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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, or GEAR UP, is a federallyfunded system of grants that focuses on preparing low-income students to enter and succeed in postsecondary educational programs. GEAR UP grants extend across 6 school years and require that funded districts begin providing grant services to students no later than the seventh grade and continue services until students graduate from high school. GEAR UP also requires that districts implement a cohort model in which services are provided to all students in participating grade levels rather than to select groups of students.

The United States Department of Education (USDE) provides for two types of GEAR UP grants: (1) partnerships grants made up of school districts, colleges or universities, and other organizations, and (2) state grants administered by state agencies, either alone or in partnership with other entities. Since 2006, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) has implemented a state-level GEAR UP grant, known as Students Training for Academic Readiness, or STAR. STAR is implemented in six school districts in south Texas that serve large proportions of low-income and minority students. These districts include Alice ISD, Brooks County ISD, Corpus Christi ISD, Kingsville ISD, Mathis ISD, and Odem-Edroy ISD. In each district, a high school and its associated feeder pattern middle school participates in STAR.

The 6-year implementation period for STAR spans the 2006-07 through 2011-12 school years, and began with an initial seventh-grade cohort in 2006-07. As this cohort has progressed through school, STAR's services have expanded to include additional grade levels. In 2010-11, the grant's fifth implementation year, the lead seventh-grade cohort was in the eleventh grade and STAR services were provided to all students in Grades 7 through 11.

In addressing GEAR UP's goal of improving students' participation in postsecondary educational opportunities, STAR addresses four core components of improving college readiness:

1. Increase information provided to students and their families regarding postsecondary activities (Information Access and Early Intervention);
2. Increase student access to advanced academic programs (Advanced Academics);
3. Increase training for teachers and counselors regarding the assessment of student abilities and the means for assisting students in postsecondary choices (Educator Preparation); and
4. Increase parent involvement and community and family support in a student's decision to go to college (Family and Community Participation and Support).

In conjunction with these purposes, STAR identifies eight specific goals for participating districts:

1. Increase the number of underrepresented (low-income and minority students) who are prepared to go to college.
2. Increase the number of limited English proficient (LEP) Hispanic students who successfully graduate and go to college.
3. Strengthen academic programs and student services at participating schools.
4. Build an academic pipeline from school to college.
5. Develop effective and enduring alliances among schools, colleges, students, parents, government, and community groups
6. Improve teaching and learning.
7. Provide students with intensive, individualized support.
8. Raise standards of academic achievement for all students.

Each goal contains a set of specific objectives that outline clear criteria for the achievement of each goal across project years. The complete set of STAR goals and their associated objectives are included in Appendix F of this report. STAR addresses its goals through a collaborative partnership that includes TEA, the College Board, the Pre-College Outreach Center (POC) at the College of Education at Texas A\&M University-Corpus Christi, and Fathers Active in Communities and Education (FACE).

## THE EVALUATION OF STAR

GEAR UP grant requirements also include an evaluation component designed to assess effectiveness and measure progress toward project goals. The findings presented in this report make up the fifth year evaluation of the state's GEAR UP/STAR project. The evaluation is limited to the GEAR UP state grant (i.e., STAR) and does not include GEAR UP partnership grants awarded to other entities in Texas. ${ }^{1}$

The purpose of the evaluation is to understand how districts implement STAR and the effectiveness of their implementation strategies in preparing students for postsecondary education. To this end, the evaluation is guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of participating STAR schools, students, teachers, and parents?
2. How is STAR implemented across participating campuses?
3. What are the effects of STAR implementation on indicators of student achievement and college preparation?

The evaluation employs a mixed-methods research design that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyses. Data sources include interviews with district and campus-level administrators, core subject area teachers, counselors, and STAR coordinators; surveys of students, parents, teachers, librarians, and counselors; observations in STAR classrooms; and demographic and performance data collected through the Texas Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS).

The STAR evaluation will produce six reports-one for each year the grant is implemented. ${ }^{2}$ While this report focuses on STAR's fifth implementation year (i.e., 2010-11), it includes comparisons to previous grant years as a means to illustrate changes over time.

## MAJOR FINDINGS

## Characteristics of Students Participating in STAR and Performance Indicators for STAR Schools in 2010-11

In 2010-11, a majority of students participating in STAR (i.e., Grades 7 through 11) were Hispanic (89\%) and from low-income backgrounds ( $\mathbf{7 5 \%}$ ). In spite of the large proportion of Hispanic students, only $2 \%$ of students receiving STAR services were characterized as LEP, and only $2 \%$ received bilingual or English as a second language (ESL) services.

[^0]Across STAR campuses, the trends in the TAKS passing rates ${ }^{3}$ for students receiving grant services reflected the trends of peer campuses ${ }^{4}$ and the state as a whole. Students in STAR's first cohort (i.e., students in Grade 11 in 2010-11) saw increases in their math and reading/ELA passing rates as well as in "all tests taken." However, students in the remaining STAR cohorts (i.e., students in Grades 7 through 10) experienced either no changes or declines in their TAKS passing rates in 2010-11.

## State-assigned accountability ratings for STAR campuses reflect the lack of growth in TAKS

passing rates. In 2010-11, half of STAR campuses (four high schools and two middle schools) were rated Academically Unacceptable. The remaining schools (two high schools and four middle schools) were rated Acceptable.

## STAR Implementation

The evaluation measures the extent to which STAR schools implement activities and services aligned with the project's four core components. To this end, the evaluation considers STAR campuses' effectiveness in: (1) Raising Academic Standards, (2) Engaging Teachers and Students, (3) Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, and (4) Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement. The sections that follow discuss key findings for each of these aspects of STAR implementation.

## Raising Academic Standards

The measurement of Raising Academic Standards reflects the extent to which teachers increase instructional rigor (Academic Rigor) and align curriculum (Curricular Alignment), and the extent to which STAR schools engage high school students in advanced coursework (Advanced Academics). On average, STAR schools partially implemented instructional and curricular reforms designed to raise academic standards during the 2010-11 school year, although trends over time indicate increases in students' engagement in classroom instruction, as well as in the proportions of high school students completing advanced coursework and participating in AP testing.

In Year 5, STAR campuses implemented instructional and curricular strategies focused on increasing Academic Rigor inconsistently. Relative to the 2009-10 grant year, data collected in 2010-11 reflect:

- Decreases in teachers' use of questioning strategies requiring higher order thinking at both the middle school and high school levels;
- Decreases in teachers' use of subject-specific instructional strategies in all core content areas at the high school level and in science and math at the middle school level;
- Increases in teachers' use of subject-specific instructional strategies in ELA and social studies at the middle school level; and

[^1]- Increases in student engagement in classroom activities at both the middle school and high school levels.

Notably, middle school students have shown progressively higher levels of engagement across STAR's implementation years. Results at the high school level have fluctuated across years, but reached their highest level in 2011.

As in previous evaluation years, teachers reported that time and scheduling constraints continued to limit Curricular Alignment efforts on STAR campuses. On average, surveyed teachers said they met in vertical teams to plan aligned instruction only once or twice a semester. In addition, some teachers said that the use of vertically aligned curricula, such as CSCOPE, reduced the need for teachers work in vertical teams. Despite the challenges of meeting in vertical teams, many teachers highlighted the value of time spent collaborating with colleagues to plan instruction, noting that shared planning time facilitated the development of lessons that better prepared students for subsequent grade levels and college coursework.

STAR high schools have consistently improved students' participation in Advanced Academics across implementation years, although some data indicate that the rigor of instruction in advanced courses is not yet sufficient to prepare students for college coursework. Year 5 data indicate that:

- $20 \%$ of students in STAR high schools took advanced courses ${ }^{5}$ (e.g., AP or dual credit courses) relative to only $14 \%$ of students in the grant's first year (i.e., 2006-07);
- $19 \%$ of students in STAR high schools participated in AP testing relative to only $9 \%$ of students in the grant's first year; and
- Only 5\% of students in STAR high schools who participated in AP testing earned a score of 3 or better relative to $8 \%$ of students in the grant's first year. ${ }^{6}$

These findings suggest that STAR high schools have been successful in encouraging students to enroll in AP courses and participate in AP testing, but they have not provided students with the level of academic preparation needed to be awarded college credit for AP coursework.

## Engaging Teachers and Students

The Engaging Teachers and Students component of STAR implementation measures the degree to which teachers and students are engaged in achieving program goals and considers (1) Teacher Engagement in Professional Development Activities and (2) Student Engagement in Schooling. Overall, STAR campuses substantially engaged teachers and students during the project's fifth year, although scores for this component declined in 2010-11 relative to previous evaluation years.

Teachers have consistently reported high levels of engagement in professional development across all implementation years, although survey responses in 2010-11 reflected a small decrease at the high school level. In interviews, some teachers said that STAR was receiving less emphasis as it entered its final years, which may partly explain the decline in teachers' engagement.

[^2]STAR campuses have had high levels of student engagement across evaluation years, but scores declined somewhat in 2010-11, particularly at the middle school level. This finding is likely related to a reduced focus on STAR implementation as the grant enters its last years. Results for middle schools also suggest that STAR has received less attention since the lead STAR cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) moved to high school.

## Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information

STAR provides increased access to information about postsecondary educational opportunities as a means to increase academic achievement and develop college-going cultures among low-income students and their families. STAR informational resources are focused on improving parents' and students' ability to plan and prepare for long-term educational goals. In measuring this component of STAR, the evaluation considers schools' effectiveness in providing information to (1) students (Student Access to Information) and (2) parents (Parent Access to Information).

Across years, STAR campuses have provided students with access to information that approached substantial levels; however, results for 2010-11 mark a decline from the levels observed in previous years, particularly at middle schools. Proportionately, fewer middle school students reported familiarity with postsecondary opportunities, such as 4 -year colleges, community colleges, and vocational/technical schools. Middle school students' awareness of college entrance requirements and financial aid also declined. In contrast, these measures generally increased at the high school level.

On average, parents have had partial access to information across STAR implementation years, and results for 2010-11 indicate that both high school and middle school parents had less access to information than in previous grant years. Less than a third of surveyed parents reported receiving information about college planning topics from their students' school in 2010-11, although most parents said they talked to their students about college planning and provided support for academic goals.

## Building School and Community Cultures That Support Academic Achievement

STAR also seeks to support academic outcomes by building school and community cultures focused on student achievement. In measuring the degree to which school and community cultures provide support for student outcomes, the evaluation considers: (1) School Environment and (2) Parent and Community Support.

Across grant years, results for both middle schools and high schools have indicated that School Environments provide substantial levels of buy-in and support for STAR. Despite considerable administrative turnover in some districts, staff on STAR campuses have generally agreed that school leaders support grant goals, foster buy-in among staff, and encourage innovation in instruction.

Evaluation findings for each STAR implementation year have indicated that Parent and Community Support has been substantial; however, results from recent evaluation years (i.e., 2009-10 and 201011) reflect declines in parent support relative to previous grant years. In interviews conducted in spring 2011, school administrators highlighted the challenges of increasing parents' engagement in school activities and raising their expectations for students' academic outcomes, noting that some parents were resistant to schools' efforts to engage students in rigorous coursework.

## THE ONGOING EVALUATION

The evaluation will continue to gather data across the project's sixth implementation year (i.e., 2011-12), including survey and site visit data and demographic and performance data collected by TEA. As the lead STAR cohort progresses through high school, the evaluation will focus on how districts' implementation strategies change in order to meet the needs of students with immediate college planning needs and how districts' efforts may affect students' postsecondary outcomes. In addition, the evaluation will consider how districts plan to sustain the implementation of STAR's reforms when grant funds expire in 2012.

## Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the Year 5 (2010-11) evaluation results for Texas' state Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs, or GEAR UP, grant, known as Students Training for Academic Readiness, or STAR. GEAR UP is a federally-funded system of grants that focuses on preparing low-income students to enter and succeed in postsecondary educational programs. The United States Department of Education (USDE) provides for two types of GEAR UP grants: (1) partnership grants made up of school districts, colleges or universities, and other organizations, and (2) state grants administered by state education agencies, either alone or in partnership with other entities.'

Texas' state grant is administered by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and will receive approximately $\$ 18$ million in federal funding across the 2006-07 through 2011-12 school years. This funding supports the implementation of the GEAR UP/STAR college readiness initiative in six low-income school districts in Texas' Gulf Coast region, as well as TEA's statewide efforts to promote college readiness. The six districts that participate in STAR are:

1. Alice Independent School District, Alice, Texas;
2. Brooks County Independent School District, Falfurrias, Texas;
3. Corpus Christi Independent School District, Corpus Christi, Texas;
4. Kingsville Independent School District, Kingsville, Texas;
5. Mathis Independent School District, Mathis, Texas; and
6. Odem-Edroy Independent School District, Odem, Texas.

These districts receive funding ranging from $\$ 134,000$ to $\$ 209,000$ for each year of STAR implementation and are required to match a minimum of $100 \%$ of federal funding with local revenue. ${ }^{8}$ In each STAR district, a middle school and its associated feeder pattern high school participate in the grant.

The USDE requires that GEAR UP districts implement a cohort model in which services are provided to all students in participating grade levels rather than to select groups of students. Districts must begin providing services to students no later than the seventh grade and services must continue until students complete the twelfth grade. STAR's lead student cohort was in the seventh grade in 2006-07 and as this cohort has progressed through school, grant services have expanded to include additional grade levels. In 2010-11, STAR's fifth year, the lead seventh-grade cohort was in the eleventh grade and services were provided to all students in Grades 7 through 11. Table 1.1 illustrates how the cohort model is implemented in STAR districts.

[^3]Table 1.1. STAR Student Cohorts by School Year and Grade

|  | Middle School |  | High School |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cohort and Year | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Grade 11 | Grade 12 |
| Year 1 (2006-07) | Cohort 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year 2 (2007-08) | Cohort 2 | Cohort 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Year 3 (2008-09) | Cohort 3 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 1 |  |  |  |
| Year 4 (2009-10) | Cohort 4 | Cohort 3 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 1 |  |  |
| Year 5 (2010-11) | Cohort 5 | Cohort 4 | Cohort 3 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 1 |  |
| Year 6(2011-12) | Cohort 6 | Cohort 5 | Cohort 4 | Cohort 3 | Cohort 2 | Cohort 1 |

The USDE specifies that at least $50 \%$ of students served by GEAR UP funds be designated as low income by their eligibility for free- or reduced-price lunches. Across grant years, the campuses that participate in STAR have enrolled increasing proportions of low-income students. During the 2005-06 school year (the year prior to implementation), $68 \%$ of students enrolled in STAR middle schools and high schools were characterized as low income. By 2010-11 (the year addressed in this report), this percentage had grown to $75 \% .{ }^{9}$ TEA also determined that students in STAR campuses had low rates of participation in advanced coursework and postsecondary education, and that the surrounding communities lacked the family and community resources to support students' postsecondary goals, which underscored the need for interventions focused on improving postsecondary educational outcomes.

## THE EVALUATION OF GEAR UPISTAR

Federal GEAR UP requirements include an evaluation component focused on assessing each grant's effectiveness and measuring progress toward project goals. TEA contracted the Texas Center for Educational Research (TCER), a nonprofit research entity, to conduct an external evaluation of the state's GEAR UP/STAR project. TCER's evaluation activities are limited to activities designed to support STAR districts and cohort student outcomes, as well as some state-level GEAR UP project initiatives, and do not include GEAR UP partnership grants awarded to other entities in Texas. ${ }^{10}$ The purpose of the evaluation is to understand how districts implement STAR and the effectiveness of their implementation strategies in preparing students for postsecondary education. To this end, the evaluation is guided by the following research questions:
4. What are the characteristics of participating STAR schools, students, teachers, and parents?
5. How is STAR implemented across participating campuses?
6. What are the effects of STAR implementation on indicators of student achievement and college preparation?

