15.2%
12	13,978	18.6%	538	7.4%
Total	74,991	100%	7,232	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and PEIMS Student-Level Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

As Table 3 shows, most students enrolled in CSR – HS high schools were Hispanic (57%), followed by almost even percentages of Whites (22%) and African-Americans (20%). These results differ from all high school students statewide, where 43%, 40% and 14% were Hispanic, White and African-American, respectively. Compared to all high school students statewide, a higher percentage of CSR – HS high school students were limited English proficient (LEP) (11%) and economically-disadvantaged (49%), a difference of 4% and 6%, respectively.

Compared to high schools, a slightly lower percentage of CSR – HS students at all-grade campuses were Hispanic (52%), while a higher percentage of students were White (25%). There was also a substantially higher percentage of students at all-grade campuses that were classified as economically disadvantaged (62%), a difference of 13 percentage points compared to CSR – HS students at public high schools.

**Table 3. Demographic Characteristics of Students Attending CSR – HS Campuses**

Characteristic	High Schools		All-grade Campuses		State
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
White	16,328	21.8%	1,833	25.4%	42.5%
Hispanic	43,066	57.4%	3,777	52.2%	39.6%
African-American	14,426	19.2%	1,565	21.6%	14.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1,063	1.4%	35	0.5%	3.2%
Native American	108	0.1%	22	0.3%	0.3%
LEP	8,449	11.3%	1,074	14.9%	6.7%
Economically-Disadvantaged	36,350	48.5%	4,455	61.6%	42.8%
Total	74,991	100%	7,232	100%	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and PEIMS Student-Level Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

*Implementation of CSR Grant Programs: CSR – HS Initiative*

Table 4 shows the most common CSR models implemented by CSR – HS grantees by campus type. Nearly one-quarter of the high schools (23%) selected the Accelerated Schools Project as their primary model, followed by High Schools that Work (14%) and AVID (11%). Results for all-grade campuses differed in that the vast majority of these campuses selected one of two models, with over half selecting the Accelerated Schools Project (53%) , and over one-fourth (27%) selecting the model developed at the University of Texas’ Dana Center – substantially higher percentages compared to high schools.

**Table 4. Most Common CSR Models Implemented by CSR – HS Campuses**

CSR Model	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number of Campuses	Percent	Number of Campuses	Percent
Accelerated Schools Project	15	23.4%	8	53.3%
High Schools that Work	9	14.1%	0	0.0%
AVID	7	10.9%	0	0.0%
Breaking Ranks II	5	7.8%	0	0.0%
UT Dana Center	4	6.3%	4	26.7%
PLATO	2	3.1%	1	6.7%
Other	22	34.4%	2	13.3%
Total	64	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

As Table 5 shows, all but one of the high school campuses that submitted progress reports (98%) indicated that they had established an active leadership team for implementation of the CSR model. Results were similar for all-grade campuses receiving grant funds, where all of the campuses established an active leadership team. This finding – the presence of active leadership teams – indicates that most grantees are implementing one of the key elements of an effective school organizational climate.<sup>13</sup>

**Table 5. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses with an Active Leadership Team for Implementation of the CSR Model**

Response	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	63	98.4%	15	100%
No	1	1.6%	0	0%
Total	63	98.4%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: One of the high schools did not respond to this question in its progress report.

By far, the most common participating members of active leadership teams at high schools were campus principals, with the vast majority of them (94%) reporting that their school principal was a team member (Table 6). Results were similar at all-grade campuses, where all school principals (100%) participated on the active leadership team. A majority of public high schools (84%) and all-grade campuses (93%) reported that teachers were also team members. More than half of the public high schools reported that vice principals (66%), curriculum specialists (66%), and department chairs (61%) were team members. Less than half of the all-grade campuses had these types of leaders on their active leadership teams (33%, 40% and 33%, respectively). Community members were the least common member of active leadership teams among both types of CSR – HS campus, with only 36% and 20% of public high schools and all-grade campuses, respectively, indicating they had community members on their active leadership teams. These results indicate that in the earliest stage of program implementation, nearly all of the grantees had established the leadership they needed for successful implementation. Especially among high schools, the leadership teams

---

<sup>13</sup> Holdzkom, 4.

appeared to be sufficiently diverse to encourage a wide-cross section of participation in implementing the grant program.

**Table 6. Participating Members of Active Leadership Teams at CSR – HS Campuses**

Team Member(s)	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Principal	60	93.8%	15	100.0%
Teacher(s)	54	84.4%	14	93.3%
Vice-Principal(s)	42	65.6%	1	33.3%
Curriculum Specialist(s)	42	65.6%	6	40.0%
Department Chair(s)	39	60.9%	5	33.3%
Community Member(s)	23	35.9%	3	20.0%
Other Leader(s)	48	75.0%	9	60.0%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages are calculated based on responses from 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

### *Annual Evaluation*

Almost all of the grantees reported conducting ongoing project evaluation and/or progress monitoring to assess implementation of the CSR model. Approximately 94% of high schools and 93% of all-grade campuses indicated that they were conducting ongoing evaluation (Table 7). Only a small percentage at either type of campus, 6% and 7%, respectively, indicated they were not conducting project evaluations.

**Table 7. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Conducting Ongoing Project Evaluation/Progress Monitoring to Assess Implementation of the CSR Model**

Response	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	60	93.8%	14	93.3%
No	4	6.2%	1	6.7%
Total	64	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

### *Curriculum and Instruction*

Table 8 describes activities implemented by grantees to improve the Curriculum and Instruction component at their campus. Nearly all of the high schools (89%) and all-

grade campuses (93%) established a CSR grant leadership team. Most high schools (88%) and all of the all-grade campuses (100%) established campus self-assessment. Nearly all of the high schools (81%) and all-grade campuses (93%) established individual student assessment, and the majority of high schools (69%) and all-grade campuses (73%) established Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) alignment. The least common curriculum and instruction activities among high schools were changes in methods and instruction (55%) and teacher curriculum review and improvement (50%). By contrast, nearly all (80%) of the all-grade campuses implemented teacher curriculum review and improvement. The least common activity among all-grade campuses was a change in methods and instruction, established by 67% of the schools.

**Table 8. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses Offering Curriculum and Instruction Activities**

Activity	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
CSR Grant Leadership Team	57	89.1%	14	93.3%
Campus Self-Assessment	56	87.5%	15	100.0%
Individual Student Assessments	52	81.3%	14	93.3%
TEKS Alignment	44	68.8%	11	73.3%
Changes in Methods of Instruction	35	54.7%	10	66.7%
Teacher Curriculum Review and Improvement	32	50.0%	12	80.0%
Other	24	37.5%	7	46.7%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages are calculated based on responses from 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

### *Non-Academic Support Services*

Grantees also implemented a range of support services separate from their academic services. As Table 9 shows, a majority of grantees offered counseling (73%), tutoring (61%), and after-school programs (52%) to help implement the Non-Academic Support Services component of CSR. A lower percentage of campuses offered mentoring (48%) and transportation (38%). A similar rank order for the most common support services was found for all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

**Table 9. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses  
Offering Non-Academic Support Services**

Service	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Counseling	47	73.4%	12	80.0%
Tutoring	39	60.9%	12	80.0%
After-School Programs	33	51.6%	10	66.7%
Mentoring	31	48.4%	8	53.3%
Transportation	24	37.5%	7	46.7%
Other	25	39.1%	9	60.0%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages are calculated based on responses from 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

### *Professional Development*

Previous research identifies the importance of strong professional development with effective follow-up to successful CSR reforms. Grantees were asked a series of questions about their implementation of such activities at their campus. As Table 10 shows, to help implement the Professional and Staff Development component of CSR, a majority of high school campuses offered training workshops (63%) to teachers and staff, followed by whole school training (56%) and study and/or working groups (52%). Coaching and mentoring (42%) and conferences (41%) were the least common professional and staff development activities offered at CSR – HS high school campuses.