The STAR evaluation will produce six reports - one for each year the grant is implemented. ${ }^{11}$ While this report focuses on STAR's fifth implementation year (i.e., 2010-11), it includes comparisons to previous grant years as a means to illustrate changes over time. This chapter provides an overview of the STAR project, its purposes and goals, and includes a brief introduction to the partner organizations that work with participating schools to achieve grant goals. The chapter also introduces the methodologies and data sources that produced the current report's findings.
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## STAR'S PURPOSES AND RELATED GOALS

To achieve its goal of improving students' readiness for and participation in postsecondary education, STAR seeks to achieve four broad purposes:

1. Increase the information provided to students and families about postsecondary opportunities;
2. Increase student participation in advanced academic programs;
3. Prepare teachers and counselors to provide support for students' postsecondary educational goals; and
4. Increase parent and community involvement in school activities and planning for postsecondary opportunities.

Each of these purposes is discussed in the sections that follow.

## Increased Access to Information

While considerable research has established that most parents and students understand the value of postsecondary education and hold high educational aspirations (Bridgeland, Dilulio, Streeter, \& Mason, 2008; Johnson \& Duffett, 2005; Roderick, 2006), many families, particularly those from low-income backgrounds with limited exposure to higher education, lack the information needed to help plan for postsecondary opportunities and to navigate application and admittance processes (Cunningham, Erisman, \& Looney, 2007; Johnson \& Duffett, 2005; Tierney, Bailey, Constantine, Finkelstein, \& Hurd, 2009). Results from 2009 national survey of adults indicates that most Americans believe that a college education is essential for students to be successful, but that college opportunities are not available for many students, particularly those from minority backgrounds (Immerwahr \& Johnson, 2009). STAR strives to address skepticism about the accessibility postsecondary educational opportunities by providing parents, students, and school staff with information about postsecondary planning and financing options, and by initiating discussions about college readiness and planning in the middle school grades.

## Advanced Academics

A growing body of recent research linking students' high school experiences to postsecondary enrollment and performance indicates that students are most likely to be successful in college if they have experienced rigorous academic preparation (Adelman, 1999, 2006; Long, Conger, \& Latarola, 2012; Levin, Belfield, Muennig, \& Rouse, 2007; Roderick, Nagaoka, \& Allensworth, 2006). According to Adelman (1999), a high quality and rigorous high school curriculum trumps test scores, class ranks, and grade point averages as the most important determinant in the likelihood of a student completing a bachelor's degree. A 2012 study that examined the courses taken by high school students and the effects of courses on postsecondary educational outcomes found that students who took rigorous courses in the core content areas and in foreign languages were more successful in college, and that the effects of rigorous courses were stronger if they were taken earlier in high school (i.e., when students were in the ninth or tenth grade). The study also found that the effects of rigorous coursework were larger for lowincome students and for students attending disadvantaged schools (Long, Conger, \& Latarola, 2012). STAR's focus on engaging students in rigorous coursework goals is well aligned with this research, stressing the importance of challenging courses in middle school as well as high school. To ensure increased participation in rigorous instruction, STAR sets specific objectives for student enrollment in challenging classes, particularly Advanced Placement (AP) and pre-AP courses.

## Educator Preparation

Recognizing that teachers need training and support to provide rigorous coursework, STAR emphasizes professional development activities that train teachers to align instruction between grade levels (i.e., vertical teaming), support the use of pre-AP and AP instructional strategies, as well as to incorporate
rigorous curricula, such as the College Board's SpringBoard pre-AP instructional program, in classroom instruction. In addition, STAR facilitates alignment between K12 and higher education by pairing university professors with classroom teachers working in the same curricular area in a collaborative mentorship arrangement known as the Faculty Fellows mentoring program.

## Family and Community Participation and Support

While high quality teachers and rigorous coursework provide support for students in pursuing postsecondary educational goals, this support is not particularly meaningful unless students take advantage of the educational opportunities available to them. Adelman (1999) asserts that students are more likely to succeed in college when they can rely on school, parent, and community environments that foster educational goals and encourage academic achievement. In their 2007 review of high school intervention strategies designed to improve graduation rates, Levin et al. concluded that "the strongest programs for increasing high school graduation rates and subsequent college participation will combine interventions in the school with those in the family, neighborhood, and community" (p. 22). Further, some research (e.g., Jeynes, 2010) has suggested that increasing parents' expectations for student achievement is more important to student outcomes than increasing parents' involvement in school activities. STAR focuses on building school and community cultures that hold high expectations for students' academic outcomes, including participation in postsecondary education. To this end, STAR establishes objectives for parents' awareness of and involvement in college planning activities.

## Project Goals

In alignment with these purposes, STAR identifies eight specific project goals for participating districts:

1. Increase the number of underrepresented (low-income and minority) students who are prepared to go to college.
2. Increase the number of limited English proficient (LEP) Hispanic students who successfully graduate and go to college.
3. Strengthen academic programs and student services at participating schools.
4. Build an academic pipeline from school to college.
5. Develop effective and enduring alliances among schools, colleges, students, parents, government, and community groups.
6. Improve teaching and learning.
7. Provide students with intensive, individualized support.
8. Raise standards of academic achievement for all students.

Each goal contains a set of specific objectives that outline clear criteria for the achievement of each goal across project years. The complete set of STAR goals and their associated objectives are included in Appendix F. Goals are referenced throughout the report chapters and are incorporated into the measurement of STAR implementation presented in chapters 4 through 9.

## STAR PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

To assist districts in achieving the project's purposes and goals, STAR includes a set of partner organizations that provide services and design activities to support grant implementation. TEA serves as the grant's administrator, providing resources and funding and ensuring compliance with USDE requirements, and four partner organizations support STAR campuses with day-to-day implementation of the grant. STAR partner organizations include : (1) the College of Education at Texas A\&M University at Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC), (2) the College Board, (3) Fathers Active in Communities and Education (FACE), and (4) the Faculty Fellows mentoring program (TAMU-CC and TAMU-Kingsville[K]). Each partner organization is focused on the goal of preparing students to obtain a college education, and
ultimately to work in a career that will offer long-term financial and personal rewards. However, each partner brings a unique approach to achieving this goal-from providing informational services; to strengthening specific skill sets for students, parents, and teachers; to engaging community support. The sections that follow briefly introduce the STAR partner organizations.

## Texas Education Agency

TEA acts as the fiscal agent for the GEAR UP/STAR grant, and as such, manages grants and contracts to STAR districts and project partners and service providers. TEA also houses the state GEAR UP office which supports efforts to achieve GEAR UP goals across the state, including offering GEAR UP toolkits, and providing networking opportunities for the 19 GEAR UP partnership grants that operate in Texas. In addition to facilitating ongoing communication among GEAR UP projects, partners, and schools, TEA staff coordinate the grant application process for STAR districts and the contract negotiation process for project partners.

## College of Education at Texas A\&M University at Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC)

In its role as a STAR partner, the College of Education supports two STAR initiatives: the GEAR UP/STAR Pre-College Outreach Center (POC) and the Faculty Fellows mentoring program. The POC develops activities for students, educators, and parents and acts as a liaison between students, parents, and colleges. The center promotes academic rigor, particularly in the areas of science and math, by providing training for teachers in vertical teaming and other strategies to improve college readiness. The center offers sessions to assist parents with financial aid and to build local community and business sponsorship of academics. The POC also coordinates the TAMU-CC and TAMU-K Faculty Fellows mentoring programs and implements a Student Ambassadors program that recruits TAMU-CC students to serve as mentors and role models in STAR schools.

The STAR Implementation Director and four College Access Coordinators (CACs) support implementation efforts and develop activities for students, parents, and educators at the six districts. During the 2010-11 school year, POC staff members provided STAR campuses with technical assistance and help in planning and executing college awareness activities, as well as planning for sustainability. CACs offices were located at participating high schools as a means to facilitate day-to-day involvement in grant planning and implementation activities.

## The College Board

The College Board is a nonprofit association that assists students in preparing for and enrolling in college. The College Board oversees the SAT and PSAT/NMSQT college testing programs, as well as the AP program of college preparatory coursework and testing. In its STAR partnership role, the College Board provides training for STAR educators in successful vertical teaming, strategies for teaching AP and preAP content, and preparation for students taking the PSAT and SAT tests. The College Board also offers training for counselors in its CollegeEd college awareness curriculum and provides college awareness materials for all cohort students. In 2010-11, the College Board introduced SpringBoard, a curriculum tailored to pre-AP coursework, in four STAR districts, and offered training to support SpringBoard implementation.

## Fathers Active in Communities and Education (FACE)

FACE offers programs designed to expand parents' awareness of college opportunities and to strengthen their role in students' academic outcomes and decision making. FACE also works with STAR educators to develop strategies to expand opportunities for parents' meaningful involvement in the school and to increase local businesses' support for academics on STAR campuses. The organization's distinctive competency is its ability to engage fathers and other male figures in the educational environment.

## Faculty Fellows Program

Faculty at both TAMU-CC and TAMU-K participate in the Faculty Fellows mentoring program, which pairs university faculty with middle school and high school teachers working in the same curricular area. University faculty participate in classroom activities and instruction and work with teachers to plan and implement rigorous lessons and course content. A central focus of the Faculty Fellows mentoring program is to introduce students to the level of academic preparation needed to succeed in college coursework.

## DATA SOURCES

The evaluation employs a mixed-methods research design that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches to analysis. Data sources include interviews with district- and campus-level administrators, core subject area teachers, counselors, and STAR coordinators; surveys of students, parents, teachers, and counselors; and demographic and performance data collected through the Texas Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) and the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS). While the data sources and data collection instruments (with some modifications) discussed in the following sections will be used across evaluation years, the descriptions that follow focus on data collected during the 2010-11 school year.

## Site Visits to STAR Districts

In spring 2011, TCER researchers visited each of the 12 campuses participating in the STAR project. Site visits included interviews with district-level administrators charged with the oversight of STAR as well as interviews with campus principals, counselors, and campus-level STAR coordinators. Interviews addressed the fifth-year implementation of STAR, the communication of STAR goals and activities to key stakeholders, the role of partner organizations, plans for sixth-year implementation, and the level of parent and community support for students' academic goals. In addition, site visits included focus group interviews with a purposefully selected sample of core subject area teachers on each campus. Focus group discussions explored the impact of STAR on classroom instruction, including the implementation of vertical teams, the role of professional development and the effect of training on teachers' classroom practices, as well as availability and effectiveness of STAR informational resources. Teachers also were asked about their involvement in the Faculty Fellows mentoring program.

Site visits also included observations in a sample of core content area classrooms in grade levels that enrolled STAR student cohorts in 2010-11 (i.e., Grades 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11). Observations generally lasted 55 minutes and were guided by the GEAR UP/STAR Classroom Observation Form saved in Appendix E. Table 1.2 presents the number of observations in each subject area conducted at STAR middle schools and high schools during spring 2011 site visits.

Table 1.2. Number of Classroom Observations, by Subject Area and Level of Schooling, Spring 2011

| Subject Observed | Middle School Classrooms ( $\mathrm{n}=47$ ) |  | High School Classrooms ( $\mathrm{n}=53$ ) |  | All Classrooms$(\mathrm{N}=100)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | \% | n | \% | N | \% |
| English/language arts and reading | 14 | 30\% | 12 | 23\% | 26 | 26\% |
| Math | 13 | 28\% | 13 | 25\% | 26 | 26\% |
| Social studies | 11 | 23\% | 14 | 26\% | 25 | 25\% |
| Science | 9 | 19\% | 14 | 26\% | 23 | 23\% |

Source: Classroom observations at STAR campuses, spring 2011.
Note. Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding.

## Surveys

The evaluation incorporates the results of three surveys conducted in spring 2011: (1) a paper and pencil survey of students on STAR campuses; (2) an online survey of teachers, counselors, and librarians working on STAR campuses; and (3) a telephone survey of parents of students attending STAR campuses during the 2010-11 school year. An overview of each survey, including response rates and the characteristics of survey respondents, is presented in the sections that follow.

Student survey. Separate paper and pencil surveys for middle school and high school students were distributed to STAR campuses in April 2011, and campus administrators were asked to ensure that surveys were administered within a 6 -week timeframe. Surveys probed the means by which students obtain information about college; their study habits, participation in school and extra-curricular activities; familiarity with postsecondary educational opportunities and financing options, and educational aspirations; as well as students' perceptions of their parents' involvement in their school work and educational planning. High school students responded to a separate section addressing participation in AP coursework and exams, and high school seniors responded to a set of questions addressing their plans subsequent to graduation. The response rate across both middle and high schools was $60 \%$; however, high school students responded at somewhat lower rates (52\%) than middle school students ( $76 \%$ ). Response rates also varied by individual campus (see Tables C. 1 and D. 1 in Appendices C and D). Without knowing the sources of this variation, it is not possible to say what types of bias the differences may introduce to survey results. The middle and high school student surveys are included in Appendix E.

Although student response rates varied by school type, results presented in Table 1.3 indicate that the characteristics of middle and high school student survey respondents in 2011 were largely reflective of all students enrolled in STAR middle and high schools in 2010-11 (see Table 2.2 in chapter 2).

Table 1.3. Characteristics of Middle School and High School Student Survey Respondents, Spring 2011

| Characteristic/Category | Middle School ( $\mathrm{n}=1,784$ ) | High School ( $\mathrm{n}=2,354$ ) | All Students $(\mathrm{N}=4,138)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| White | 7.3\% | 8.3\% | 7.9\% |
| African American | 3.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.0\% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 86.3\% | 86.0\% | 86.4\% |
| Other | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 3.0\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 49.7\% | 50.8\% | 50.3\% |
| Female | 50.3\% | 49.2\% | 49.7\% |

Sources: STAR Middle School Student Survey, STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Teacher, counselor, and librarian survey. Teachers, counselors, and librarians on STAR campuses responded to an online survey in April 2011. The survey included items addressing faculty assignments and background characteristics; the role of teachers, counselors, and librarians in supporting students' preparation for higher education; their familiarity with the GEAR UP project; and their participation in vertical teams and the CollegeEd resources developed by the College Board. Teachers responded to a separate set of items addressing the effectiveness of AP coursework and AP training, as well as their participation in the Faculty Fellows mentoring program. Counselors responded to a section that asked them to rate the level of importance they assigned to a variety of counseling tasks, as well as the percentage of their time spent on tasks such as assisting students with course selection, providing counseling on personal issues, career choices, or postsecondary educational opportunities.

Of the 615 staff members identified as teachers, counselors, or librarians on STAR campuses, 590 completed a survey for a response rate of $96 \%$. The teacher, counselor, and librarian survey is included in Appendix E. As presented in Table 1.4, teachers comprised the largest proportion of survey respondents ( $94 \%$ ), followed by counselors ( $5 \%$ ), and librarians ( $1 \%$ ). On average, respondents had about 11 years experience in their current position and about 7 years experience working at their current campus. A majority of teachers responding to the survey taught core subject area courses (59\%).