Results were different among other all-grade types of CSR – HS campuses. The most common forms of professional and staff development was sending staff to conferences (80%) and whole school training (80%). Workshops (67%) were also common opportunities available to school staff. The least common professional and staff development opportunities among all-grade campuses were study/working groups and coaching/mentoring, although more than half (53%) of the campuses offered each of these opportunities to their staff.



**Table 10. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses  
Offering Professional and Staff Development Activities**

Activity	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Workshops	40	62.5%	10	66.7%
Whole School Training	36	56.3%	12	80.0%
Study/Working Groups	33	51.6%	8	53.3%
Coaching/Mentoring	27	42.2%	8	53.3%
Conferences	26	40.6%	12	80.0%
Other	51	79.7%	6	40.0%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages are calculated based on responses from 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

Table 11 reports the frequency that professional and staff development activities were offered at CSR – HS high school campuses. Although coaching/mentoring was one of the less common activities overall, when offered it was available the most frequently, with 48% of campuses offering coaching and/or mentoring to teachers on a weekly basis. Study/working groups were also offered frequently by high schools, with 33% of the grantees that offered this opportunity doing so on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Although more commonly available to teachers and staff, whole school training and workshops were offered much less frequently, with 42% of all grantees that offered the former doing so only once per semester, and 38% of grantees that offered the latter doing so only once per month. Conferences were available the least frequently, with 54% of grantees making this opportunity available only once per semester.

Similar to high schools, a majority of all-grade campuses (75%) offered coaching/mentoring to teachers and staff on a weekly basis (Table 12). Most study/working group sessions (38%) were also offered weekly. However, whole school training and workshops at all-grade campuses were offered somewhat more frequently than at high schools, with half of the all-grade campuses (50%) offering each professional development activity on a monthly basis.

**Table 11. Frequency of Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS High Schools**

Activity	Whole School Training		Conferences		Workshops		Coaching/Mentoring		Study/Working Groups	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Weekly	2	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	2.5%	13	48.1%	7	21.2%
Bi-Weekly	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	7.4%	4	12.1%
Monthly	10	27.8%	1	3.8%	15	37.5%	5	18.5%	8	24.2%
Bi-Monthly	7	19.4%	1	3.8%	3	7.5%	1	3.7%	3	9.1%
Once per Semester	15	41.7%	14	53.8%	7	17.5%	3	11.1%	4	12.1%
Other	2	5.6%	10	38.5%	14	35.0%	3	11.1%	7	21.2%
Total Number of Activities	36	100%	26	100%	40	100%	27	100%	33	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

**Table 12. Frequency of Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses**

Activity	Whole School Training		Conferences		Workshops		Coaching/Mentoring		Study/Working Groups	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Weekly	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	3	37.5%
Bi-Weekly	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Monthly	6	50.0%	1	8.3%	5	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
Bi-Monthly	2	16.7%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%
Once per Semester	1	8.3%	3	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%
Other	2	16.7%	8	66.7%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	2	25.0%
Total Number of Activities	12	100%	12	100%	10	100%	8	100%	8	

Table 13 shows the average number of teachers, administrators, and staff per CSR – HS campus that had participated in Professional and Staff Development activities by the end of the first reporting period. The most often attended activity was whole school training, with an average of 84 participants per campus. By far, the majority of participants in this and other activity categories were teachers, ranging from 75% to 87% of all participants depending upon the activity. Teachers were best represented in study/working groups (87%), workshops (85%) and whole school training (83%). The highest percentage of administrators attending was for conferences (13%), while all other staff members were best represented in conferences (13%), whole school training (12%) and coaching/mentoring (11%).

Similar to high schools, the most often attended Professional Development activity at all-grade campuses was whole school training, with 100% participation (Table 14). The majority of participants in this and other activity categories were teachers, ranging from 55% to 80% of all participants. Teachers attending Professional Development activities at all-grade campuses were best represented in conferences (80%), workshops (79%) and whole school training (74%). Administrators were best represented in conferences (20%) and all other staff members were best represented in coaching/mentoring (41%).

**Table 13. Average Number of Teachers, Administrators, and Staff Participating in Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS High School Campuses**

Staff Category	Whole School Training		Conferences		Workshops		Coaching/Mentoring		Study/Working Groups	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Teachers	70	83.3%	12	75.0%	28	84.8%	22	81.5%	27	87.1%
Administrators	4	4.8%	2	12.5%	2	6.1%	2	7.4%	2	6.5%
Staff	10	11.9%	2	12.5%	3	9.1%	3	11.1%	2	6.5%
Total	84	100%	16	100%	33	100%	27	100%	31	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

**Table 14. Average Number of Teachers, Administrators, and Staff Participating in Professional and Staff Development Activities Offered at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses**

Staff Category	Whole School Training		Conferences		Workshops		Coaching/ Mentoring		Study/ Working Groups	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Teachers	26	74.3%	4	80.0%	23	79.3%	12	54.5%	10	71.4%
Administrators	2	5.7%	1	20.0%	1	3.5%	1	4.5%	1	7.1%
Staff	7	20.0%	0	0.0%	5	17.2%	9	40.9%	3	21.4%
Total	35	100%	5	100%	29	100%	22	99.9%	14	99.9%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Some percentages do not sum to 100.0 due to rounding.

*Parent and Community Involvement*

Grantees were also asked about activities implemented to improve Parent and Community Involvement at their campus. It seems that a substantially higher percentage of all-grade campuses than high schools had implemented a range of Parent and Community Involvement activities at their campuses by the end of the first reporting period. It will be interesting to see whether this earlier implementation relates to higher levels of parent participation in future evaluations of this grant program.

The most common Parent and Community Involvement activity for both types of campuses was parental involvement in decision-making, established by more than half (58%) of the CSR – HS high schools and nearly three-fourths (74%) of the all-grade campuses (Table 15). Nearly one-half (44%) of the high schools offered parent education and/or training, compared to two-thirds (67%) of the all-grade campuses, and 28% of high schools offered parent or community volunteer programs, compared to 60% of the all-grade campuses. The least common involvement activity was home visits, established by only 19% and 27% of the high schools and all-grade campuses, respectively.

**Table 15. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses  
Offering Parent and Community Involvement Activities**

Activity	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Parental Involvement in Decision-making	37	57.8%	11	73.3%
Parent Education/Training	28	43.8%	10	66.7%
Parent or Community Volunteer Programs	18	28.1%	9	60.0%
Home Visits	12	18.8%	4	26.7%
Other	24	37.5%	11	73.3%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages were calculated based on responses provided by 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses.

High schools had an average of 140 parents participating in Parent and Community Involvement activities offered at the campus by the end of the first reporting period (Table 16). This compares to an average of 79 parents per campus attending activities at all-grade campuses. This is probably a function of enrollment levels at these campuses, with more students enrolled in high schools than all-grade campuses or charter schools. High schools reported an average of 53 parents per campus participating in parent education and/or training, and a similar number of parents (47) participated in parent or community volunteer programs. By comparison, an average of 28 and 21 parents, respectively, attended these activities at all-grade campuses.

It is interesting that the most common activity, parent involvement in decision-making, was attended by a relatively small number of parents at both high schools (22) and all-grade campuses (6). This suggests that perhaps grantees, particularly high schools, may want to increase the number of parent education or parent volunteer opportunities available at their campuses, since these seem to be attended by a substantially larger number of parents on average when they are held. Perhaps this relates to parental interest in these activities, or maybe it relates to recruitment strategies implemented by the grantees. It may also be related to the nature of some decision-making activities on a campus (e.g., committee meetings) where the total number of parents participating is likely to be smaller. This finding and these possibilities merit further research.