Table 1.4. Characteristics of Teacher, Counselor, Librarian Survey Respondents, Spring 2011

| Characteristic/Category | Middle School ( $\mathrm{n}=214$ ) | High School ( $\mathrm{n}=376$ ) | All Respondents ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| White | 32.7\% | 33.8\% | 33.4\% |
| African American | 2.3\% | 3.5\% | 3.1\% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 62.1\% | 58.2\% | 59.6\% |
| Other | 2.8\% | 4.6\% | 3.9\% |
| Gender |  |  |  |
| Male | 26.3\% | 43.3\% | 37.1\% |
| Female | 73.7\% | 56.7\% | 62.9\% |
| Experience |  |  |  |
| Average years in position | 10.1 | 11.0 | 10.6 |
| Average years at this campus | 6.6 | 6.7 | 6.7 |
| Position |  |  |  |
| Teacher | 93.9\% | 93.4\% | 93.6\% |
| Counselor | 4.2\% | 5.6\% | 5.1\% |
| Librarian | 1.9\% | 1.1\% | 1.4\% |
| Subject Area (teachers only) |  |  |  |
| Math | 18.7\% | 14.8\% | 16.3\% |
| Science | 14.0\% | 13.3\% | 13.6\% |
| English/language arts | 22.3\% | 13.0\% | 16.4\% |
| Social studies | 12.4\% | 12.4\% | 12.4\% |
| Self-contained (special education) | 4.7\% | 3.9\% | 4.2\% |
| Other | 28.0\% | 42.4\% | 37.1\% |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Parent survey. A telephone survey of parents of students attending STAR campuses was conducted in May 2011. The survey was administered to a random sample comprised of $10 \%$ of the parents at each STAR campus, stratified by the number of students at each grade level. This method resulted in a sample of 707 parents, and 626 parents completed surveys for a response rate of $89 \%$. The survey included items addressing parent involvement in their student's school, education, and college planning. Parents responded to items describing access to college awareness and college planning information and resources. Specific items addressed parent knowledge of financial aid opportunities. Parents also indicated the highest level of education they felt their child would complete. The survey was available in both English and Spanish, and Spanish speaking interviewers were available to administer the Spanish version. The script for the parent survey is included in Appendix E.

Table 1.5 describes the characteristics of responding parents, and by inference, the characteristics of the population of parents of STAR students. Just over a third of households (35\%) were single parent homes, and $64 \%$ of households consisted of two parents. Parents were predominately Hispanic (78\%), and about $13 \%$ of parents were White. English was spoken in $94 \%$ of households, and Spanish was spoken in $36 \%$ of households. The average tenure at families' current address was 11 years. Over half of households ( $55 \%$ ) had incomes less than $\$ 35,000,23 \%$ were between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 75,000$, and $14 \%$ of household had earnings of more than $\$ 75,000$.

Table 1.5. Characteristics of Parent Survey Respondents, Spring 2011

| Characteristic | Middle School <br> Parents <br> $(\mathrm{n}=235)$ | High School <br> Parents <br> $(\mathrm{n}=391)$ | All Parents <br> $(\mathrm{N}=626)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Households, Two parent | $69.4 \%$ | $60.4 \%$ | $63.7 \%$ |
| Households, Single parent | $28.5 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ |
| Average number of years at current address | 10.2 | 12.1 | 11.3 |
| Ethnicity Latino/Hispanic | $80.4 \%$ | $77.0 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ |
| Ethnicity White | $11.9 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $13.4 \%$ |
| Ethnicity African American | $1.7 \%$ | $2.6 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| College attendance | $54.9 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Average number of years of college attendance | 2.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 |
| Household income less than $\$ 35,000$ | $48.9 \%$ | $58.3 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ |
| Household income between $\$ 35,000$ and $\$ 75,000$ | $23.8 \%$ | $22.3 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ |
| Household income more than $\$ 75,000$ | $17.5 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ | $14.1 \%$ |
| English spoken at home | a | $94.5 \%$ | $93.6 \%$ |
| Spanish spoken at home ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $34.0 \%$ | $37.6 \%$ | $36.9 \%$ |
| STAR |  |  |  |

Source: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Note. Percentages across categories (e.g., ethnicity, household income) may not total to 100 . Some parents did not respond to certain questions.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Some parents responded that both English and Spanish were spoken in the home.

## Demographic and Performance Data

The evaluation relies on demographic and performance data collected primarily from TEA's archival databases: PEIMS and AEIS. PEIMS is an archival database that contains all data collected from Texas public schools by TEA. PEIMS includes student demographic and academic performance data, as well as information about school staffing, finance, and organization. AEIS is an archival database that contains information about the academic performance and accountability rating of each public school district and campus in Texas. Some analyses also incorporate data included in TEA's public school directory, known as AskTED. Results are presented for STAR campuses and include comparable findings for TEAidentified peer-comparison campuses ${ }^{12}$ and statewide averages for purposes of comparison.

## THE ONGOING EVALUATION

The results presented in this report comprise the fifth-year findings for the evaluation of the STAR project. The ongoing evaluation will continue to gather data across the project's sixth (2011-12) implementation year, including survey and site visit data and demographic and performance data collected by TEA. As the lead STAR cohort progresses through high school, the evaluation will focus on how districts' implementation strategies change in order to meet the needs of students with immediate college planning needs and how districts’ efforts may affect students' postsecondary outcomes. In addition, the evaluation will consider how districts plan to sustain the implementation of STAR's reforms when funds expire in 2012.
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## Chapter 2

The Characteristics of STAR Schools

The evaluation's first research question addresses the characteristics of STAR schools and the cohorts of students receiving STAR services (i.e., students in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11). Using demographic and performance data collected primarily from TEA's PEIMS database and AEIS reports, this chapter presents information about STAR districts and campuses, including school size, and the characteristics of students and staff. Analyses incorporate comparisons of STAR schools to statewide averages.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF STAR DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

The following sections describe the characteristics of STAR districts and campuses and rely primarily on data provided through TEA's AEIS reports for the 2010-11 school year.

## Districts and Schools

Six school districts in the Gulf Coast area that enroll predominantly low-income, Hispanic students participate in the STAR project. Each school district includes a feeder system with at least one middle school and one high school. A feeder system, or vertical feeder pattern, includes middle schools that send students to a particular high school. As Table 2.1 shows, the 12 participating campuses include six midlevel schools (three schools serving Grades 7 and 8 and three serving Grades 6 to 8 ) and six high schools. Enrollment in STAR schools varied widely. On average, mid-level schools had fewer students (474 students) than high schools (764 students). Since 2000-01, overall enrollment in STAR schools has decreased from 9,359 students to 7,424 students, or a decrease of $20.7 \%$, and enrollment decreases have tended to be steeper at the high school than at the middle school level ( $24.6 \%$ vs. $13.5 \%$ ) (see Figure 2.1).

As noted in chapter 1, STAR is implemented in an add-a-cohort model that began with a lead cohort of Grade 7 students in 2006-07, and expands to include additional grade levels as students progress. During the 2010-11 school year, the lead group of Grade 7 students was in Grade 11 and the STAR cohort had expanded to include students in Grades 7 through 11-totaling just under 5,000 students. Table 2.1 shows the percentage of students by campus served by STAR in 2010-11, and indicates that $83 \%$ of mid-level students and $80 \%$ of high school students at STAR campuses were part of the cohort. Overall, $81 \%$ of students at the 12 STAR campuses were part of the STAR cohort during the 2010-11 school year.

Table 2.1. Student Enrollment for STAR Campuses, 2010-11

| Campus | Number of Students | Number of Cohort Students ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Percentage of Cohort Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mid-Level Schools |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High (6-8) | 339 | 232 | 68\% |
| Adams Middle School (7-8) | 816 | 816 | 100\% |
| Memorial Middle School (7-8) | 512 | 512 | 100\% |
| Driscoll Middle School (6-8) | 608 | 398 | 65\% |
| Mathis Middle School (7-8) | 333 | 225 | 68\% |
| Odem Junior High (6-8) | 234 | 166 | 71\% |
| Group Average | 474 | 392 | -- |
| Group Total | 2,842 | 2,349 | 83\% |
| High Schools |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias High School | 402 | 321 | 80\% |
| Alice High School | 1450 | 1184 | 82\% |
| H. M. King High School | 1024 | 849 | 83\% |
| Miller High School | 979 | 743 | 76\% |
| Mathis High School | 433 | 342 | 79\% |
| Odem High School | 294 | 238 | 81\% |
| Group Average | 764 | 613 | -- |
| Group Total | 4,582 | 3,677 | 80\% |
| Overall Average | 619 | 502 | -- |
| Overall Total | 7,424 | 6,026 | 81\% |

Source: Student enrollment $(7,424)$ from 2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus student statistics data file.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Grades 7 through 11.


Figure 2.1. STAR middle school, high school, and total enrollment, 2001-2011.
Sources: Texas Education Agency 2001 through 2011 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus student statistics data files.

## Student Cohort Characteristics

Figure 2.2 compares the demographic characteristics of students included in the STAR cohort in 2010-11 (i.e., student in Grades 7 through 11) with state averages, and indicates that the STAR cohort was comprised of a larger proportion of Hispanic students than the state as a whole ( $89 \% \mathrm{vs} .47 \%$ for the state) and a notably smaller proportion of White ( $8 \%$ vs. $34 \%$ ) and African American students ( $3 \%$ vs. $13 \%$ ). Relative to state percentages, a larger percentage of STAR cohort students were characterized as economically disadvantaged ( $75 \%$ vs. $53 \%$ ) and a smaller percentage were limited English proficient, or LEP ( $2 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ ).


Figure 2.2. STAR cohort characteristics, 2010-11.
Sources: Texas Education Agency 2011 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) individual student demographic data file. State percentages were calculated from Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 2011 campus student statistics data file.
Notes. STAR cohort students were in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11. State percentages were calculated using counts of students in each group. State percentages excluded STAR campuses and included campuses with grade types "middle" and "secondary." The majority of grade type "middle" campuses spanned Grades 6 to 8 . The majority of grade type "secondary" campuses spanned Grades 9 through 12.

Table 2.2 reports the ethnic distribution of cohort students by campus and illustrates that in 2010-11 cohort students at each STAR campus were predominantly Hispanic and economically disadvantaged.

Table 2.2. Student Cohort Characteristics, 2010-11

| Campus | Percent <br> African <br> American | Percent Hispanic | Percent White | Percent Eco. Disadv | Percent LEP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mid-Level Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 0.0\% | 98.7\% | 0.9\% | 82.8\% | 3.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 0.2\% | 92.2\% | 7.0\% | 72.1\% | 2.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 4.7\% | 84.2\% | 9.6\% | 73.8\% | 1.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 8.0\% | 86.2\% | 4.3\% | 90.2\% | 1.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 2.7\% | 92.0\% | 5.3\% | 84.9\% | 1.8\% |
| Odem Junior High | 0.0\% | 83.1\% | 16.9\% | 59.0\% | 0.6\% |
| Group Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.7\% | 89.4\% | 7.0\% | 76.9\% | 1.9\% |
| High Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias High School | 0.0\% | 97.2\% | 2.2\% | 89.1\% | 1.2\% |
| Alice High School | 0.3\% | 93.2\% | 6.1\% | 65.7\% | 2.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 3.9\% | 80.6\% | 13.8\% | 70.1\% | 2.2\% |
| Miller High School | 7.0\% | 88.2\% | 3.6\% | 85.7\% | 2.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 1.2\% | 89.2\% | 9.6\% | 80.7\% | 0.6\% |
| Odem High School | 0.0\% | 81.5\% | 17.2\% | 60.1\% | 0.4\% |
| Group Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.5\% | 88.5\% | 8.1\% | 73.8\% | 2.0\% |
| GEAR UP Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.6\% | 88.8\% | 7.7\% | 75.0\% | 1.9\% |
| State Percentage ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 13.4\% | 47.4\% | 33.6\% | 53.3\% | 7.7\% |

Sources: Texas Education Agency 2011 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) individual student demographic data file. State percentages were calculated from Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 2011 campus student statistics data file.
Note. STAR cohort students were in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Group and STAR percentages were calculated using counts of students in each group.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ State percentages excluded STAR campuses and included campuses with grade types "middle" and "secondary" only. The majority of grade type "middle" campuses spanned Grades 6 to 8 . The majority of grade type "secondary" campuses spanned Grades 9 to 12 . Percentages were calculated using counts of students.

## Educational Programs

Figure 2.3 and Table 2.3 present information on cohort students participating in educational programs designed to meet specific educational needs, such as special education and gifted and talented programs. The average percentage of cohort students enrolled in special education was $14 \%$ which is higher than the state average of $10 \%$. A smaller percentage of cohort students were enrolled in bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) programs than students statewide ( $2 \% \mathrm{vs} .7 \%$ ). The percentage of cohort students enrolled in gifted and talented programs in STAR schools was slightly lower than the state percentage ( $8 \%$ vs. $10 \%$ ).


Figure 2.3. Cohort students participating in special programs, 2010-11.
Sources: Texas Education Agency 2011 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) individual student demographic data file. State percentages were calculated from Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 2011 campus student statistics data file.
Notes. STAR cohort students were in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11. State percentages were calculated using counts of students in each group. State percentages excluded STAR campuses and included campuses with grade types "middle" and "secondary." The majority of grade type "middle" campuses spanned Grades 6 to 8 . The majority of grade type "secondary" campuses spanned Grades 9 to 12.

Table 2.3. Cohort Students in Special Programs, 2010-11

| Campus | Percent <br> Special <br> Education | Percent <br> Bilingual/ESL | Percent Gifted and Talented |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junior High and Middle Schools |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 9.1\% | 2.6\% | 8.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 8.9\% | 2.2\% | 11.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 9.0\% | 0.8\% | 9.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 14.1\% | 1.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 12.0\% | 0.9\% | 4.9\% |
| Odem Junior High | 11.4\% | 0.6\% | 13.3\% |
| Group Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.3\% | 1.6\% | 8.4\% |
| High Schools |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias High School | 18.1\% | 1.2\% | 12.1\% |
| Alice High School | 11.3\% | 2.3\% | 12.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 11.7\% | 1.2\% | 5.4\% |
| Miller High School | 22.6\% | 2.7\% | 0.3\% |
| Mathis High School | 12.3\% | 0.3\% | 4.1\% |
| Odem High School | 14.7\% | 0.0\% | 7.6\% |
| Group Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 14.6\% | 1.7\% | 7.2\% |
| GEAR UP Percentage ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 12.9\% | 1.6\% | 7.7\% |
| State Percentage ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 9.8\% | 7.3\% | 10.2\% |

Sources: Texas Education Agency 2011 Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) individual student demographic data file. State percentages were calculated from Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) 2011 campus student statistics data file.
Note. STAR cohort students were in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Group and STAR percentages were calculated using counts of students in each group.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ State percentages excluded STAR campuses and included campuses with grade types "middle" and "secondary" only. The majority of grade type "middle" campuses spanned Grades 6 to 8. The majority of grade type "secondary" campuses spanned Grades 9 to 12. Percentages were calculated using counts of students.

## Teacher Characteristics

Table 2.6 provides data showing that STAR teachers, on average, had approximately 12 years teaching experience, which was about the same as the state average ( 12 years); STAR average teacher experience varied from 9 to about 16 years by campus. STAR campuses enrolled a somewhat smaller percentage of beginning teachers than the state ( $6 \%$ vs. $7 \%$ ). However, about $20 \%$ of teachers at Mathis High School were in their first year of teaching in 2010-11, which is more than triple the average of other STAR campuses and more than double the state average. The percentage of minority teachers working at STAR campuses ranged from $45 \%$ at Odem High School to $91 \%$ at Falfurrias High School. In STAR middle schools, instructional aides represented a slightly higher percentage of the total staff ( $14 \%$ ) compared to the percentage of aides in STAR high schools ( $10 \%$ ) and the state as a whole ( $11 \%$ ).