**Table 16. Average Number of Parents Participating in Parent and Community Involvement Activities Offered at CSR – HS Campuses**

Activity	High Schools	All-grade Campuses
	Number of Parents	Number of Parents
Parent Education/Training	53	28
Parent or Community Volunteer Programs	47	21
Parent Involvement in Decision-making	22	6
Home Visits	18	24
Total	140	79

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Table 17 presents data related to the degree to which high schools had implemented each Parent and Community Involvement activities by the end of the first reporting period. It is to be expected that at this early stage of program implementation, most campuses had yet to report full implementation of each activity in their CSR program. In every activity area, only one-third (33%) or less of high schools and all-grade campuses reported the activity was either ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’.

**Table 17. Degree of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS Initiative High Schools**

Degree of Implementation	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%
Not Implemented	6	9.4%	7	11.1%	3	4.7%	9	14.1%	6	9.4%
Somewhat Implemented	21	32.8%	18	28.6%	10	15.6%	28	43.8%	26	40.6%
Moderately Implemented	19	29.7%	23	36.5%	32	50.0%	14	21.9%	18	28.1%
Mostly Implemented	14	21.9%	9	14.3%	15	23.4%	10	15.6%	9	14.1%
Fully Implemented	4	6.3%	6	9.5%	4	6.3%	3	4.7%	5	7.8%
Total	64	100%	63	100%	64	100%	64	100%	64	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: One high school did not respond this question for non-academic support services.

Of the campuses that submitted progress reports, the highest percentage indicated they had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ Professional Development (30%), followed by Curriculum and Instruction (28%), Non-Academic Support Services (24%) and Annual Evaluation (22%). Parent and Community Involvement was the least implemented activity, with only one in five campuses (20%) indicating they had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ this component.

A majority of high schools reported that the top three most implemented components were on schedule or ahead of schedule (Table 18). Nearly all of the grantees indicated that their implementation of the Curriculum and Instruction component (94%) was on schedule or ahead of schedule, followed by Professional Development (88%), Non-Academic Support Services (84%) and Annual Evaluation (80%). Community Involvement was the most common component reported as ‘behind schedule’, with 28% of high schools reporting that this was the case.

**Table 18. Location on Timeline of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR– HS Initiative High Schools**

Degree of Implementation	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Behind Schedule	4	6.3%	10	15.9%	8	12.5%	18	28.1%	13	20.3%
On Schedule	60	93.8%	52	82.5%	55	85.9%	46	71.9%	50	78.1%
Ahead of Schedule	0	0.0%	1	1.6%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.6%
Total	64	100%	63	100%	64	100%	64	100%	64	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: One high school did not respond this question for non-academic support services.

High schools also reported on the degree of difficulty associated with each component’s implementation (Table 19). Not surprisingly, Community Involvement was reported by the highest percentage of grantees as the most difficult component to implement, with nearly half (48%) indicating that this component as ‘difficult’ or ‘very difficult’ to implement. Professional Development was reported as the easiest component to implement, with 31% of grantees reporting their implementation experience as ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’.

**Table 19. Difficulty of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS Initiative High Schools**

Degree of Implementation	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Very Difficult	4	6.3%	2	3.1%	3	4.7%	4	6.3%	4	6.3%
Difficult	13	20.3%	16	25.0%	14	21.9%	26	41.3%	14	21.9%
Neither	33	51.6%	32	50.0%	27	42.2%	28	44.4%	37	57.8%
Easy	14	21.9%	14	21.9%	18	28.1%	5	7.9%	9	14.1%
Very Easy	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	64	100%	64	100%	64	100%	63	100%	64	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: One high school did not respond to the question regarding parent and community involvement.

Table 20 illustrates the degree to which all-grade campuses had implemented each Parent and Community Involvement activity by the end of the first reporting period. The highest percentage of all-grade campuses indicated they had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ Professional Development (33%), Non-Academic Support Services (33%) and Annual Evaluation (20%). Similar to high schools, Parent and Community Involvement was the least implemented activity, with only 13% of all-grade campuses indicating they had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ this component.

**Table 20. Degree of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses**

Degree of Implementation	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%	Number of Campuses	%
Not Implemented	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%
Somewhat Implemented	9	60.0%	8	53.3%	3	20.0%	5	33.3%	7	46.7%
Moderately Implemented	3	20.0%	2	13.3%	6	40.0%	8	53.3%	3	20.0%
Mostly Implemented	3	20.0%	3	20.0%	3	20.0%	1	6.7%	2	13.3%
Fully Implemented	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%
Total	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.



Unlike high schools, all-grade campuses were much more optimistic about the location of each activity on the implementation timeline (Table 21). Every campus (100%) in this category rated Parent and Community Involvement as ‘on schedule’ or ‘ahead of schedule’. Nearly every campus (93%) rated the other CSR activities as ‘on schedule’ or ‘ahead of schedule’.

**Table 21. Location on Timeline of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses**

Implementation Schedule	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Behind Schedule	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%
On Schedule	14	93.3%	13	86.7%	13	86.7%	14	93.3%	14	93.3%
Ahead of Schedule	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
Total	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

All-grade campuses also reported on the degree of difficulty associated with each component’s implementation (Table 22). Similar to high schools, Parent and Community Involvement was reported by the highest percentage of all-grade campuses (27%) as ‘difficult’ or ‘very difficult’ to implement. Professional Development was reported as the easiest component to implement, with 33% of all-grade campuses reporting their implementation experience as ‘easy’ or ‘very easy’.

**Table 22. Difficulty of Implementation of CSR-Funded Activities at CSR – HS All-grade Campuses**

Difficulty of Implementation	Curriculum and Instruction		Non-Academic Support Services		Professional Development		Parent/Community Involvement		Annual Evaluation	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Very Difficult	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Difficult	3	20.0%	0	0.0%	2	13.3%	4	26.7%	3	20.0%
Neither	9	60.0%	10	66.7%	8	53.3%	8	53.3%	8	53.3%
Easy	3	20.0%	5	33.3%	4	26.7%	3	20.0%	4	26.7%
Very Easy	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

### *Obstacles to Program Implementation*

Forty-seven of the 86 CSR – HS campuses (54%) indicated that they encountered obstacles when implementing their CSR program. Grantees were asked to describe the principal obstacles they faced when implementing their CSR models (Table 23).<sup>14</sup> Of those who reported encountering implementation barriers, more than half of the high schools and all-grade campuses indicated a lack of parental participation (51%) as an impediment to the successful implementation of CSR components. Grantees identified several reasons for the source of this problem, including poverty, language barriers, conflicting work schedules due to parents working multiple jobs, limited transportation opportunities and challenges associated with single-parent households. These socioeconomic issues were the most common reasons provided by grantees to explain the lack of parental participation in reform efforts.

Scheduling conflicts (21%) were the next most common obstacle, followed by insufficient staff or limited staff skills (17%), lack of staff buy-in (9%) and limited capacity for self-assessment (9%). If insufficient staff and lack of staff buy-in are combined, staff-related issues become the second most common type of obstacle (26%).

**Table 23. Top Five Obstacles to Program Implementation, All CSR Campuses**

Obstacle	Number of Responses	Percent of All Respondents
Lack of Parental Participation	24	51.1%
Scheduling Conflicts	10	21.3%
Insufficient Staff or Limited Staff Skills	8	17.0%
Lack of Staff Buy-In	4	8.5%
Limited Capacity for Self-Assessment	4	8.5%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages were calculated based on 47 grantees that responded to this question.

---

<sup>14</sup> Only seven open-enrollment charter schools or all-grade campuses provided information on obstacles they encountered during implementation of key CSR components. Three of the seven (43%) identified the lack of parent participation as a problem. One campus each identified funding shortages, lack of staff buy-in, limited alignment of the curriculum with TEKS, and misalignment between the funding cycle and program timelines as obstacles to implementation.

When asked whether such obstacles were resolved by the middle of the grant period, more than two-thirds (69%) of all campuses indicated that they had resolved the obstacles to the relevant component’s implementation (Table 24).

**Table 24. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses that Resolved Obstacles to Implementation**

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	31	68.9%
No	14	31.1%
Total	45	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages were calculated based on 45 grantees that responded to this question.

Grantees described how they resolved the program implementation obstacles they faced (Table 25). Hiring new staff members to support program implementation was the most common means by which grantees attempted to resolve obstacles (23%). This included hiring counselors, specialists in core curriculum areas (e.g., reading and math), hiring staff with data skills to conduct self-assessments and hiring program managers to coordinate efforts to implement CSR components on the campus.

The next most common solution to perceived implementation barriers was to increase professional development opportunities for teachers and school staff (17%). Grantees identified several areas where teachers and staff received additional training, such as conducting self-assessments, team-building and content-specific training. Other solutions that were adopted to overcome barriers included implementing or changing parental outreach strategies (13%), hiring new campus leadership (9%) and seeking solutions through their technical service provider (6%).

**Table 25. Top Five Resolutions to Program Implementation Obstacles**

Obstacle Resolution	Number of Responses	Percent of All Respondents
New Support Staff	11	23.4%
Professional Development Opportunities	8	17.0%
Parental Outreach Program	6	12.8%
New Leadership	4	8.5%
Technical Assistance	3	6.4%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages were calculated based on 47 grantees that responded to this question.

*Technical Assistance*

CSR – HS grantees were required to obtain the services of a technical assistance provider to help campuses receiving grant funds with the implementation of the CSR program. As Table 26 shows, nearly half (48%) of CSR – HS high schools reported they received technical assistance once a month or less frequently, whether monthly (26%), bi-monthly (8%) or only once per semester (13%). By contrast, one-half (50%) of all-grade campuses reported they received technical assistance on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. Only 21% of high schools received technical assistance on a similar basis.

**Table 26. Frequency that CSR – HS Campuses Received Technical Assistance**

Frequency	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Column Percent	Number	Column Percent
Weekly	9	14.8%	7	50.0%
Bi-Weekly	4	6.6%	0	0.0%
Monthly	16	26.2%	3	21.4%
Bi-Monthly	5	8.2%	1	7.1%
Once per Semester	8	13.1%	0	0.0%
Other	19	31.1%	3	21.4%
Total	61	100%	14	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Four high schools and one all-grade campus did not respond to this question.

As Table 27 indicates, the most common areas of reform in which technical assistance providers offered guidance to high schools were Professional Development (77%), Curriculum (66%) and Instruction (61%). Similar results were evident among all-grade campuses, with 100%, 73% and 73% of schools receiving technical assistance in these

areas, respectively. The least common areas in which high schools received technical assistance were Parent Involvement (34%), Classroom Management (31%) and Technology (23%).

Interestingly, there were only two major areas of reform – Classroom Management and Technology – where less than half of the all-grade campuses received technical assistance. Only 47% of the all-grade campuses received technical assistance in Classroom Management and 27% of these campuses received technical assistance in Technology. Approximately 60% or more of the all-grade campuses received technical assistance in each of the other areas of reform. By contrast, there were only three major areas of reform (Professional Development, Curriculum and Instruction) where more than half of the high schools received technical assistance.

**Table 27. Major Areas of Reform in which Technical Assistance Providers Offered Guidance to CSR – HS Campuses**

Area of Reform	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Professional Development	49	76.6%	15	100.0%
Curriculum	42	65.6%	11	73.3%
Instruction	39	60.9%	11	73.3%
Student Assessment	29	45.3%	9	60.0%
Support Services	27	42.2%	9	60.0%
School Management	25	39.1%	11	73.3%
Parental Involvement	22	34.4%	9	60.0%
Classroom Management	20	31.3%	7	46.7%
Technology	15	23.4%	4	26.7%
Other	16	25.0%	4	26.7%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Percentages are based on 64 high schools and 15 all-grade campuses that submitted progress reports.

Based on these findings, it seems that, compared to high schools, a higher percentage of open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses are receiving technical assistance in a larger number of areas of reform, and are receiving it more frequently. It is unclear why this is the case. Perhaps this is why a somewhat higher percentage of all-grade campuses (93%) than high schools (89%) reported that there was no instance where a technical assistance provider had failed to provide adequate assistance. This finding merits further research.

**Table 28. Percentage of CSR – HS Campuses  
that Reported an Instance where a Technical Assistance Provider  
Failed to Provide Adequate Assistance**

Response	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	7	11.1%	1	6.7%
No	56	88.9%	14	93.3%
Total	63	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: One high school did not respond to this question.

*Additional Funding Sources*

Grantees were also asked to describe the additional sources of funds used to supplement the federal CSR grants supporting the CSR programs at their campus. Funding patterns between high schools and all-grade campuses were different. Although the same percentage of all-grade campuses (47%) as high schools (47%) reported using additional federal funds to support the programs, a higher percentage of all-grade campuses (60%) than high schools (39%) indicated that they used state funds (Table 29). A lower percentage of all-grade campuses (33%) than high school campuses (52%) reported using local funds, and a substantially lower percentage of all-grade campuses (13%) than high school campuses (30%) indicated that they used no additional sources of funding to support their CSR programs.

**Table 29. Additional Sources of Funding Used by CSR – HS Campuses to Support  
their CSR Program**

Funding Source	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Federal	30	46.9%	7	46.7%
State	25	39.1%	9	60.0%
Local	33	51.6%	5	33.3%
Private	5	7.8%	0	0.0%
None	19	29.7%	2	13.3%
Other	6	9.4%	1	6.7%
Total	64	100%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Differences between campus types were also evident in the other sources of funding that grantees were reported as seeking. As Table 30 indicates, more than one-third of high schools (39%) reported they were seeking additional federal funds to support their CSR reforms, compared to only one in five (20%) of the all-grade campuses. Approximately 33% of both high schools and all-grade campuses indicated they were seeking state funds, but a substantially higher percentage of high schools (28%) than all-grade campuses (7%) reported that they were seeking local funds. More high schools (25%) than all-grade campuses (13%) reported they were seeking private funds to support CSR activities. Approximately one-third of high school campuses (33%) reported they were not seeking additional funding to support their programs, compared to nearly half (47%) of all-grade campuses.

**Table 30. Additional Sources of Funding that CSR – HS Campuses are Actively Seeking to Support their CSR Programs**

Funding Source	High Schools		All-grade Campuses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Federal	25	39.1%	3	20.0%
State	21	32.8%	5	33.3%
Local	18	28.1%	1	6.7%
Private	16	25.0%	2	13.3%
None	21	32.8%	7	46.7%
Other	21	32.8%	0	0.0%
Total	64	100.0%	15	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

### Section III. CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning (ITL)

The CSR – ITL program is the primary CSR grant program in Texas, serving the largest number of campuses and students. It is open to all eligible Title I schools that meet the program requirements, irrespective of campus type or grade levels served – a characteristic that differentiates this grant program from the CSR – HS program. As Table 31 indicates, the majority of CSR – ITL campuses were elementary schools and middle schools. For Cycle 2, implemented in 2001 and completing its fourth and final year on June 30, 2005, the majority of campuses were elementary schools (62%), and middle schools (17%). The campus mix for Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program, which began on July 1, 2004, differed from Cycle 2 in that it contained a lower percentage of elementary schools (42%) and a substantially higher proportion of middle schools (35%). For both cycles of the CSR – ITL grant program, only 18% and 15% of campuses, respectively, were high schools.