Table 2.4. STAR Teacher Characteristics, 2010-11

| Campus | Number | Average Years Teacher Experience | Percent <br> Beginning <br> Teachers | Percent <br> Minority <br> Teachers ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Percent Instructional Aides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junior High and Middle Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 29 | 15.1 | 3.5\% | 86.0\% | 17.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 63 | 9.0 | 10.1\% | 62.9\% | 10.6\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 37 | 11.4 | 5.4\% | 78.5\% | 16.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 42 | 12.7 | 2.4\% | 60.6\% | 14.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 24 | 12.2 | 4.1\% | 55.4\% | 12.4\% |
| Odem Junior High | 20 | 10.0 | 9.8\% | 59.2\% | 14.0\% |
| Group Average | 36 | 11.7 | 5.9\% | 67.1\% | 14.3\% |
| High Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias High School | 33 | 15.5 | 6.0\% | 90.9\% | 9.1\% |
| Alice High School | 118 | 12.4 | 5.4\% | 58.7\% | 8.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 73 | 13.5 | 5.5\% | 67.1\% | 12.0\% |
| Miller High School | 84 | 10.0 | 2.4\% | 63.8\% | 12.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 37 | 8.9 | 19.7\% | 60.0\% | 8.2\% |
| Odem High School | 26 | 15.4 | 0.0\% | 45.1\% | 11.3\% |
| Group Average | 62 | 12.6 | 6.5\% | 64.3\% | 10.3\% |
| STAR Average | 49 | 12.2 | 6.2\% | 65.7\% | 12.3\% |
| State Average ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 50 | 11.7 | 7.3\% | 35.6\% | 10.8\% |

Source: Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System 2011 campus staff statistics data file.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Minority includes all non-white groups.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Group and STAR percentages were calculated using counts of teachers and staff in each group.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ State percentages excluded STAR campuses and included campuses with grade types "middle" and "secondary" only. The majority of grade type "middle" campuses spanned Grades 6 to 8 . The majority of grade type "secondary" campuses spanned Grades 9 to 12 . Percentages were calculated using counts of teachers and staff.

## SUMMARY

This chapter has provided information about the characteristics of STAR districts and campuses, including staff and cohort students, and included comparisons to state averages. STAR cohort students were in Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11. Overall, $81 \%$ of students at STAR campuses participated in STAR services during the 2010-11 school year, including $83 \%$ of middle school students and $80 \%$ of high school students.

Relative to state averages, the STAR cohort was made up of substantially larger proportions of Hispanic students ( $89 \%$ vs. $47 \%$ ) and low-income students ( $75 \%$ vs. $53 \%$ ). Correspondingly, the cohort was made up of smaller proportions of African American ( $3 \%$ vs. $13 \%$ ) and White ( $8 \%$ vs. $34 \%$ ) students than other Texas middle and high schools. Despite its concentration of Hispanic students, the STAR cohort included lower proportions of LEP students ( $2 \%$ vs. $8 \%$ ) than middle and high schools statewide in 2009-10.

In terms of special educational programs, proportionately more cohort students participated in special education ( $13 \%$ vs. 10\%) than Texas middle and high schools, on average. Similar to results for LEP students, proportionately fewer cohort students in participated in bilingual and ESL programs than the state average for middle and high schools ( $2 \%$ vs. $7 \%$ ).

The STAR project attempts to improve the academic preparation of students with a goal of increasing the number of students who pursue higher education opportunities. To measure progress toward this goal, this chapter compares fifth year data (2010-11) with baseline data across several important academic indicators. The chapter utilizes data provided through TEA's AEIS database and includes measures related to accountability ratings and performance on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) examinations. Results are reported across indicators for STAR cohort students and, where appropriate, for TEA-identified "peer group" campuses, ${ }^{13}$ as well as state averages for purposes of comparison. The focus is on five groups or cohorts of students. Cohort 1 includes students who were in Grade 11 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2005-06. Cohort 2 students were in Grade 10 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2006-07, Cohort 3 students were in Grade 9 in 201011 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2007-08, Cohort 4 students were in Grade 8 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2008-09, and Cohort 5 students were in Grade 7 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2009-10.

Note that Appendix I compares 2009-10 data with 2005-06 data across a wide variety of academic indicators that are benchmarks against which districts' progress toward STAR goals may be. It is important to note that these data reflect the performances of all students in STAR schools and are not specific to cohort students.

## STAR CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS

## Accountability Ratings

Under the Texas accountability system, campuses are assigned one of four ratings-Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, and Academically Unacceptable-which are largely based on TAKS performance, completion rates, and dropout rates. Data presented in Table 3.1 indicate that across implementation years, most STAR campuses have been rated Academically Acceptable; however, in 2010-11, two middle schools and four high schools received the Academically Unacceptable rating.

Table 3.1. STAR Campus Accountability Ratings, 2005-06 Through 2010-11

|  | Middle Schools |  |  |  |  |  | High Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rating | $05-06$ | $06-07$ | $07-08$ | $08-09$ | $09-10$ | $10-11$ | $05-06$ | $06-07$ | $07-08$ | $08-09$ | $09-10$ | $10-11$ |
| Exemplary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recognized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Acceptable | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Academically <br> Unacceptable | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

Sources: 2005-06 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus reference files.

[^6]
## TAKS Performance

Although STAR is not specifically focused on TAKS preparation and tutoring, the evaluation includes information on students' TAKS performance as a measure of academic progress and overall learning. Table 3.2 compares the five cohorts of students on STAR campuses with peer campus and state averages. Comparisons focus on baseline year ${ }^{14}$ to 2010-11 changes for each group. For each group of students, average baseline to 2010-11 changes followed the same overall trends as peer campuses and the state overall, although the magnitude of changes varied by cohort and comparison group. For example, students in Cohort lexperienced gains for "all tests taken," reading/ELA, and mathematics tests that were similar those of peer campuses but exceeded state averages. Like peer campuses and state average, students in the remaining STAR cohorts either had no change or saw declines in their TAKS passing rates, but no clear pattern emerges relative to peer campuses or the state average.

[^7]Table 3.2 TAKS Passing Rates for STAR Cohort Students

| Cohort/TAKS Test | STAR Campuses |  |  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | State |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Baseline | 2010-11 | Baseline to 2011 Change | Baseline | 2010-11 | Baseline to 2011 Change | Baseline | 2010-11 | Baseline to 2011 Change |
| Cohort 1 -- Grade 11 in 2010-11, Grade 6 (Baseline) in 2005-06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All tests taken | 63\% | 72\% | 9 | 70\% | 80\% | 10 | 78\% | 84\% | 6 |
| Reading/ELA | 86\% | 91\% | 5 | 88\% | 93\% | 5 | 92\% | 94\% | 2 |
| Mathematics | 66\% | 81\% | 15 | 73\% | 88\% | 15 | 81\% | 90\% | 9 |
| Cohort 2 -- Grade 10 in 2010-11, Grade 6 (Baseline) in 2006-07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All tests taken | 61\% | 47\% | -14 | 71\% | 54\% | -17 | 78\% | 65\% | -13 |
| Reading/ELA | 88\% | 86\% | -2 | 89\% | 89\% | 0 | 92\% | 91\% | -1 |
| Mathematics | 63\% | 59\% | -4 | 75\% | 69\% | -6 | 80\% | 75\% | -5 |
| Cohort 3 -- Grade 9 in 2010-11, Grade 6 (Baseline) in 2007-08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All tests taken | 66\% | 49\% | -17 | 75\% | 61\% | -14 | 81\% | 69\% | -12 |
| Reading/ELA | 88\% | 82\% | -6 | 91\% | 86\% | -5 | 94\% | 89\% | -5 |
| Mathematics | 68\% | 51\% | -17 | 79\% | 63\% | -16 | 83\% | 72\% | -11 |
| Cohort 4 -- Grade 8 in 2010-11, Grade 6 (Baseline) in 2008-09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All tests taken | 65\% | 47\% | -18 | 73\% | 60\% | -13 | 80\% | 69\% | -11 |
| Reading/ELA | 89\% | 78\% | -11 | 90\% | 85\% | -5 | 93\% | 89\% | -4 |
| Mathematics | 67\% | 62\% | -5 | 77\% | 75\% | -2 | 82\% | 80\% | -2 |
| Cohort 5 -- Grade 7 in 2010-11, Grade 6 (Baseline) in 2009-10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All tests taken | 67\% | 60\% | -7 | 69\% | 68\% | -1 | 76\% | 75\% | -1 |
| Reading/ELA | 79\% | 79\% | 0 | 82\% | 82\% | 0 | 86\% | 86\% | 0 |
| Mathematics | 76\% | 69\% | -7 | 78\% | 77\% | -1 | 83\% | 81\% | -2 | Sources: STAR and peer campus data from Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus level TAKS data files (2005-06 through 2010-11), and State Performance

Reports from 2005-06 through 2010-11.
Notes. These analyses compare the performance of the same group of students as they progress through grade levels. For example, the Cohort 3 students in Grades 6 and 7 are Notes. These analyses compare the performance of the same group of students as they progress through grade levels. For example, the Cohort 3 students in Grades 6 and 7 are viewed as the same group of students. This quasi-cohort method is not an analysis of matched students over time because there is attrition from one year to the next (e.g., some
students are retained, others move from school to school, etc.). Because mid-level campuses in three STAR districts did not have Grade 6 , their corresponding intermediate campuses were used for Grade 6 data. These districts and their corresponding intermediate campuses were Dubose Intermediate and Memorial Intermediate in Alice ISD, Gillett Intermediate in Kingsville ISD, and Mathis Intermediate in Mathis ISD
${ }^{\text {a }}$ For each campus in the state, TEA creates a peer comparison group of 40 public school campuses selected on the basis of six student demographic characteristics. These are the percentages of African American, Hispanic, White, economically disadvantaged, and LEP students as well as the percentage of mobile students. TEA then reports the median or middle value of the 40 comparison campuses on a performance indicator.

## SUMMARY

This chapter reported STAR campus accountability ratings from 2006 through 2011. In addition, archival data gathered from the TEA's AEIS data system was used to present baseline to 2011 TAKS comparisons for the five STAR student cohorts. Although Cohort 1 experienced gains in TAKS passing rates in 201011, the remaining cohorts either saw no change in passing rates or experienced declines. This pattern also was evident for peer campuses and the state as a whole. Correspondingly, half of STAR campuses (i.e., four high schools and two middle schools) received the accountability rating of Academically Unacceptable in 2010-11.

In an attempt to understand why programs designed to improve student achievement outcomes succeed or fail, researchers are increasingly focusing on the manner in which schools implement their programs. Considerable research has demonstrated that the quality of program implementation is closely associated with student outcomes and that teacher buy-in and support as well as district and campus level commitment to program goals are important to implementation quality (Berman \& McLaughlin, 1978; Bifulco, Duncombe, \& Yinger, 2005; Borman, 2005; Borman, Hewes, Overman, \& Brown, 2003; Datnow, Borman, \& Stringfield, 2000; Vernez, Karam, Mariano, \& DeMartini, 2006; Yap, 1996). Recognizing that educational programs are unlikely to produce their desired outcomes if they are implemented partially, or not at all, researchers have developed methodologies designed to measure the degree to which schools implement the core components of the educational programs they adopt, or the fidelity of implementation. Such methodologies rely heavily on data collected through surveys of program stakeholders as well as observations of program implementation in classrooms or other educational settings.

Researchers at RAND designed an approach to measuring the implementation of models of Comprehensive School Reform, or CSR, that relies on survey and observational data to (1) measure the degree to which individual components of a CSR model were implemented in participating schools, and (2) provide an overall measure of program implementation derived from aggregated (averaged) measures of model components (Vernez, Karam, Mariano, \& DeMartini, 2006). In developing its approach to measuring implementation, RAND first identified the key components of each CSR model it considered and translated components into "a set of model requirements, practices, and support activities that a school should have or do in order to faithfully implement the model in all of its dimensions" (emphasis in original, p. 20). Then researchers specified the criteria that defined the full implementation of each model component and its related supporting components, as well as survey items that measured the degree to which components were implemented. Survey results were standardized in order to facilitate the comparison across different types of indicators (e.g., categorical, scale, or continuous response items). Standardized scores were then used to measure the degree to which individual CSR model components were implemented relative to maximum score values (i.e., the score representing full implementation). This process enabled researchers to produce (1) an overall implementation score for each core and supporting component of the CSR model, (2) an overall implementation score for the key CSR model components, and (3) an overall implementation score derived from the averaged scores of key component scores (p. 33).

While the advantage of this approach is that it is applicable across a large number of schools and facilitates the measurement of similar practices in different schools, RAND notes that it has some important limitations. Constraints on survey length limit researchers' ability to measure all aspects of model implementation and researchers are not able to gather complete information on classroom instruction. Despite these limitations, RAND asserts that "our approach permits us to measure variations in the level of implementation" and to make comparisons between schools (p. 34).

## MEASURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STAR

The measurement of STAR implementation presented in this evaluation incorporates RAND's methodology and suffers from some of the same limitations. As discussed in this section, the measurement of STAR implementation relies heavily on survey data, and, as RAND notes, constraints on survey length prevent researchers from gathering complete information about the programs they study. In addition, the evaluation incorporates data collected during classroom observations conducted in the spring
of each evaluation year. While classroom observations provide valuable data on instructional activities and student engagement, it is unlikely that a single observation conducted at one point in time can identify the depth of instruction that takes place in a teacher's classroom in a school year. In light of these limitations, readers are asked to recognize that the measurement of STAR implementation is not able to capture all aspects of implementation, but it provides a useful approach to understanding variations in the level of implementation across schools and grant years.

## The Approach to Measuring STAR Implementation

Following the approach outlined by RAND, researchers first identified the core components of STAR implementation based on the program's broad purposes. As discussed in chapter 1, these core components include:

1. Raising Academic Standards,
2. Engaging Teachers and Students,
3. Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, and
4. Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement.

Because STAR districts did not receive grant funding until late in the fall 2006 semester, most districts did not begin to implement the program until spring 2007. Given STAR's abbreviated first-year implementation period, the measurement of implementation begins in STAR's second year (2007-08) when districts were fully implementing the program.

In developing the approach to measuring STAR implementation, researchers reviewed relevant research and STAR's eight goals (see Appendix F) to identify and define the supporting components for each of the core components listed above. Once supporting components were defined, researchers revised data collection instruments to gather information measuring the degree to which supporting components were present in STAR schools. Central to this task was the development of survey items and classroom observation instruments that measured the varied dimensions of supporting components.

In the spring of each evaluation year, surveys are administered to teachers, counselors, and librarians; middle and high school students; and parents of students attending STAR campuses. Characteristics of spring 2011 survey respondents and response rates are presented in chapter 1. In addition, researchers conduct classroom observations at each STAR campus during site visits conducted in the spring of each evaluation year. Following RAND's model, classroom observation data and survey items are standardized to enable comparisons across different scales. In collaboration with TEA staff and program administrators, researchers identified the criteria that define whether supporting components have been implemented to a (1) minimal, (2) partial, (3) substantial, or (4) full degree.

The section that follows describes each core component of STAR implementation and its related supporting components. Most supporting components are made up of a set of indicators measured by survey instruments, classroom observations, PEIMS data, and so on. Indicator scores are averaged to produce an aggregate implementation score for each supporting component. In turn, supporting component scores are averaged to produce an aggregate implementation score for each respective core component, and core component scores are averaged to produce an overall, or aggregate, implementation score (see Figure 4.1). Report chapters present aggregate findings for STAR middle schools and high schools, as well as overall program implementation across implementation years. For more specific information on the data sources used to measure each STAR component and the indicators that make up each supporting component, please see Table G. 1 in Appendix G.

## Raising Academic Standards

Research has consistently indicated that the strongest indicator of the likelihood that a student will be successful in postsecondary educational opportunities is the rigor of their academic preparation (Adelman, 1999, 2006; Levin, Belfield, Muennig, \& Rouse, 2007; Roderick, Nagaoka, \& Allensworth, 2006). In order to improve students' preparation for postsecondary opportunities, STAR focuses on three supporting components of increasing academic standards: (1) Academic Rigor, (2) Curriculum Alignment, and (3) Advanced Academics.