**Table 31. Distribution of CSR - ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3**

School Type	Cycle 2		Cycle 3	
	Number of Campuses	Percent	Number of Campuses	Percent
Primary/Elementary	116	61.7%	36	42.4%
Middle School	31	16.5%	30	35.3%
High School	33	17.6%	13	15.3%
Other	8	4.3%	6	7.1%
Total	188	100%	85	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

#### *Characteristics of CSR – ITL Students*

The typical CSR – ITL student in 2005 was enrolled in an elementary or middle school, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged. The grade level distribution of students at CSR –ITL campuses in 2005 differed between each grant cycle (Table 32). Similar to all students statewide, most Cycle 2 students were enrolled in grades K-5 (46% and 44%, respectively). For Cycle 3, only 29% of students were enrolled in these grade levels, with a substantially higher percentage of students enrolled in grades 6-8 (35%). By comparison, 17% of Cycle 2 students were enrolled in grades 6-8. Both grant cycles



served a higher percentage of high school students than the grade level distribution of all students statewide. Approximately 35% of Cycle 2 students and 32% of Cycle 3 students were enrolled in grades 9-12. Statewide, only 28% of all students were enrolled in these grade levels.

**Table 32. Grade Level of Students Attending CSR - ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3**

Grade Level	Cycle 2		Cycle 3		State
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent	
EE	548	0.4%	293	0.5%	0.3%
PK	5,774	4.3%	2,371	3.8%	3.8%
KG	9,936	7.4%	2,744	4.4%	7.5%
1	10,769	8.0%	3,080	5.0%	7.9%
2	10,019	7.4%	3,075	4.9%	7.6%
3	9,837	7.3%	2,902	4.7%	7.5%
4	9,646	7.1%	2,878	4.6%	7.5%
5	8,951	6.6%	3,479	5.6%	7.5%
6	8,582	6.4%	6,638	10.7%	7.6%
7	6,926	5.1%	7,657	12.3%	7.6%
8	6,777	5.0%	7,466	12.0%	7.5%
9	14,364	10.6%	8,016	12.9%	8.7%
10	12,090	8.9%	5,034	8.1%	7.2%
11	11,181	8.3%	3,540	5.7%	6.2%
12	9,721	7.2%	3,014	4.8%	5.6%
Total	135,121	100%	62,187	100%	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and PEIMS Student Level Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Cycle 2 included 188 campuses for an average of 719 students per campus. Cycle 3 included 85 campuses for an average of 732 students per campus.

There are also differences in demographic characteristics between students enrolled at CSR - ITL campuses in 2005 and all students statewide (Table 33). For both Cycle 2 (56%) and Cycle 3 (65%), the majority of students were Hispanic, compared to only 44% of all students statewide. A higher percentage of CSR - ITL students were classified as limited English proficient (LEP), with 22% of students in each grant cycle in this category. By contrast, only 15% of all students statewide were classified as LEP. There was a lower percentage of Cycle 2 (45%) and Cycle 3 (48%) students classified as economically disadvantaged, compared to more than half (53%) of all students statewide.

**Table 33. Demographic Characteristics of Students Attending  
CSR - ITL Campuses, Cycle 2 and Cycle 3**

Characteristic	Cycle 2		Cycle 3		State
	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent	
White	34,271	25.4%	11,985	19.3%	38.7%
Hispanic	75,939	56.2%	40,375	64.9%	43.8%
African-American	21,739	16.1%	8,890	14.3%	14.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2,866	2.1%	782	1.3%	2.9%
Native American	306	0.2%	155	0.2%	0.3%
LEP	29,890	22.1%	13,542	21.8%	15.3%
Educationally-Disadvantaged	60,988	45.1%	29,726	47.8%	52.8%
Total	135,121	100%	62,187	100%	100%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and PEIMS Student Level Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

*Implementation of CSR Grant Programs: CSR – ITL*

School principals at CSR - ITL campuses were asked to provide an assessment of the degree to which each of the 11 CSR components was implemented at their campus. Principals were asked to rank each component on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 indicates no implementation and 5 indicates full implementation (i.e., the component is evident across the campus and fully developed in accordance with the program description in the grant application). Technical assistance providers helping grantees to implement their CSR - ITL models were also asked to rate each component by degree of implementation using the same scale. It is expected that by the end the of the grant period most Cycle 2 schools would have fully or nearly fully implemented each of the CSR components.

Cycle 2 school principals rated the degree of implementation of each component highly, with at least three-quarters (75%) or more rating each component with a '4' or '5'. As shown in Table 34, Measurable Goals and Benchmarks and Student Achievement were the most common fully-implemented components at the end of the grant cycle according to school principals, with nearly all of the principals (97%) rating the degree of implementation of these components at their schools with a '4' or '5'. Coordination of Resources also appeared to be a well implemented CSR component, with 95% of grantees indicating a high degree of implementation.

The opinions of technical service providers were sought to provide an independent view of the degree of program implementation at CSR – ITL campuses. Overall, a somewhat lower percentage of technical assistance providers than school principals reported that each CSR component was fully implemented by the end of the grant period. For several of the components, the assessment differences were substantial.

Almost all technical assistance providers (91%) agreed with school principals that the Measurable Goals and Benchmarks component was implemented highly at Cycle 2 campuses. Most technical assistance providers (90%) also agreed that the Coordination of Resources component was fully-implemented at Cycle 2 campuses. The same percentage (90%) of technical assistance providers reported that the Annual Evaluation component was fully implemented. By contrast, a substantially lower percentage of technical assistance providers (83%) than school principals (97%) indicated that the Student Achievement component was fully implemented – a 14 percentage point difference. There was also disagreement in the percentage of technical assistance providers (84%) and school principals (93%) reporting that Comprehensive Design was fully implemented – a difference of 9 percentage points.

**Table 34. Percentage of CSR - ITL Campuses that Fully Implemented a CSR Component, Cycle 2**

School Principals' Assessment		Technical Assistance Providers' Assessment	
CSR - ITL Component	Percent	CSR - ITL Component	Percent
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks	96.7%	Measurable Goals and Benchmarks	90.6%
Student Achievement	96.7%	Annual Evaluation	89.8%
Coordination of Resources	95.4%	Coordination of Resources	89.8%
Research-Based Methods	94.8%	Professional Development	88.3%
Support of School Staff for Reform	94.1%	Research-Based Methods	87.5%
Annual Evaluation	94.1%	Support Provided for Staff	87.5%
Support Provided for Staff	93.5%	External Assistance	87.5%
Comprehensive Design	92.8%	Support of School Staff for Reform	86.7%
Professional Development	92.8%	Comprehensive Design	84.4%
External Assistance	83.0%	Student Achievement	82.8%
Parent & Community Involvement	74.5%	Parent & Community Involvement	70.9%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: Results are based on final evaluation reports submitted by 153 grantees.



For technical assistance providers, the second and third most-common fully-implemented components were Student Achievement (74%) and Professional Development (73%). Similar to Cycle 2, parent and community involvement was identified by the lowest percentage of school principals (46%) and technical assistance providers (44%) as a fully-implemented component by the end of the first reporting period.

Overall, technical service providers rated the degree of implementation for each component at a lower level than school principals. Even so, the percentages of providers reporting that a component was fully implemented were still comparatively high. According to technical assistance providers, between 58% and 88% of the Cycle 3 campuses had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ 10 of the 11 CSR components by the end of the first reporting period. This is a promising result that may lead to positive outcomes for CSR programs in Cycle 3.

## **Section IV. CSR – Improving Teaching and Learning Cycle 2 Student Achievement Results**

The earlier analysis conducted on behalf of the TEA by Academic Information Management (AIM) in 2004 examined the impact of CSR reforms on the percentage of students that met state reading and mathematics assessment standards in each of the 2001-2004 school years. The analysis also examined the degree of improvement between 2001 and 2004 in the percentage of students at Cycle 2 campuses meeting state assessment standards. This period covers the change from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) to TAKS standards, and AIM's analysis examined Cycle 2 results up to the third year of program implementation. The findings presented in this section update this earlier research by examining student 2005 TAKS performance and the degree of improvement in student performance between 2001 and 2005, the fourth and final year of Cycle 2 of the CSR – ITL grant program.

### *CSR Grantee and Comparison Group Analysis*

This section of the evaluation updates prior research on Cycle 2 by conducting a statistical examination of final student performance results for Cycle 2 campuses, as measured by student performance on the first administration of the 2005 TAKS assessment, and the change in the percentage of students meeting state assessment standards between 2001 and 2005, which covers the entire Cycle 2 grant period. For both analyses, comparisons are made between CSR campuses and a comparable group of campuses that did not receive CSR funds.