Academic rigor. In its focus on increasing the rigor of classroom instruction, STAR provides professional development for teachers in implementing AP strategies in all core content classrooms and in working in vertical teams to align instruction between grade levels. As teachers learn to implement techniques designed to increase the rigor of instruction, students are expected to become more engaged in learning and experience improved academic outcomes. The measurement of academic rigor in STAR classrooms uses data collected during classroom observations in a sample of core content classrooms in STAR middle and high schools in the spring of each evaluation year. Researchers complete observations using an instrument that measures the degree to which instructional activities incorporate higher order thinking skills, as well as subject-specific indicators of rigorous instruction drawn from College Board materials. Table 1.2 in chapter 1 presents the number of observations conducted by subject area and school type in spring 2011, and the evaluation's classroom observation instrument is included in Appendix E.

Curricular alignment. In order to support teachers in improving students' academic achievement, the College Board offers vertical team training to faculty on all STAR campuses. While the College Board's professional development curriculum is designed to instruct teachers in strategies that support students enrolled in AP coursework, the training is applicable to non-AP content and is offered to all core content area teachers. In addition, the College Board offers training designed to support vertical teams among middle school and high school counselors.

The College Board defines a vertical team as:
...a group of educators from different grade levels in a given discipline who work cooperatively to develop and implement a vertically aligned program aimed at helping students acquire the academic skill necessary for success in the Advanced Placement Program and other challenging coursework (College Board, 2004, p.3).

The College Board training assists teachers and counselors in working collaboratively to develop instructional plans that build on one another to create a vertically articulated path through course content. The measurement of curricular alignment uses items from the teacher survey that address teachers' use of vertical team strategies and participation in vertical team meetings.

In 2010-11, the POC contracted with an independent consultant to provide additional support for curricular alignment on STAR campuses. The POC consultant visited STAR districts four times over the course of the year and worked with district staff to develop training and support tailored to individual districts' curricular alignment and vertical teaming needs. During district visits, the consultant also worked with teachers to develop classroom strategies and routines that support rigorous instruction and met with administrators to encourage the use of vertical teams to align curriculum and improve instructional rigor.

Advanced academics. As part of efforts to increase the rigor of instruction for low-income and minority students, there has been a push to increase the number of such students enrolled in AP coursework. However, research indicates that the benefits of AP coursework accrue only to students who are able to
pass AP exams and that there is little value in extending AP classes to students who are unprepared for challenging coursework or in watering down course content to ensure broader student participation (Geiser \& Santelices, 2004; Dougherty, Mellor, \& Jian, 2006). In recognition of this research, the approach to measuring advanced academics in STAR high schools incorporates three indicators: (1) the percentage of students in STAR high schools who participate in advanced courses drawn from TEA Course Completion Records, and College Board data indicating (2) the percentage of students in STAR high schools who participate in AP exams, and (3) the percentage of AP exams that earn a score of 3 or higher.

## Engaging Teachers and Students

STAR seeks to engage teachers and students in achieving program goals through targeted grant activities. Teachers are provided with opportunities to participate in high quality professional development offered by College Board and POC consultants, and schools are expected to offer a range of activities to increase student engagement in achieving academic goals. In measuring student and teacher engagement, the evaluation identified two supporting components (1) Teacher Engagement in Professional Development Activities and (2) Student Engagement in Schooling.

Teacher engagement in professional development activities. In support of the curricular alignment goals discussed in the previous section, STAR provides teachers with the opportunity to participate in high quality professional development activities offered by the College Board and the Model Classroom Project (MCP), and four STAR districts are using GEAR UP funding to support the implementation of the Advancement Via Individual Determination, or AVID, program, which offers training for teachers in preparing and motivating underserved students for postsecondary opportunities. In order to measure teachers' participation in professional development opportunities, the evaluation uses information collected through the spring surveys of teachers.

In 2010-11, College Board professional development activities focused on improving teachers' skill in designing and implementing rigorous instruction and in collaborating with colleagues. MCP training focused on the development of instructional leadership skills for campus administrators and MCP consultants worked in classrooms coaching teachers' use of techniques focused on increasing instructional rigor. Some teachers in districts implementing AVID participated in training focused on providing students with the study habits and organizational skills needed to be academically successful.

Student engagement in schooling. The evaluation relies on student survey data addressing students’ participation in a range of school activities focused on improving academic outcomes (e.g., tutoring, mentoring, study skills workshops, etc.), as well as student attendance rates available through Texas' PEIMS archival database.

## Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information

Recognizing that many low-income families lack the information needed to effectively plan for and take advantage of postsecondary educational opportunities, STAR seeks to increase parents' and students' access to postsecondary planning information. In measuring this component of STAR, the evaluation identified two supporting components: (1) Student Access to Information and (2) Parent Access to Information. Both components are measured using information gathered through spring surveys of parents and students, and the measurement of Student Access to Information also includes partnercollected data addressing student participation in informational programs.

## Building School and Community Cultures That Support Academic Achievement

STAR also seeks to support academic outcomes by building school and community cultures focused on student achievement. The STAR partner organization FACE offers programs that engage parents, students, and the larger community in school activities. In measuring the degree to which school and community cultures provide support for student outcomes, the evaluation considers two supporting components: (1) School Environment and (2) Parent and Community Support.

School environment. As a means to measure the degree to which school environments provide strong support for student achievement, the evaluation relies on data collected through spring teacher surveys that address school leadership, staff buy-in and support for STAR goals, and whether schools support innovative cultures that encourage new approaches to instruction.

Parent and community support. Parent and community support for student achievement are measured using data collected through spring surveys of teachers and parents. Survey items focus on the level of parent support for students' academic goals as well as parent and community involvement in school activities.


## SUMMARY

This chapter provided an overview of the methodology used to measure (1) the overall implementation of STAR in participating schools, (2) the implementation of STAR's four core components, and (3) the implementation of varying dimensions of core components, or supporting components. In disaggregating implementation scores by core and supporting components, the evaluation seeks to provide a means to identify areas of strength and weakness in district and campus implementation strategies and to provide a useful tool to measure districts' progress over time.

## Raising Academic Standards

A primary objective of STAR is to raise academic expectations for all students in order to increase the number of students "who are prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary education" (TEA, 2006; USDE, 1998). To achieve this goal, STAR schools are expected to increase academic rigor through instructional and curricular reform, and students in STAR schools are encouraged to participate in advanced courses. The USDE's 2008 evaluation of GEAR UP programs nationally emphasized the importance of intensive instructional reform, noting that only programs which successfully increased academic rigor experienced improved student outcomes. However, research has found that effecting instructional change is a particularly challenging component of school reform (Vernez, Karam, Mariano, \& DeMartini, 2006).

As a means to measure STAR campuses' efforts to raise academic standards, the evaluation considers three supporting components of instructional rigor: (1) the extent to which STAR teachers use rigorous instructional strategies across all core content courses (Academic Rigor), (2) the extent to which STAR teachers align instruction with campus and district colleagues (Curricular Alignment), and (3) the availability of rigorous course offerings for students in STAR schools (Advanced Academics). Exhibit 5.1 highlights the Raising Academic Standards component of STAR implementation, its supporting components and indicators. These aspects of STAR implementation are discussed in this chapter.

Exhibit 5.1


## DATA SOURCES: ACADEMIC STANDARDS

The measurement of STAR districts' efforts to improve academic standards relies on data collected through (1) observations of instruction in a sample of core content area classrooms in STAR schools conducted in the spring of each evaluation year; (2) spring surveys of teachers on STAR campuses; (3) TEA Course Completion records; and (4) School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview provided by the College Board. (See Appendix G for detailed information on the measurement of each of the three supporting components of Raising Academic Standards as well as indicators of supporting components.) In addition, the chapter includes information collected through teacher focus groups and administrator interviews conducted during spring 2011 site visits.

The sections that follow discuss the evaluation's approach to measuring each indicator and supporting component of the Raising Academic Standards component of STAR implementation. Results for the Academic Rigor and Curricular Alignment indicators are presented for middle schools, high schools, and for all STAR campuses; however, the Advanced Academics indicator is limited to STAR high schools. For each indicator, results are presented for 4 implementation years (i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11).

## MEASURING ACADEMIC RIGOR

Improving the level of rigor in classroom instruction is central to achieving STAR's goal of increasing students' readiness for postsecondary educational opportunities. Considerable research has established that access to rigorous instruction and challenging coursework in high school is the strongest determinant of whether a student will be successful in postsecondary educational opportunities (Adelman, 1999, 2006; Levin, Belfield, Muennig, \& Rouse, 2007; Roderick, Nagaoka, \& Allensworth, 2006). In order to increase the level of rigor in instruction, STAR offers a range of teacher professional development opportunities designed to improve instruction through the use of AP strategies. Such strategies include developing lessons that increase student engagement and participation, using questioning techniques that elicit higher-order thinking, developing quality assessments, and providing effective remediation.

To facilitate increased academic rigor on STAR campuses, POC and College Board training consultants meet regularly with teachers to observe classroom instruction, offer feedback, model subject-specific AP instructional strategies, and provide support for curricular alignment. During classroom observations conducted in spring of each evaluation year, researchers measure the extent to which lessons include the higher-order thinking skills and AP subject-specific instructional strategies addressed in training, as well as the degree to which lessons engage students in the learning process. Researchers average scores across observed classrooms to find a mean score per indicator for each campus and convert scores to a 5 -point scale, where scores indicate the extent to which each instructional component is implemented: not at all ( $0.00-1.25$ ), to a small extent (1.26-2.50), to a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and to a large extent (3.765.00). As noted in chapter 1, spring 2011 classroom observations were limited to grade levels that served student cohorts included in STAR services-Grades 7 and 8 at the middle school level and Grades 9, 10, and 11 at the high school level.

## Indicator Score: Higher Order Thinking Skills

Figure 5.1 illustrates the extent to which observed lessons included Higher Order Thinking Skills across the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 school years. As indicated in the figure, researchers observed higher order thinking strategies somewhat less in 2010-11 than in 2009-10. In 2009-10, observed teachers used higher order thinking strategies to a small extent at both the middle school (2.46) and high school (2.31) levels. This represents a decrease from the 2009-10 school year, in which researchers observed higher order thinking strategies to a moderate extent ( 2.68 overall).


Figure 5.1. Average STAR scores for Higher Order Thinking Skills, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores reported using a 5-point scale: not at all (0.00-1.25), a small extent (1.26-2.50), a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and a large extent (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Scores: Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies

Researchers also recorded the extent to which teachers incorporated AP Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies for each of the four core content areas (i.e., English/language arts (ELA), math, social studies, and science) during classroom observations in the respective subject areas. Results for middle school classrooms are presented in Figure 5.2a, results for high school classrooms are presented in Figure 5.2b, and results aggregated across both sets of classrooms are presented in Figure 5.2c. Findings for middle schools indicate that the use of Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies increased somewhat in ELA and social studies classrooms, but for math and science, the use of strategies decreased during the 2010-11 school year. The use of subject-specific strategies decreased for all subject areas at the high school level in 2010-11, with the most notable decrease occurring in math. In the aggregate, STAR classrooms incorporated AP strategies to a moderate extent in ELA and to a small extent in other subject areas during the 2010-11 school year (see Figure 5.2c).


Figure 5.2a. Average middle school scores across campuses for Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies, as a mean by subject and year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: not at all (0.00-1.25), a small extent (1.26-2.50), a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and a large extent (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.


Figure 5.2b. Average high school scores across campuses for Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies, as a mean by subject and year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: not at all (0.00-1.25), a small extent (1.26-2.50), a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and a large extent (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.


Figure 5.2c. Average STAR scores across campuses for Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies, as a mean by subject and year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: not at all (0.00-1.25), a small extent (1.26-2.50), a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and a large extent (3.76-5.00). For more information regarding the construction of core components, supporting components, and indicators; the items used, and how scores were computed, see Appendix G.

## Indicator Score: Student Engagement

During site visit classroom observations, researchers also recorded the average level of Student Engagement, using a 5-point scale, ranging from (1) low engagement, to (3) moderate engagement, to (5) high engagement. Figure 5.3 presents results averaged across STAR middle schools and high schools, as well as the overall average for both types of schools for the 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 school years. Relative to previous implementation years, STAR campuses earned somewhat higher Student Engagement scores (3.07 overall) in 2010-11. Both middle school (3.13) and high school (3.02) students exhibited moderate engagement during site visit classroom observations.


Figure 5.3. Average STAR scores for Student Engagement, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: low engagement (1.00), moderate engagement (3.00), and high engagement (5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Supporting Component Score: Academic Rigor

Once scores for each indicator of academic rigor were converted to the 5-point scale, a final score for the Academic Rigor supporting component was derived by averaging indicator scores for: (1) Higher Order Thinking Skills, (2) Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies, and (3) Student Engagement. As presented in Figure 5.4, STAR schools earned a mean Academic Rigor score of 2.39 (overall), or STAR schools partially implemented instructional rigor during the 2010-11 school year, which represents a slight decline relative to findings for 2009-10.


Figure 5.4. Supporting component score: Academic Rigor, as a mean: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: not at all (0.00-1.25), a small extent (1.26-2.50), a moderate extent (2.51-3.75), and a large extent (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Increasing Academic Rigor: What About Homework?

Across years, results from student surveys indicate that schools place limited academic demands on students outside of regular instructional hours. The spring student survey contains an item that asks students to indicate the amount of time they spend completing homework each day. Table 5.1 presents students' responses for the spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 surveys. Across survey administration periods, the largest proportions of both middle and high school students reported that they spend less than 30 minutes completing homework each day. Results for 2010-11 indicate that the amount of time both high school and middle school students spent completing homework decreased relative to 2009-10. Correspondingly the percentage of students reporting that they did no homework increased in 2010-11.

Table. 5.1. STAR Students' Average Amount of Homework, as a Percentage: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

|  | Middle School $^{\mathbf{a}}$ |  |  |  | High School $^{\mathbf{j}}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amount | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ |
| No homework | NA | NA | $11.2 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | NA | NA | $11.9 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |
| Less than 30 <br> minutes | $50.9 \%$ | $53.0 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ | $46.5 \%$ | $49.2 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ | $43.9 \%$ |
| 30 to 59 minutes | $39.2 \%$ | $38.6 \%$ | $39.0 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $36.5 \%$ | $33.5 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ |
| 1 to 2 hours | $7.3 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $7.4 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |
| More than 2 <br> hours | $2.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |

Source: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
${ }^{2}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,766$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,315)$

## MEASURING CURRICULAR ALIGNMENT

STAR's goals (see Appendix F) address the importance of horizontal and vertical ${ }^{15}$ team training in strengthening schools' academic programs, and in its role as a STAR partner, the College Board offers training focused on promoting collaboration and cooperation between educators "from different grade levels in a given discipline...to develop and implement a vertically aligned program" (College Board, 2004, p. 3). In addition, POC consultants provided individualized vertical team training and implementation support in each STAR district throughout the 2010-11 school year. Although vertical team training opportunities were open to both middle school and high school teachers in 2010-11, trainings were generally offered at district high schools and were coordinated with high school schedules in order to ensure that large numbers of AP teachers would have access to sessions. This approach to providing training created barriers for some middle school teachers when sessions offered at high schools did not align with their schedules. Although some middle school teachers experienced challenges participating in vertical team training offered at high school campuses, middle school teachers generally were able to meet in campus-based vertical teams (i.e., middle school teams) more frequently than their high school counterparts because the smaller size of middle schools provided greater flexibility in terms of scheduling meetings.

As discussed in the sections that follow, the indicator scores Vertical Teaming Strategies and Vertical Team Meetings are derived from teachers' responses to scaled items included on spring surveys. Indicator scores are calculated by averaging scaled responses for individual teachers and then averaging across teachers at a particular campus to obtain a campus-level score.

## Indicator Score: Vertical Teaming Strategies

In order to determine the extent to which core content area teachers on STAR campuses implemented Vertical Teaming Strategies, the spring surveys asked teachers to indicate how often they used strategies such as working with peers to develop lesson plans, acting as an instructional coach or receiving coaching, observing a colleague's teaching or being observed by a colleague. Teachers responded using a 5-point scale: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) often, or (5) almost daily. Figure 5.5 presents aggregated survey results for STAR middle school and high school teachers and the overall STAR average for 4 evaluation years. Results indicate that in 2010-11, STAR teachers sometimes used vertical teaming strategies ( 2.71 overall). Relative to results for 2009-10, teachers' reported use of vertical teaming strategies increased somewhat at middle schools and decreased somewhat at high schools.
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Figure 5.5. Average STAR scores for the Use of Vertical Teaming Strategies, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) often, or (5) almost daily. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Vertical Team Meetings

The evaluation's surveys also asked core content area teachers how often they participated in Vertical Team Meetings using a 5-point scale: (1) never, (2) one to two times a year, (3) one to two times a semester, (4) at least once a month, or (5) at least once a week. Figure 5.6 presents aggregate scores averaged across STAR middle schools and high schools, as well as the overall average for teachers on all STAR campuses. Results indicate that teachers in both middle and high schools met one to two times a year ( 2.48 overall) in 2010-11. Middle school teachers' participation in meetings increased somewhat, while high school teachers' participation decreased slightly.


Figure 5.6. Average STAR scores for the Frequency of Vertical Team Meetings, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) never, (2) one to two times a year, (3) one to two times a semester, (4) at least once a month, or (5) at least once a week. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Challenges to Implementing Vertical Teams

Core content area teachers responding to surveys indicated the extent to which various challenges presented barriers to vertical teaming. Results are presented as summed percentages. Summed percentages present the percentage of teachers who indicated a barrier represented a moderate challenge plus the percentage of teachers indicating a barrier was a large challenge. Table 5.2 presents results for surveys administered in spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Across survey administrations, teachers cited time and scheduling constraints as the primary barrier to meeting in vertical teams. Roughly similar proportions of teachers identified inadequate leadership, staff turnover, poor communication, insufficient teacher preparation as barriers across yeas.

Table 5.2. Barriers to Vertical Teaming, as a Summed Percentage of Respondents: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

| Challenge | 2007-08 <br> $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ <br> $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 - 1 0}$ <br> $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{2 9 8})$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 1 1}$ <br> $(\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 0 7})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time/scheduling constraints | $75.0 \%$ | $78.2 \%$ | $79.9 \%$ | $80.1 \%$ |
| Inadequate leadership or guidance | $38.9 \%$ | $41.1 \%$ | $38.9 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ |
| Poor communication between <br> teachers | $34.1 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ |
| Turnover | $41.0 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $38.3 \%$ | $38.4 \%$ |
| Vertical teaming is not a priority | NA | $32.7 \%$ | $30.6 \%$ | $37.1 \%$ |
| Insufficient teacher participation | $32.7 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ | $36.2 \%$ |

Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. NA=not applicable. This survey item was introduced in spring 2009. Summed percentages consist of the percentage of respondents indicating a challenge was a barrier to a moderate extent plus the percentage of respondents indicating a challenge was a barrier to a large extent.

Consistent with findings reported in Table 5.2, participants in site visit interviews and focus group discussions reported that district scheduling conflicts, lack of leadership, and weak communication limited teachers' ability to participate in vertical teams. In interviews conducted in spring 2011, many teachers said that they were unable to meet in vertical teams because district policies limited the amount of time teachers spent working outside of the classroom. Such policies were generally implemented in response to poor TAKS scores and concerns about accountability ratings. As one administrator noted, time spent working outside of class is "taboo now."

Some administrators and teachers also noted that vertical teams were not considered a priority because their districts used a curriculum package (i.e., CSCOPE) that aligned core content area instruction across grade levels.

## Supporting Component Score: Curricular Alignment

Campuses' Vertical Team Strategies and Vertical Team Meeting indicator scores were averaged to obtain a Curricular Alignment supporting component score for each STAR campus (see Exhibit 5.1). Figure 5.7 presents results averaged across STAR middle schools, high schools, and all STAR campuses (STAR Average). Results indicate, on average, campuses partially implemented strategies to align curricula (2.60 overall). Middle school scores (2.66) increased slightly from 2009-10 while high school scores (2.56) remained about the same.


Figure 5.7. Supporting component score: Curricular Alignment, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale. Mean: Curricular Alignment: minimal ( 0.00 - 1.50), partial ( 1.51 3.00 ), substantial ( $3.01-4.50$ ), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## The Benefits of Working in Vertical Teams

Although teachers participating in spring 2011 focus groups generally agreed that the emphasis on vertical teams had diminished across STAR implementation years, teachers also highlighted the benefits of working in vertical teams that included both the middle school and high school faculty. As one middle school science teacher explained:

For me, it [vertical teaming] helps because l've just moved to eighth grade...The seventh grade teacher discusses with me the things that she's covered. Plus, all the TEKS have been moved around in science. Sometimes I can go to the [high school] biology or chemistry teacher and have a discussion about what I need to do to prepare them [students] beyond my TEKS.

Teachers also pointed to the need to include elementary schools in vertical teams in order to more effectively prepare students for postsecondary opportunities. A high school teacher said:
[Vertical alignment] really should be fifth through twelfth [rather than seventh through twelfth]. We really need to look all the way from fifth grade through twelfth grade. It's like we need to sit down with those teachers and say: "I don't care what CSCOPE says. I don't care what the TAKS objectives or TEKS objectives are. We need to look at how we can get our kids better prepared for high school because in high school we're trying to get them prepared for college.

In recognition of the benefits of vertical teaming, teachers in one district said they planned to be more assertive about requesting that in-service training days be used to support vertical teams in the future.

## MEASURING ADVANCED ACADEMICS (HIGH SCHOOL ONLY)

STAR also seeks to raise academic standards by increasing the percentage of students enrolling in and successfully completing advanced courses. As presented in Exhibit 5.1, this supporting component, known as Advanced Academics is limited to STAR high schools, is made up of three indicators: (1) Advanced Course Completion, (2) AP Exam Participation, and (3) AP Exam Indicators. The Advanced Course Completion indicator measures the percentage of high school students who participate in advanced courses such as AP or dual credit courses in a given year. The AP Exam Participation indicator measures the percentage of high school students who participate in AP testing in a given year, and the $A P$ Exam Score indicator measure the percentage of tested students who receive a score of 3 or higher on AP exams in a given year. ${ }^{16}$ At the time of this report's writing, the TEA data used to construct the Advanced Course Completion indicator were available through the 2009-10 school year; however, the data used to construct the AP Exam Participation and AP Exam Indicator scores were available through 2010-11. The results presented in the sections that follow reflect the differences in available data.

## Indicator Score: Advanced Course Completion

Advanced Course Completion scores represent the percentage of students at STAR high schools who received credit for at least one advanced course in a given school year. STAR establishes the goal of 50\% of students completing AP or concurrent enrollment courses (see Appendix F) and the Advanced Course Completion indicator is measured relative to this goal using a 5-point scale: (1) $10 \%$ of students complete advanced courses (achieving 20\% of the STAR goal); (2) 20\% of students complete advanced courses (achieving $40 \%$ of the STAR goal), (3) 30\% of students complete advanced courses (achieving 60\% of the STAR goal), (4) $40 \%$ of students complete advanced courses (achieving $80 \%$ of the STAR goal), and (5) $50 \%$ of students complete advanced courses, (achieving $100 \%$ of the STAR goal). As noted in the previous section, TEA advanced course completion data are lagged a year. Therefore, data for STAR implementation Year 5 (i.e., 2010-11) rely on course completion data for the 2009-10 school year.

Figure 5.8 presents results for STAR high schools and indicates that advanced course completions increased when the lead STAR cohort (seventh grades in 2006-07) entered high school in 2008-09 and the pattern of increase continued in 2009-10, when cohort students were in the tenth grade. Although results presented in Figure 5.8, fall short of STAR goals, the trend suggests increasing numbers of students in STAR high schools are participating in advanced coursework. Recognizing that most AP and dual credit courses are taken when students are in the eleventh and twelfth grades, this trend is expected to increase more steeply as the STAR cohort progresses through the final years of high school.
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Figure 5.8. Average STAR scores for Advanced Course Completion, as a mean by year: Implementation Year 2 through Year 5.
Sources. TEA Course Completion Records, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10.
Notes. Data are lagged a year. Results for STAR implementation Year 5 (i.e., 2010-11) rely on 2009-10 data. Scores are reported using a 5 -point scale: (1) $10 \%$ of students enrolled in advanced courses, or $20 \%$ of STAR goal; (2) $20 \%$ of students enrolled, or $40 \%$ of STAR goal; (3) $30 \%$ of students enrolled, or $60 \%$ of STAR goal; (4) $40 \%$ of students enrolled, or $80 \%$ of STAR goal; and (5) $50 \%$ of students enrolled in advanced courses, or $100 \%$ of STAR goal. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Scores: AP Exam Participation and AP Exam Score

Similarly, AP Exam Participation indicator scores are reported using a 5-point scale derived relative to the statewide average for students' participation in AP exams for a given school year. In 2010-11 the statewide average for high school students' completion of AP exams was $13.9 \%$. This defines the following scale: (1) $2.8 \%$ of students took an AP exam ( $20 \%$ of state average), (2) $5.6 \%$ of students took an AP exam ( $40 \%$ of state average), (3) $8.3 \%$ of students took an AP exam ( $60 \%$ of state average), (4)
$11.1 \%$ of students took an AP exam ( $80 \%$ of state average), and (5) $13.9 \%$ of students took an AP exam ( $100 \%$ of state average). The scale for the AP Exam Score indicator is derived using an analogous process. The scale measures the percentage of AP exams taken by students at STAR high schools that received a score of 3 relative to the corresponding state average of $43.9 \%$. This process defines the following scale: (1) $8.8 \%$ of tests scored 3 or higher ( $20 \%$ the state average), (2) $17.6 \%$ of tests scored 3 or higher ( $40 \%$ of the state average), (3) $26.3 \%$ of tests scored 3 or higher ( $60 \%$ of the state average), (4) $35.2 \%$ of tests scored 3 or higher ( $80 \%$ of the state average), and (5) 43.9\% of tests scored 3 or higher ( $100 \%$ of the state average).

As presented in Figure 5.9, STAR high schools increased AP Exam Participation substantially in 2009-10 when $16.4 \%$ of students attending STAR high schools participated in AP exams relative to the state average of $12.8 \%$. Given that measures of implementation are framed in terms of a 5 -point scale, results
for STAR high schools are capped at a score of 5, although STAR high schools achieved $129 \%$ of the state average in 2009-10. Similarly, results for 2010-11 indicate that STAR high schools continued to exceed the state average. In 2010-11, 13.9\% of students statewide took at least one AP exam compared with $18.9 \%$ of students at STAR high schools ( $135 \%$ of the state average).

Although STAR high schools have increased the proportion of students participating in AP exams, results presented in Figure 5.9 suggest that smaller percentages of tested students are earning a score of 3 or better. In 2010-11, only $5 \%$ of AP test takers at STAR high schools earned a score of 3 or better compared with about $44 \%$ of test takers statewide. The decline in the percentage of students earning scores of 3 or better in STAR high schools suggests that while high schools are successful in encouraging students to participate in testing, many tested students lack the academic preparation to earn scores that will receive college credit.


Figure 5.9. Average STAR high school scores for AP Exam Participation and AP Exam Indicators, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: College Board School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview and Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicators System enrollment data: 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale framed in terms of STAR high schools performance relative to state averages: (1) STAR high schools achieve $20 \%$ of state average;( 2) STAR high schools achieve $40 \%$ of state average; (3) STAR high schools achieve $60 \%$ of state average; (4) STAR high schools achieve $80 \%$ of state average; and (5) STAR high schools achieve $100 \%$ of state average. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Supporting Component Score: Advanced Academics (High School Only)

Researchers averaged scores across the (1) Advanced Course Completion, (2) AP Exam Participation, and (3) AP Exam Score indicators to obtain an aggregate Advanced Academics supporting component score for STAR high schools. Although results presented in Figure 5.10 indicate that STAR high schools implemented Advanced Academics at a partial level in 2010-11, the increasing trend across grant years suggests that high schools are making consistent progress in improving students' access to and participation in rigorous coursework.


Figure 5.10. Supporting component score: Advanced Academics, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources. TEA Course Completion Records, 2006-07,2007-08, 2008-09; 2009-10; College Board School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview and Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicators System enrollment data: 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.
Notes. Scores are reported using the following scale: minimal implementation (0.00-1.5), partial implementation (1.51-3.00), substantial implementation (3.01-4.50), and full implementation (4.51-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## CORE COMPONENT SCORE: RAISING ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Researchers averaged the (1) Academic Rigor, (2) Curricular Alignment, and (3) Advanced Academics supporting component scores to obtain an overall Raising Academic Standards core component score for each campus (see Exhibit 5.1). Because Advanced Academics data are limited to high schools, averages for middle school implementation are limited to results for the Academic Rigor and Curricular Alignment supporting components. As presented in Figure 5.11, STAR schools earned a 2.50 (overall), or STAR schools partially implemented instructional and curricular strategies designed to raise academic standards in 2010-11. Middle schools earned a somewhat higher mean score (2.55) than high schools (2.48), although results indicate partial implementation at both levels.


Figure 5.11. Core component scores: Raising Academic Standards, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; TEA Course Completion Records, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10; College Board School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview and TEA Academic Excellence Indicators System enrollment data: 2007-08, 2008-09, 200910, and 2010-11.
Notes. Middle School averages are limited to Academic Rigor and Curricular Alignment supporting components. Scores are reported using a 5 -point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-4.50$ ), and full (4.51-5.00). Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## SUMMARY

On average, STAR schools partially implemented activities and services designed to raise academic standards, although findings indicate increasing trends in the level of student engagement in STAR classrooms and the proportion of high school students participating in advanced coursework and AP testing. Indicators for advanced course completion and AP testing are expected to increase further as the lead STAR cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) enter their final years of high school because many advanced courses are limited to students in the eleventh and twelfth grades. Although STAR high schools have made substantial gains in the proportion of students participating in advanced coursework and AP testing, they have not experienced a corresponding increase in the proportion of students who achieve AP test scores sufficient to earn college credit. This suggests that high schools must continue to focus on rigorous classroom instruction in order ensure that students have the academic preparation needed for postsecondary opportunities.

The need for increased academic rigor is also evident in results for the Higher Order Thinking Skills and Subject-Specific Instructional Strategies indicators at both the middle school and high school levels. During classroom observations conducted in spring 2011, researchers observed teachers using questioning strategies that required students to use higher order thinking to a lesser extent than in spring 2010. In addition, researchers observed fewer subject-specific instructional strategies across the four core content areas at the high school level and in math and science at the middle school level.

Results presented in this chapter indicate that despite challenges to participating vertical team training, middle school teachers met in vertical teams and used vertical teaming strategies more often than high school teachers. It is likely that the smaller size of middle schools facilitates the easier coordination of vertical team meetings and may partially explain this finding. However, in focus group interviews, both high school and middle school teachers highlighted the benefits of working in vertical teams, noting that the meetings provided opportunities to align instruction and discuss students' needs.

## Engaging Teachers and Students

A second component of STAR implementation is the degree to which teachers and students are engaged in achieving program goals. As discussed in chapter 4, the evaluation measures this component of STAR implementation by considering (1) teacher engagement in STAR professional development opportunities and (2) student participation in activities that address STAR goals and attendance rates. This chapter presents findings from the evaluation's analysis of STAR campuses' progress in engaging teachers and students in activities that support STAR. Exhibit 6.1 illustrates the structure of this analysis and its place within the larger context of STAR implementation.