These analyses also compare student performance results at CSR campuses implementing program components at a high level with results at CSR campuses implementing the program less fully. This section provides findings from an analysis of student performance results at high-implementing and low-implementing CSR Cycle 2 campuses across each of the 11 CSR components – an analysis beyond the scope of the AIM study. It is expected that, other things equal, campuses implementing CSR reforms at a high level would experience a more marked improvement in student performance than both

comparable campuses that have not implemented reforms and CSR campuses that have implemented reforms less fully.

A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine whether there were any observable differences in the percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS standards between low-implementing and high-implementing CSR campuses, and between each of these groups (i.e., low and high implementers) and the comparison group of non-CSR campuses. For this analysis, CSR campuses were grouped into those whose technical service providers rated at least 8 of the 11 CSR components with a '4' or '5', meaning at least eight components were in the 'implementing' or 'fulfilling' stage (the highest reported levels of implementation), and those with fewer than 8 CSR components ranked with a '4' or '5'.<sup>15</sup>

As Table 36 indicates, a slightly higher percentage of students at non-CSR campuses (82%) than high-implementing CSR (79%) and low-implementing CSR (79%) campuses met 2005 TAKS reading standards. Math results were similar, with 72% of students at non-CSR campuses meeting 2005 TAKS math standards, compared to 71% and 69% of high-implementing and low-implementing CSR campuses, respectively. Additionally, the percentage differences between low- and high-implementing campuses were small, within a difference of 3 percentage points or less for both reading and math. None of the differences were statistically significant. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that full implementation of a majority of CSR components was related to student performance on the reading and math TAKS in 2005.

---

<sup>15</sup> If a technical assistance provider's rating for a component was missing, the value was replaced with the school principal's rating for that component.

**Table 36. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Standards, by CSR Group and Degree of CSR Implementation**

TAKS Assessment	CSR Group		Comparison Group Percent Passing (c)	Percentage Point Difference		
	CSR High Implementers Percent Passing (a)	CSR Low Implementers Percent Passing (b)		(a)-(b)	(a)-(c)	(b)-(c)
2005 TAKS Reading	78.8%	79.2%	81.9%	-0.4%	-3.1%	-2.7%
2005 TAKS Math	70.9%	68.6%	71.9%	2.3%	-1.0%	-3.3%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Assessment of the effectiveness of CSR reforms in Cycle 2 must also consider whether there were any observable differences between student performance in the first year of the grant program, which can be viewed as a baseline for analysis, and student performance in the final year of the grant program. It should be noted that the TAAS test was given to students through 2002, and was administered to students in grades 3-8 and grade 10. A new state assessment, the TAKS, was adopted in 2003. The TAKS is a more difficult test, and has been implemented in stages with increasingly more rigorous passing standards applied in each of the years 2003, 2004 and 2005. The new assessment was also expanded to include students in grades 9 and 11. Not surprisingly, the gradual implementation of more rigorous standards over time is related to declining percentages of students meeting state assessment standards at all Texas schools over the same period of time. Given this trend, in the analyses that follow, a smaller decline in the passing rate for a group of campuses is interpreted as a positive student performance outcome.

The AIM study found that between 2001 and 2004, the phased-in approach to implementing the new assessment standards was associated with declining percentages of students meeting state assessment standards, and that the percent decline in student performance on state assessments over this period was lower for CSR campuses in Cycle 2. To explore this association further, an ANOVA was conducted to determine whether CSR programs were related to improved student performance (relative to comparable non-CSR campuses) between 2001 and 2005, which encompasses the entire four-year grant period. Unlike the AIM analysis, the availability of implementation data for this



report allowed for breaking the CSR group into high-implementing and low-implementing campuses. For this analysis, the change in the percentage of students meeting state assessment standards in both of these groups was compared to results for non-CSR campuses in the comparison group.

Results of the analysis indicate that CSR campuses with higher implementation levels fared better on the state reading assessment over the 2001 to 2005 period than campuses that implemented CSR components less fully. The amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting the state passing standard in reading between 2001 and 2005 was lower at high-implementing campuses (1 percentage point) than at low-implementing campuses (5 percentage points), a difference of approximately 4 percentage points (Table 37).<sup>16</sup>

Additionally, CSR campuses with high levels of implementation also performed better on the reading assessment than comparable non-CSR campuses, with an approximate 3 percentage point difference between each group.<sup>17</sup>

Results for CSR student performance on state math assessments were just as encouraging. The percentage of students meeting math passing standards at high implementing campuses declined by 11 percentage points between 2001 and 2005, compared to 18 percentage points among low-implementing CSR campuses, a difference of 7 percentage points.<sup>18</sup> The decline was also lower for high implementing CSR campuses when compared to non-CSR comparison group campuses, with an approximate 5 percentage point difference between each group.<sup>19</sup>

These results indicate that CSR high-implementing campuses outperformed low-implementing CSR campuses in math between 2001 and 2005. High-implementing campuses also seem to have outperformed non-CSR campuses, though given the lack of statistical significance this finding should be interpreted cautiously.

---

<sup>16</sup> This difference was statistically significant at the .05 level.

<sup>17</sup> This difference was not statistically significant.

<sup>18</sup> This difference was statistically significant at the .05 level.

<sup>19</sup> This difference was not statistically significant.

As measured by changes in student performance over time, these findings provide evidence that highly-implemented CSR programs experience improved student performance when compared to low-implementing CSR campuses. It is also encouraging that high-implementing CSR campuses fared better than non-CSR comparison group campuses in both assessment areas during this period.

**Table 37. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Standards in Reading and Math between 2001 and 2005, by CSR Group and Degree of CSR Implementation**

Assessment	CSR Group		Comparison Group Percentage Point Difference (c)	Percentage Point Difference		
	High Implementers Percentage Point Difference (a)	Low Implementers Percentage Point Difference (b)		(a)-(b)	(a)-(c)	(b)-(c)
2001 (TAAS)-2005 (TAKS) Reading	-0.7%	-5.0%	-3.7%	4.3%*	3.0%	-1.3%
2001 (TAAS)-2005 (TAKS) Math	-11.3%	-18.1%	-16.0%	6.8%*	4.7%	-2.6%

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: \* denotes statistical significance at the .05 level.

*Analysis of Student Achievement and CSR Component Implementation at Cycle 2 Campuses*

Another set of analyses examined the relationship between the degree of a particular CSR component’s implementation and student performance results at high-implementing and low-implementing CSR Cycle 2 campuses. For each component, t-tests were conducted that compared results between groups whose technical assistance providers rated the component’s implementation level with a ‘4’ or ‘5’, and campuses with an implementation rating for that component of ‘3’ or less.

Results show that for 2005 TAKS reading results, none of the CSR components was associated statistically with higher or lower student performance (Table 38).

**Table 38. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Reading Standards, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component**

Component	Low Implementer Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	High Implementers Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	Difference	t-value
Research-Based Methods	79.6%	78.4%	1.2%	0.6
Comprehensive Design	78.7%	79.3%	0.6%	0.3
Professional Development	78.9%	79.1%	0.2%	0.1
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks	78.6%	79.3%	0.7%	0.4
Support of School Staff for Reform	78.4%	79.9%	1.6%	0.8
Support Provided for Staff	79.0%	79.0%	0.0%	0.0
Parent and Community Involvement	79.2%	78.3%	0.9%	0.4
Annual Evaluation	78.7%	79.3%	0.6%	0.3
External Assistance	79.8%	78.5%	1.3%	0.7
Coordination of Resources	77.8%	80.0%	2.2%	1.1
Student Achievement	78.8%	79.2%	0.4%	0.2

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: A t-value of approximately 2.0 or greater indicates a relationship that is statistically significant at the .05 level. None of the components were statistically significant.