Exhibit 6.1


## DATA SOURCES: TEACHER AND STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

The measurement of teacher and student engagement relies on data collected through spring surveys of (1) teachers and (2) students on STAR campuses, as well as (3) campus attendance rates reported in PEIMS. The chapter also includes information about districts' approaches to engaging teachers and students that was collected during site visit interviews conducted in spring 2011. The sections that follow discuss the evaluation's approach to measuring teacher and student engagement and provide measures of the degree to which teachers participated in professional development and students were engaged in school during the 2010-11 school year. Results are presented for middle schools, high schools, and all STAR campuses (STAR Average) across 4 implementation years (i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11). Appendix G presents detailed information about how each supporting component and indicator of teacher and student are constructed.

## MEASURING TEACHERS ENGAGEMENT IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

As a means to engage teachers in STAR implementation and to increase academic outcomes for students, STAR provides a range of professional development activities for teachers across each implementation year. Training activities are facilitated by POC and College Board representatives and generally are
focused on improving classroom instruction. Prior to the 2009-10 school year, most professional development opportunities were offered in a workshop format in which teachers across districts came together to receive training in a common location. However, low rates of participation across the 2006-07 through 2008-09 school years, led grant managers to revise the approach to providing training during the 2009-10 school year. Instead of holding large-scale trainings offered to teachers in a single location, POC and College Board consultants visited STAR districts and campuses in order to provide campus-based professional development. This approach was sustained during the 2010-11 school year.

In order to measure teachers' engagement in professional development, the spring surveys asked respondents to indicate whether they had received sufficient training to implement AP strategies, use data to plan instruction, and whether their schools encouraged them learn and implement new instructional strategies. Teachers indicated their level of agreement using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. (See Appendix G for specific survey items.) Responses were averaged for individual teachers and then across teachers to compute a mean Teachers' Attitudes Toward Professional Development score for each STAR campus.

As indicated in Figure 6.1, teachers tended to agree (3.60 overall) that they received sufficient training in 2010-11 and that their campus supported professional development opportunities. High school teachers reported lower levels of agreement in 2010-11 than they expressed in previous years (3.52). The responses of middle school teachers have remained largely unchanged across evaluation years.


Figure 6.1. Average scores for Teachers' Engagement in Professional Development, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## MEASURING STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN SCHOOLING

STAR also seeks to increase students' engagement in schooling by increasing the number of activities designed to heighten students' focus on academic achievement and career opportunities. STAR partner organizations, such as FACE and the Faculty Fellows Program, work with districts to design and implement activities that encourage students to be more involved in school and to take ownership of their academic outcomes. In measuring the Student Engagement in Schooling supporting component of STAR implementation, the evaluation considers two indicators: (1) Student Participation in STAR Support Activities and (2) Student Attendance Rates. The sections that follow discuss results for each of these indicators, as well as the Student Engagement in Schooling supporting component score.

## Indicator Score: Student Participation in STAR Support Activities

The measurement of STAR implementation incorporates an indicator of students' participation in activities designed to achieve STAR's goals and objectives. ${ }^{17}$ Across spring survey administrations middle and high school students responded to items that asked whether they participated in a range of STAR support activities, including tutoring, counseling, and mentoring, as well as STAR partnersponsored events. Researchers used survey responses to identify the number of unique activities in which students participated during a given school year. Figure 6.2 presents findings using the following 5-point scale: (1) 1.5 types of activities, (2) 3.0 types of activities, (3) 4.5 types of activities, (4) 6.0 types of activities, or (5) 7.5 types of activities. Results indicate that high school students' participation in STAR activities has consistently increased across implementation years, marked by a notable increase in participation levels after the lead STAR cohort moved to high school in 2008-09. Participation in STAR activities has fluctuated at the middle school level, with higher levels of participation in 2007-08 and 2009-10, but lower levels during the 2008-09 and 2010-11 school years.
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Figure 6.2. Average STAR scores for Student Participation in STAR Support Activities, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) 1.4 types of activities, (2) 2.8 types of activities, (3) 4.2 types of activities, (4) 5.6 types of activities, or (5) 7.0 types of activities. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Student Attendance Rates

Recognizing that any educational intervention intended to affect student outcomes will have a limited impact if students are not present in school to receive services, the measurement of STAR implementation includes an indicator of student attendance. Student Attendance Rate scores are measured using data obtained from TEA's PEIMS archival database. Because PEIMS attendance data are lagged a year, scores for each implementation year are derived using data from the previous school year-the most current data available for a given school year. For example, the 2007-08 Student Attendance Rate score relies on 200607 PEIMS data and 2008-09 scores rely on 2007-08 data. Because of this limitation, the evaluation includes lagged Student Attendance Rate scores as a proxy for current year outcomes. Student Attendance Rate scores are reported using a 5-point scale based on STAR schools' attendance rates relative to the state average for a given year ( $95.5 \%$ in 2009-10): (1) a $76.4 \%$ attendance rate or $80 \%$ of the state average, (2) an $81.2 \%$ attendance rate or $85 \%$ of the state average, (3) an $86.0 \%$ student attendance rate or $90 \%$ of the state average, (4) a $90.7 \%$ student attendance rate or $95 \%$ of the state average, or (5) a $95.5 \%$ student attendance rate or $100 \%$ of the state average.

As presented in Figure 6.3, STAR middle schools and high schools maintained a $92 \%$ average attendance rate, representing $96 \%$ of the state average in 2010-11 (data drawn from 2009-10). Middle school and high school students had similar attendance rates (about $92 \%$ ), which was about $96 \%$ of the state average.


Figure 6.3. Average STAR scores for Student Attendance Rates, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: Public Education Indicator Management System (PEIMS): 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 attendance data.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) a $76.4 \%$ attendance rate or $80 \%$ of the state average, (2) an $81.2 \%$ attendance rate or $85 \%$ of the state average, (3) an $86.0 \%$ student attendance rate or $90 \%$ of the state average, (4) a $90.7 \%$ student attendance rate or $95 \%$ of the state average, or (5) a $95.5 \%$ student attendance rate or $100 \%$ of the state average. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.
${ }^{a}$ Score is a proxy drawn from 2006-07 PEIMS data.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Score is a proxy drawn from 2007-08 PEIMS data.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Score is a proxy drawn from 2008-09 PEIMS data.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Score is a proxy drawn from 2009-10 PEIMS data.

## Supporting Component Score: Student Engagement in Schooling

As noted earlier in this section, the supporting component score for Student Engagement in Schooling is the average of schools' scores for Systems of Support and Student Attendance Rates (see Exhibit 6.1). Results presented in Figure 6.4 indicate that both middle schools (3.09) and high schools (3.28) achieved substantial levels of student engagement during the 2010-11 school year. However, trends across years indicate that middle school student engagement scores dropped in 2010-11, which may reflect a reduced emphasis on STAR since the lead cohort moved to high school.


Figure 6.4. Supporting component scores: Student Engagement in Schooling, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Public Education Indicator Management System (PEIMS): 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 attendance data. Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ $4.50)$, and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ) levels of engagement. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## CORE COMPONENT SCORE: ENGAGING TEACHERS AND STUDENTS

Researchers averaged (1) Teachers' Engagement in Professional Development and (2) Student Engagement in Schooling supporting component scores to obtain the composite Engaging Teachers and Students core component score. Results presented in Figure 6.5, indicate that STAR campuses earned an average Engaging Teachers and Students core component score of 3.40 overall, which indicates substantial implementation. Average results were similar for STAR high schools (3.40) and middle schools (3.41); however, the pattern of decline evident in scores for both levels of schooling supports teachers' views that implementation efforts are diminishing as the grant enters its final years.


Figure 6.5. Core component scores: Engaging Teachers and Students, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Public Education Indicator Management System (PEIMS): 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 attendance data.
Notes. Results are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ 4.50 ), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ) levels of engaging teachers and students. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## SUMMARY

Results presented in this chapter indicate that STAR districts have engaged teachers and students to a substantial extent across grant years, but that the focus on STAR implementation may be diminishing as the grant enters its final years. In alignment with decreasing scores for the core component Engaging Teachers and Students in 2010-11, teachers said that there was less of a focus on professional development and partner representatives noted that it was more difficult to implement their programs and activities than in previous grant years.

Despite the reduced emphasis on STAR implementation, results for high school students reflect a pattern of increasing participation in activities, such as tutoring and counseling, that are focused on achieving STAR goals and the increasing trend begins in 2008-09 when the lead STAR cohort entered high school. In contrast, middle school students' participation in activities that support STAR has fluctuated across years, with the lowest level of participation occurring in 2010-11. This pattern suggests that implementation efforts may be more focused on the lead STAR cohort and that middle school services may decline as the cohort progresses through high school.

In order to increase academic achievement and develop college-going cultures among low-income students and their families, STAR provides increased access to informational resources about postsecondary educational opportunities. STAR information resources are designed to improve parents' and students' ability to plan and prepare for long-term educational goals. As presented in Exhibit 7.1, the evaluation measures this component of STAR-Increasing Student and Parent Access to Informationby examining two supporting components: STAR campuses' implementation of services that provide informational resources to (1) students (Student Access to Information) and (2) parents (Parent Access to Information). More information about how core components, supporting components, and indicators are constructed is included in Appendix G.

Exhibit 7.1


## DATA SOURCES: STUDENT AND PARENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The evaluation's measurement of students' and parents' access to postsecondary planning information relies on data collected through (1) spring surveys of students in STAR schools, (2) student summer program participation data from the POC, and (3) spring surveys of STAR parents. In addition, the discussion includes information collected during spring 2011 interviews with administrators and counselors, as well as focus group discussions with teachers on STAR campuses.

The sections that follow discuss the evaluation's approach to measuring student and parent access to postsecondary planning information and provide measures of the degree to which STAR schools provided information to students and parents during the 2010-11 school year. Results are presented for middle schools, high schools, and all STAR campuses across 4 implementation years (i.e., 2007-08, 2008-09,

2009-10, and 2010-11). See Appendix G for more information on the measurement of the student and parent supporting components.

## MEASURING STUDENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The STAR goals (see Appendix F) emphasize the importance of providing all students with comprehensive information about postsecondary opportunities, including entrance requirements and financial aid (TEA, 2006). The Student Access to Information supporting component of STAR implementation is derived from the average of five indicators: (1) Student Informational Activities, (2) Students' Participation in Summer Programs, (3) Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities, (4) Students' Awareness of College Entrance Requirements, and (5) Students'Awareness of Financial Assistance (see Exhibit 7.1). The indicators are designed to measure the extent to which STAR schools implement activities and services that support students' awareness of postsecondary opportunities and planning needs. The sections that follow discuss the evaluation's approach to measuring each indicator as well as the Student Access to Information supporting component score.

## Indicator Score: Student Informational Activities

The Student Informational Activities indicator measures the degree to which STAR campuses provide students with access to activities designed to support college access and planning, such as college tours, college or career fairs, presentations by college faculty, and so on. The spring student surveys ask respondents to indicate the activities they participated in during a given school year from a list of typical STAR informational activities (e.g., college fairs, college planning workshops, college tours). The evaluation considers the average number of unique activities students attended on each campus, ${ }^{18}$ and averages are presented according to the 5-point scale: students attended (1) 1 kind of activity, (2) 2 kinds of activities, (3) 3 kinds of activities, (4) 4 kinds of activities, and (5) 5 kinds of activities. Because items addressing access to informational activities were not included on the spring 2008 survey, scores for the 2007-08 school year are not included in the analysis.

Findings presented in Figure 7.1 indicate that in 2010-11 students in STAR schools participated in fewer activities than in 2009-10. On average, students in STAR schools participated in less than two (1.44) unique types of activities. While high school students participated in more activities than middle school students (1.94 vs. 1.34), scores declined across both sets of students in 2010-11.
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Figure 7.1. Average STAR scores for Informational Activities, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2009, 2010, and 2011. Notes. Data is not available for 2007-08 (NA) because survey items were added in 2008-09. Responses are reported using a 5 -point scale: students attended (1) 1 kind of activity, (2) 2 kinds of activities, (3) 3 kinds of activities, (4) 4 kinds of activities, and (5) 5 kinds of activities. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Students' Participation in Summer Programs

In addition to activities provided during the school year, TEA and the POC offer STAR summer programs focused on increasing college awareness. TEA program administrators established the expectation that cohort students from each STAR district will participate in summer programs each year of the grant, and the POC offers an optional Summer Bridge program with space for 30 students from each STAR district. The Students' Participation in Summer Programs indicator score relies on POC attendance data for STAR summer programs at TAMU-CC and considers the percentage of students per district attending summer programs relative to available space ( 30 students per district). The POC first provided programming in the summer of 2009, so scores do not exist for the 2007-08 implementation year. Scores are presented using a 5 -point scale: (1) 6 students attended or $20 \%$ of available space, (2) 12 students attended or $40 \%$ of available space, (3) 18 students attended or $60 \%$ of available space, (4) 24 students attended or $80 \%$ of available space, and (5) 30 students attended or $100 \%$ of available space.

As presented in Figure 7.2, districts sent seven students, on average, to POC summer programs, or met $23 \%$ of available space in summer 2011 (2010-11 implementation year). This marks a decline from the previous years in which districts sent 16 students to summer programs, on average. Participation in the summer bridge program was low across districts on 2011-the district with the most participants sent only 12 students and one district did not have any students who participated in the program. However,
some districts offered local summer programs to meet the goal of engaging cohort students in summer programs.


Figure 7.2. Average STAR scores for districts' Participation in Summer Programs, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: Pre-College Outreach Center (POC) Summer Program Attendance Data, 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Notes. POC began implementing summer programs in summer 2009, so 2007-08 data is not available. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) 6 students attended or $20 \%$ of available space, (2) 12 students attended or $40 \%$ of available space, (3) 18 students attended or $60 \%$ of available space, (4) 24 students attended or $80 \%$ of available space, and (5) 30 students attended or 100\% of available space. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities

The Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities indicator is measured using survey items that ask students to indicate their level of familiarity with (1) 4 -year colleges and universities, (2) community and junior colleges, and (3) vocational and technical schools using the response categories: (1) not familiar, (2) somewhat familiar, and (3) very familiar. Researchers determined the average number of opportunities with which students were somewhat or very familiar at each STAR campus and converted averages to a 5-point scale in which ( $0.00-1.67$ ) indicates students were familiar with one type of postsecondary opportunity, (1.68-3.34) indicates students were familiar with two types of opportunities, and (3.35-5.00) indicates students were familiar with each type of postsecondary opportunity. Results presented in Figure 7.3 indicate that students at both STAR middle schools (2.73) and high schools (3.17) were familiar with about two types of postsecondary opportunities during the 2010-11 school year. Results for middle school students suggest that familiarity with the types of postsecondary opportunities dropped in the years after the lead STAR cohort moved to high school in 2008-09.


Figure 7.3. Average STAR scores for Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale. Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities: students are familiar with one type of postsecondary opportunity ( $0.00-1.67$ ), students are familiar with two opportunities (1.68-3.34), and students are familiar with all three types of postsecondary opportunity (3.35-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Trends in Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities

Figures $7.4 \mathrm{a}, 7.4 \mathrm{~b}$, and 7.4 c present students' familiarity with each of the three types of postsecondary opportunities included in the Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities indicator discussed in the previous section. For each figure, percentages represent the sum of the percentage of students indicating they were somewhat familiar and the percentage of students indicating that they were very familiar with each type of postsecondary opportunity for each survey administration.

Results presented in Figure 7.4a indicate that students' level of familiarity with 4-year colleges and universities has remained relatively stable across years, but that familiarity decreased somewhat at the middle school level once the lead STAR cohort moved to high school in 2008-09.