For the percentage of students meeting TAKS math passing standards, the Coordination of Resources component was associated with improved student performance, with a higher percentage of students at high-implementing CSR campuses meeting 2005 TAKS standards, compared at lower percentage of students meeting the math standard at low-implementing campuses, a difference of approximately 6 percentage points (Table 39).<sup>20</sup> This result provides some evidence that the Coordination of Resources (federal, state, local and private) may be related to better student performance in mathematics.

<sup>20</sup> This difference was statistically significant at the .05 level.

**Table 39. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting 2005 TAKS Math Standards, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component**

Component	Low Implementer Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	High Implementers Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	Difference	t-value
Research-Based Methods	69.9%	69.0%	0.9%	0.3
Comprehensive Design	68.8%	70.3%	1.5%	0.5
Professional Development	68.2%	71.4%	3.2%	1.2
Measurable Goals and Benchmarks	67.8%	71.2%	3.4%	1.3
Support of School Staff for Reform	68.3%	71.3%	3.0%	1.1
Support Provided for Staff	69.0%	70.2%	1.2%	0.5
Parent and Community Involvement	69.4%	70.1%	0.7%	0.2
Annual Evaluation	68.5%	70.4%	1.9%	0.7
External Assistance	69.2%	69.7%	0.5%	0.2
<b>Coordination of Resources</b>	<b>66.3%</b>	<b>72.2%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>2.2*</b>
Student Achievement	67.4%	71.2%	3.8%	1.4

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: A t-value of approximately 2.0 or greater (in bold) indicates a relationship that is statistically significant at the .05 level. \* denotes statistical significance at the .05 level.

Another analysis examined the relationship between varying levels of implementation of CSR components and the change in the percentage of students at CSR campuses meeting state assessment passing standards between 2001 and 2005. As in previous analyses, given the implementation of more rigorous standards by 2005, success is measured by a smaller amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting assessment standards in reading and math.

Table 40 indicates that a high degree of implementation for each of the 11 CSR components was associated with improved student performance (i.e., smaller declines) in state reading assessments over time. For every component, the amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting state reading standards was lower for CSR campuses implementing the component at a high level. The largest differences were evident for the following CSR components: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks (4%), Support Provided for Staff (4%), Parent and Community Involvement (6%), Annual Evaluation (4%) and Coordination of Resources (4%).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Each of these differences was statistically significant at the .05 level.

**Table 40. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Reading Standards between 2001 and 2005, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component**

Component	Low Implementer Change in Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	High Implementers Change in Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	Difference	t-value
Research Based Methods	-4.2%	-2.2%	2.0%	1.2
Comprehensive Design	-4.8%	-1.7%	3.1%	1.9
Professional Development	-4.4%	-1.6%	2.8%	1.7
<b>Measurable Goals and Benchmarks</b>	<b>-5.0%</b>	<b>-1.5%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>2.1*</b>
Support of School Staff for Reform	-4.5%	-1.5%	3.0%	1.8
<b>Support Provided for Staff</b>	<b>-5.1%</b>	<b>-0.7%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>2.6*</b>
<b>Parent and Community Involvement</b>	<b>-4.5%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>2.9*</b>
<b>Annual Evaluation</b>	<b>-5.3%</b>	<b>-1.5%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>2.3*</b>
External Assistance	-4.5%	-2.4%	2.1%	1.2
<b>Resources</b>	<b>-5.5%</b>	<b>-1.4%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>2.5*</b>
Student Achievement	-4.8%	-2.1%	2.7%	1.6

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: A t-value of approximately 2.0 or greater (in bold) indicates a relationship that is statistically significant at the .05 level. \* denotes statistical significance at the .05 level.

A high degree of implementation for each of the 11 CSR components was also associated with improved student performance (i.e., smaller declines) in state math assessments over the 2001 to 2005 period. Similar to the reading findings, the amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting state math passing standards was lower for CSR campuses implementing the program component more fully (Table 41). The largest differences were evident for the following CSR components: Professional Development (5%), Measurable Goals and Benchmarks (5%), Parent and Community Involvement (7%), Coordination of Resources (8%) and Student Achievement (5%).<sup>22</sup> It is important to note that a high degree of implementation of Coordination of Resources was related to both a higher percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS math passing standards and improvement in the percentage of students meeting state math passing standards between 2001 and 2005. It seems that of all CSR components, Coordination of Resources may have the largest impact on student math performance among CSR campuses. This finding merits further research, as it is integrally related to program sustainability after grant funds are no longer available.

<sup>22</sup> Each of these differences was statistically significant at the .05 level.

**Table 41. Difference in the Percentage of Students Meeting State Assessment Math Standards between 2001 and 2005, by Degree of CSR Implementation and CSR Component**

Component	Low Implementer Change in Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	High Implementers Change in Percent Meeting TAKS Standard	Difference	t-value
Research Based Methods	-16.0%	-14.4%	1.6%	0.6
Comprehensive Design	-17.0%	-13.5%	3.5%	1.4
<b>Professional Development</b>	-17.5%	-12.2%	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>2.1*</b>
<b>Measurable Goals and Benchmarks</b>	-17.8%	-12.8%	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>2.0*</b>
Support of School Staff for Reform	-17.0%	-12.7%	4.3%	1.6
Support Provided for Staff	-17.1%	-12.8%	4.3%	1.7
<b>Parent and Community Involvement</b>	-16.9%	-9.8%	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>2.3*</b>
Annual Evaluation	-17.2%	-13.6%	2.6%	1.4
External Assistance	-16.3%	-14.6%	1.7%	0.7
<b>Resources</b>	-19.5%	-11.9%	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>3.1*</b>
<b>Student Achievement</b>	-18.1%	-13.1%	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>2.0*</b>

Source: Grantee Progress/Evaluation Reports and AEIS Data, Texas Education Agency, 2005.

Note: A t-value of approximately 2.0 or greater (in bold) indicates a relationship that is statistically significant at the .05 level. \* denotes statistical significance at the .05 level.

Given the results of these analyses, it appears there is some evidence to indicate that participation in Cycle 2 of the CSR program was related to improvement in student achievement results. These encouraging findings suggest that the CSR program may be having the intended effect of helping high-poverty and low-achieving schools in the grant program to improve. Of course, since these analyses were conducted at the campus-level, it is impossible to determine which types of student activities associated with campus-wide school reforms have the most positive impact on individual students' academic performance.

The campus-level analyses conducted for this evaluation report treat all students attending high-implementing and low-implementing CSR schools the same, whereas it is likely there is substantial variation across campuses in the number of CSR program-related contact hours, types of CSR-funded activities and the number of students at each campus participating in those activities. A student-level statistical analysis controlling for these factors, as well as socio-economic and demographic factors would yield more precise results. However, due to data limitations, an analysis of this type was beyond the scope of this evaluation report.

## Section V. Concluding Observations

This evaluation report examined the implementation of CSR components and activities in the two CSR-funded grant programs in Texas. Each of these programs serves different student populations, with the CSR – HS program serving primarily high school students, and the CSR – ITL program serving primarily students attending elementary schools and middle schools.

The vast majority of all CSR – HS grantees established active leadership teams early in the grant period to facilitate implementation of the grant program. Especially among high schools, the leadership teams appeared to represent a wide cross-section of school staff. This is an encouraging finding, and may lead to increased “buy-in” among school staff into campus reforms as the grant program progresses. On the other hand, leadership teams on all-grade campuses tended to be dominated by principals and teachers. One possible area of improvement for open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses is to include a more diverse staff base on the active leadership team. It is also important that both high school campuses and all-grade campuses make an effort to include a higher proportion of parents on the leadership teams. Either of these steps would likely increase the chances for program success.

Results also showed that during the first five months of the CSR – HS grant (i.e., January 1, 2005 to May 31, 2005), most of the CSR – HS grantee campuses were implementing a wide range of activities related to campus-wide reform. Grantees reported on activities implemented to improve Curriculum and Instruction, Non-Academic Support Services, Professional Development and Parent and Community Involvement. As expected given this early stage of program implementation, most campuses reported that each activity had not yet been fully implemented. In every activity area, only one-third (33%) or less of all campuses reported the activity was either ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’. On the other hand, most grantees reported that their implementation timelines for each activity were on schedule. This suggests that as the grant program progresses, grantees should be able to improve implementation levels as expected.

Several interesting differences between high schools and all-grade campus types in activity implementation emerged from grantee responses. Although both high schools and all-grade campuses implemented a wide range of activities to facilitate school-wide reform, a substantially higher percentage of open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses than high schools established a range of parental involvement activities by the early stages of program implementation.

This finding may be related to the difficulty of implementation of these types of activities. Nearly half (48%) of the high schools indicated that implementing parent activities was a difficult task. Less than one-third (27%) of all-grade campuses indicated that this was the case. This begs the question of why it might be more difficult to implement parent activities at high schools, as compared to open-enrollment charter schools and all-grade campuses. One interesting finding that might bear on this issue is the fact that only one-third (34%) of the high schools received technical assistance in the area of parental involvement, compared to 60% of all-grade campuses. There was also a notable difference in the frequency with which technical assistance was received by each type of grantee, with only 15% of the high schools reporting they received such assistance once a week, compared to half (50%) of the all-grade campuses. Perhaps parental involvement is an area where high schools can seek additional guidance from their technical assistance providers.

Overwhelmingly, the most common barrier to successful program implementation reported by CSR – HS grantees in their progress reports was the lack of parental participation in school-wide reforms – cited by more than half (51%) of all campuses that responded to this question. It will be interesting in future evaluation studies of the CSR – HS program to see whether this difference in parent program implementation and the difficulty of parent activity implementation is related to differences in parent participation rates over time. It is possible that parent participation in CSR high schools began at a higher level compared to all-grade campuses. Research is needed to further investigate these relationships.



Similar to CSR – HS grantees, CSR – ITL Cycle 3 grantees were in the early stages of program implementation by the end of the first reporting period. Even so, whereas only 33% or less of CSR – HS grantees reported that CSR activities were ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’, most of the Cycle 3 technical assistance providers indicated that the majority of Cycle 3 campuses had ‘mostly implemented’ or ‘fully implemented’ 10 of the 11 CSR components by the end of the first reporting period (between 58% and 88% of campuses for each component). This difference is likely due to the fact that the amount of time within the first reporting period for each group differed, with CSR – HS campuses reporting implementation occurring in the first five months of the grant period (January 1, 2005 to May 31, 2005), and Cycle 3 campuses reporting implementation during the first year of the grant period (July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005).

Varying implementation levels may also relate to differences in the typical campus type – an elementary or middle school for Cycle 3 and a high school for the CSR – HS program. It will be interesting to analyze whether CSR – HS campuses achieve similar levels of implementation by the end of the first year (i.e. by December 31, 2005), and compare each group’s implementation levels over time to see whether this relates to variations in student performance. The CSR – HS program and Cycle 3 of the CSR – ITL program are each in the early stages of program implementation and the findings presented in this report might very well change as time progresses.

This evaluation report also examined whether there was evidence of a relationship between implementation of CSR programs by CSR – ITL Cycle 2 campuses and student performance outcomes, as measured by the percentage of students meeting state passing standards in reading and math. Although a higher percentage of students at non-CSR campuses met 2005 TAKS passing standards in reading and math, the differences between groups were small and not statistically significant.

On the other hand, promising results were evident for the association between CSR programs and improvement in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005. Analyses conducted for this evaluation

showed that CSR campuses that implemented program components at higher levels outperformed low-implementing campuses in the amount of improvement in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005. Similar results were found when comparing the performance of students at high-implementing CSR campuses and non-CSR campuses in the comparison group over the 2001 to 2005 period.

There was a smaller decline in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005 among students at high-implementing campuses, compared to students at low-implementing campuses, a difference of four percentage points and seven percentage points, respectively. Both of these differences were statistically significant. Similar results were found for the difference between high-implementing CSR campuses and non-CSR campuses, with a smaller decline in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math standards between 2001 and 2005 in evidence among students at high-implementing campuses, compared to students at non-CSR campuses, a difference of three percentage points and five percentage points, respectively. These findings parallel those presented in the 2004 AIM report, where similar percentage point differences between Cycle 2 and comparison group campuses were found in each of the years 2001-2004.

Positive results were also found for the relationship between a high degree of implementation of each CSR component and student performance outcomes at high-implementing CSR campuses. Although only one component (Coordination of Resources) was found to be statistically associated with a higher percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS passing standards, a high degree of implementation for each of the 11 CSR components was statistically associated with improved student performance on state reading and math assessments over time (i.e., 2001 to 2005).

For every component, the amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards was lower for CSR campuses implementing the component at a high level than for CSR campuses implementing the component at a

lower level. For reading, the most promising results were found for Measurable Goals and Benchmarks, Support Provided for Staff, Parent and Community Involvement, Annual Evaluation and Coordination of Resources. For math, the most promising results were Measurable Goals and Benchmarks, Parent and Community Involvement, Coordination of Resources and Student Achievement.

It is important to note that Coordination of Resources was found to be statistically associated with a higher percentage of students meeting 2005 TAKS math passing standards, and with improved student performance on reading and math assessments between 2001 and 2005. This suggests the importance of coordinating federal, state, local and private resources with district and campus efforts when seeking to improve student achievement in math through campus-wide reforms. This is a finding that merits further research, perhaps through site visits at CSR campuses implementing this component.

It is also interesting that the largest differences in the percentage of students meeting state reading and math passing standards between 2001 and 2005 were evident for the Parent and Community Involvement component. The amount of decline in the percentage of students meeting TAKS reading and math passing standards was lower at high-implementing campuses than low-implementing campuses, a difference of 6% and 7%, respectively. These are positive outcomes indicating student performance results in these assessment areas were better at high-implementing CSR campuses, which is in keeping with program goals.

This finding suggests that Parent and Community Involvement may be among the most important component overall to successful campus-wide reforms. Given the difficulties regarding parent participation discussed in this report, this finding suggests the importance of taking steps to establish more parent participation and outreach activities at CSR campuses, particularly among CSR – HS campuses, where problems with parent participation were reported more frequently. It is early enough in that grant program's

implementation period that such steps may have a positive effect on the success of CSR reforms.

## References

Borman, G. D., Hewes, G.M., Overman, L.T., and Brown, S. (2002). *Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis*. Baltimore, MD: CRESPAR/Johns Hopkins University, Retrieved on March 28, 2005, from <http://csos.jhu.edu/CRESPAR/techReports/Report59.pdf>

Frome, L., (2001) *High Schools that Work: Findings from the 1996-1998 Assessments*, Research Triangle Institution

Holdzkom, D., (2002) *Effects of Comprehensive School Reform in 12 Schools: Results of a Three Year Study* Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C.

Husbands, J., Beese, Stacy, (2001) *Review of Selected High School Reform Strategies*, Aspen Program on Education

Kim, L., Zitzer, M., (1999) *Powerful Learning Framework for Teachers*, U.S. Department of Education;

Sugar, W., (2001) *Evaluation Series, Forest Grove High School, Forest Grove, Oregon*, PLATO Learning, Inc.

Watt, K M., Yanez, D., Cossio, G., *AVID: A Comprehensive School Reform Model for Texas*. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal, vol. 10 (2002-2003);

Smith, E., (1998) *Breaking Ranks: A High School Restructuring Initiative*, U.S. Department of Education.

Comprehensive School Reform: Texas High Schools Initiative, Announcement  
[http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/disc/csr\\_thsi/announce.pdf](http://www.tea.state.tx.us/opge/disc/csr_thsi/announce.pdf)