Figure 7.4a. Students' familiarity with 4 -year colleges and universities, as a percentage by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Middle School and High School Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages are the sum of the percentage students responding they were somewhat familiar and students responding they were very familiar with 4-year colleges and universities for each survey administration.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,761$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,329)$
Figure 7.4b presents results for students' level of familiarity with community colleges across survey years. Similar to results for 4 -year colleges and universities (see Figure 7.4a), findings indicate that middle school students' familiarity with community colleges began to decline once the lead STAR cohort moved to high school in 2008-09, but that high school students' level of familiarity with community colleges has remained relatively stable across years.


Figure 7.4b. Students' familiarity with community colleges, as a percentage by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Middle School and High School Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages are the sum of the percentage students responding they were somewhat familiar and students responding they were very familiar with community colleges for each survey administration.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,755$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,321)$

Figure 7.4c presents similar information for vocational or technical schools. Again, the trend for middle school students suggests that familiarity levels began to drop once the lead cohort moved to high school in 2008-09. Results for high school students indicate small increases in their familiarity with vocational or technical schools across project years.


Figure 7.4c. Students' familiarity with vocational or technical schools, as a percentage by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Middle School and High School Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages are the sum of the percentage students responding they were somewhat familiar and students responding they were very familiar with vocational or technical schools for each survey administration.
${ }^{\text {a }} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=1,940) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=1,887) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=1,521) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=1,750)$
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,317)$

## Indicator Score: Students' Awareness of Entrance Requirements

The Students' Awareness of Entrance Requirements indicator measures the degree to which STAR campuses provide students with information needed to improve their awareness of postsecondary entrance requirements. The evaluation's student surveys ask respondents to indicate whether a GEAR UP/STAR representative, a school counselor, a teacher, or an administrator has discussed postsecondary education entrance requirements with them. The Students' Awareness of Entrance Requirements indicator score reflects the percentage of students at each campus who indicated they had received information from at least one source and uses the following 5-point scale: (1) $20 \%$, (2) $40 \%$, (3) $60 \%$, (4) $80 \%$, and (5) $100 \%$ of students received information from at least one school source (e.g., a GEAR UP/STAR representative, a school counselor, a teacher, or an administrator). As presented in Figure 7.4, 72\% of students in STAR schools ( 3.60 overall) received information about postsecondary entrance requirements from at least one school source during the 2010-11 school year, which marks a decrease relative to results for 2009-10. The source of this decrease is largely attributable to results for middle school students. In 2010-11 about 65\% of middle school students reported receiving information about college entrance requirements from a school source compared to $75 \%$ in 2009-10.


Figure 7.5. Average STAR scores for Students’ Awareness of Entrance Requirements, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Notes. Responses are reported using a 5 -point scale: (1) $20 \%$, (2) $40 \%$, (3) $60 \%$, (4) $80 \%$, and (5) $100 \%$ of students received information from at least one school source. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

Results presented in Table 7.1 present the full range of sources of information about college entrance requirements, including non-school sources such as parents and siblings, presented on the student surveys. Findings indicate that across years, students are most likely to rely on parents for information, but that high school students have increasingly turned to school sources for information about college entrance requirements, while middle school students' reliance on school sources has generally declined over time. Across implementation years (i.e., from 2007-08 to 2010-11), the percentage of high school students who received information about college entrance requirements from a GEAR UP representative, a teacher, and a school administrator increased by 17,13 , and 10 percentage points, respectively. In contrast, the percentage of middle school students receiving information from a GEAR UP representative declined by 23 percentage points. Declines in the percentages of middles school student receiving information from school administrators, ( -3 percentage points) and counselors ( -1 percentage point) were smaller, and the percentage of middle school students receiving information from teachers increased somewhat across years ( +3 percentage points). In interviews conducted as part of the spring 2011 site visits, some teachers said that their schools' participation in STAR motivated them to become more involved in providing students with information about college. One teacher explained:
[Teachers] have become more of the college advocates for our kids - making them more aware of what's available to them. We always get wrapped up in our content [areas] and sometimes we forget to be the advertisers [of college] and GEAR UP has helped to bring that to the forefront.

Table.7.1. STAR Students' Sources of Information Regarding College Entrance Requirements, as a Percentage: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

| Sources | Middle School ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | High School ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 |
| Parents | 69.1\% | 69.1\% | 74.2\% | 70.0\% | 62.3\% | 59.2\% | 62.0\% | 62.1\% |
| Counselors | 31.7\% | 26.7\% | 33.5\% | 30.6\% | 53.3\% | 49.6\% | 55.0\% | 54.5\% |
| Teachers | 51.3\% | 51.4\% | 49.5\% | 53.8\% | 43.7\% | 46.4\% | 54.3\% | 56.2\% |
| Another family member | 46.9\% | 47.4\% | 47.1\% | 45.3\% | 38.3\% | 39.7\% | 39.0\% | 39.0\% |
| GEAR UP <br> Representatives | 42.9\% | 21.6\% | 29.9\% | 20.3\% | 18.4\% | 23.5\% | 34.7\% | 35.4\% |
| Siblings | 31.6\% | 34.3\% | 33.7\% | 33.7\% | 31.7\% | 31.3\% | 28.3\% | 30.0\% |
| Administrators | 24.8\% | 20.7\% | 20.9\% | 21.8\% | 11.7\% | 14.1\% | 14.3\% | 18.4\% |
| No one | 10.5\% | 13.7\% | 10.7\% | 13.0\% | 13.8\% | 10.0\% | 11.3\% | 9.6\% |

Source: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages will not total to 100 . Students may have indicated multiple sources of information.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,792$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,371)$

## Indicator Score: Students' Awareness of Financial Assistance

The evaluation also considers Students' Awareness of Financial Assistance as an indicator of STAR implementation, and students responding to the spring surveys indicated whether they received information about financial assistance for postsecondary educational opportunities from a school source (e.g., a GEAR UP/STAR representative, a school counselor, a teacher, or an administrator). The Students' Awareness of Financial Assistance indicator score measures the percentage of students at each STAR campus who reported receiving postsecondary planning information from at least one school source. Percentages have been converted to a 5 -point scale: (1) $20 \%$, (2) $40 \%$, (3) $60 \%$, (4) $80 \%$, and (5) $100 \%$ of students received information about financial assistance from at least one school source.

As presented in Figure 7.6, about half ( $49 \%$ ) of students in STAR schools received information from school staff regarding financial assistance during the 2010-11 school year. Not surprisingly, high schools earned higher Students' Awareness of Entrance Requirements (see Figure 7.5) and Students' Awareness of Financial Assistance scores than middle schools, which likely reflect the greater emphasis on postsecondary planning at the high school level. The proportion of middle school students receiving information about financial assistance has decreased across implementation years. In 2010-11, only 38\% of middle school students reported receiving financial planning information from a school source compared to $45 \%$ of students in 2009-10. This finding is consistent with results presented in Figure 7.5 and suggests that the emphasis on providing middle school students with college planning resources declined after the lead STAR cohort moved to high school in 2008-09. The cohort's move to high school, however, has not resulted in a corresponding increase in the percentage of high school students receiving information about financial assistance. Across survey years, the percentage of high school students reporting receiving information has remained relatively stable, ranging from $59 \%$ in 2009-10 to $56 \%$ in both 2007-08 and 2008-09. In 2010-11, 58\% of high school students reported receiving information about financial assistance from a school source.


Figure 7.6. Average STAR scores for Students’ Awareness of Financial Assistance, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) $20 \%$, (2) $40 \%$, (3) $60 \%$, (4) $80 \%$, and (5) $100 \%$ of students received information from at least one school source. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

While the measurement of the Students' Awareness of Financial Assistance indicator score is limited to school information sources, the spring surveys also asked students about other sources of information (e.g., parents and siblings). Table 7.2 presents the percentage of students reporting they received information across the full range of sources listed on surveys and indicates that large proportions of students rely on their parents and siblings for information about financial aid. Notably, about a third of middle school students ( $34 \%$ ) and a quarter of high school students ( $25 \%$ ) reported that they did not receive financial assistance information from any source during the 2010-11 school year.

Across years, however, trends in students' responses indicate that high school students have increased their reliance on school sources of information. In particular, the percentage of high school students turning to GEAR UP representatives, teachers, and school administrators have increased by 11,8 , and 4 percentage points, respectively, across the STAR implementation period. Middle school students' reliance on school sources of information has declined across years, with the most notable decline in the percentage of students receiving information from a GEAR UP representative (a drop of 21 percentage points).

Table. 7.2. STAR Students' Sources of Financial Assistance Information, as a Percentage: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

| Sources | Middle School $^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |  |  | High School $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ |
|  | $52.9 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ | $50.1 \%$ | $47.3 \%$ | $46.0 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $44.3 \%$ |
| Counselors | $23.4 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $44.6 \%$ | $38.8 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $39.8 \%$ |
| Teachers | $32.3 \%$ | $31.2 \%$ | $25.8 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $28.6 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $34.6 \%$ |
| GEAR UP | $32.1 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $25.4 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ |
| Representatives | $30.4 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $28.3 \%$ | $25.8 \%$ | $22.4 \%$ | $22.5 \%$ | $21.3 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ |
| Another family member | $21.9 \%$ | $20.7 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| Siblings | $15.4 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| Administrators | $21.3 \%$ | $25.2 \%$ | $31.8 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $19.0 \%$ | $25.1 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ |
| No one |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages will not total to 100 . Students may have indicated multiple sources of information.
${ }^{\text {a }} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=1,940) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=1,887) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=1,521) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=1,792)$
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,371)$

## Students' and Parents' Perceptions of the Affordability of Postsecondary Education

The spring surveys also asked students and parents whether they thought postsecondary educational options were affordable using family income, scholarships, and financial aid. The figures that follow present the percentages of students and parents who thought that 4-year colleges and universities (Figure 7.7 a) and community colleges (Figure 7.7b) were affordable across survey years. For each figure, percentages represent the sum of the percentage of parents and students indicating they could probably afford each type of postsecondary opportunity and the percentage of parents and students indicating they could definitely afford each opportunity for each survey administration.

Results presented in Figure 7.7a indicate that for both students and parents, perceptions of the affordability of 4-year colleges and universities as remained relatively constant across years. For each survey administration period, parents were the most confident of the affordability of 4-year colleges and universities, with $85 \%$ or more of parents across years indicating they could probably or definitely afford tuition. Middle school and high school students were less confident of the affordability of 4-year colleges and universities. Across years, just over $67 \%$ of middle school students and just over $58 \%$ of high school students thought their families could afford tuition.


Figure 7.7a. Students' and parents' perceptions of the affordability of 4-year colleges and universities, as a percentage by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Middle School and High School Surveys and STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

Note. Percentages are the sum of the percentage students and parents responding that they could probably afford the tuition at 4 -year colleges and universities and the percentage students and parents responding that they could definitely afford the tuition at 4 -year colleges and universities for each survey administration.
${ }^{2}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,761$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08$ ( $\mathrm{N}=3,371$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=2,991$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=3,075$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=2,329$ )
${ }^{\prime}$ 2007-08 (N=809);2008-09(N=670); 2009-10 (N=669); 2010-11 (N=619)
Figure 7.7b presents results for community colleges. Similar to results for 4-year colleges and universities (see Figure 7.7a), parents are highly confident in their ability to pay for community college, with more than $90 \%$ indicating they could probably or definitely that they could afford tuition. Although middle school students were initially less confident than high school students in their families' ability to pay community college tuition, their confidence generally increased across STAR implementation years, which may reflect greater awareness of the costs of postsecondary educational opportunities.


Figure 7.7b. Students' and parents' perceptions of the affordability of community college, as a percentage by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Middle School and High School Surveys and STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.

Note. Percentages are the sum of the percentage students and parents responding that they could probably afford community college tuition and the percentage students and parents responding that they could definitely afford community college tuition for each survey administration.
${ }^{2}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,761$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=3,371) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=2,991) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=3,075) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=2,329)$
${ }^{c} 2007-08(\mathrm{~N}=809) ; 2008-09(\mathrm{~N}=670) ; 2009-10(\mathrm{~N}=669) ; 2010-11(\mathrm{~N}=619)$

## Supporting Component Score: Student Access to Information

The overall Student Access to Information supporting component score is derived from the average of campuses' Student Informational Activities, Students’ Participation in Summer Programs, Students' Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities, Students' Awareness of Entrance Requirements, and Students’ Awareness of Financial Assistance indicator scores (see Exhibit 7.1). Because Student Informational Activities data were not collected during the 2007-08 evaluation year, scores for that year are not included in the analysis.

Findings presented in Figure 7.8 indicate that STAR campuses partially implemented activities and services designed to provide students with Access to Information (2.37 overall). Consistent with the understanding that postsecondary planning information is generally emphasized to a greater extent in high school, STAR high schools earned higher Student Access to Information scores than middle schools in 2010-11 ( 3.05 vs. 2.30). Middle school scores decreased in 2011, continuing a pattern of decline that began in 2008-09 when the lead student cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) advanced to high school. This pattern is reflected in analyses throughout this report and suggests that middle schools have placed less emphasis on STAR has since the first cohort moved to high school.


Figure 7.8. Supporting component scores: Student Access to Information, as a mean by year: 200708 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Pre-College Outreach Center (POC) Summer Attendance Data, 2009, 2010 and 2011.
Notes. POC began implementing summer programs in summer 2009, so 2007-08 data are not available. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-4.50$ ), and full implementation ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Seniors' College Planning

Each year, the spring student survey asks high school seniors about their college plans, including whether they have taken college entrance exams and completed application processes. Although the lead STAR cohort will not complete the twelfth grade until the project's final implementation year (i.e., 2011-12), each year, twelfth-graders' responses are used to indicate the perceptions of seniors in participating schools, establish trends, and guide development of programming in future years. The following sections present seniors' responses.

## College Entrance Exams

As presented in Table 7.6, a larger proportion of seniors responding to the spring 2011 survey had taken college entrance exams than in previous years. More than half of surveyed students had taken the PSAT (53\%) and ACT (54\%), and more than a third had taken the SAT $(38 \%)$ in 2011. Correspondingly, smaller proportions of students indicated they planned to take the PSAT, SAT, and ACT, and smaller proportions of students responded that they would not take the PSAT and SAT.

Table 7.3. Seniors at STAR Campuses Entrance Exam Status, as a Percentage: 2007-08
Through 2010-11

|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seniors } \\ & \text { 2007-08 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Seniors } \\ & \text { 2008-09 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Seniors } \\ & \text { 2009-10 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seniors } \\ & \text { 2010-11 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exam | Exam Status | ( $\mathrm{N}=670$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=584$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=587$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=418$ ) |
| PSAT | Have taken | 47.8\% | 50.1\% | 39.0\% | 52.5\% |
|  | Plan to take | 7.1\% | 9.7\% | 8.6\% | 5.5\% |
|  | Will not take | 21.7\% | 19.2\% | 21.5\% | 16.9\% |
|  | Unsure | 23.5\% | 21.1\% | 30.9\% | 25.1\% |
| SAT | Have taken | 25.1\% | 27.7\% | 26.8\% | 38.3\% |
|  | Plan to take | 26.6\% | 26.6\% | 24.0\% | 21.3\% |
|  | Will not take | 24.8\% | 23.4\% | 24.0\% | 20.1\% |
|  | Unsure | 23.6\% | 22.4\% | 25.2\% | 20.3\% |
| ACT | Have taken | 52.8\% | 49.2\% | 50.4\% | 54.0\% |
|  | Plan to take | 23.3\% | 24.8\% | 23.4\% | 18.1\% |
|  | Will not take | 9.6\% | 9.7\% | 8.4\% | 10.0\% |
|  | Unsure | 14.3\% | 16.4\% | 17.9\% | 17.9\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding. 2009-10 and 2010-11 only include data from five districts. One district did not administer student surveys to seniors.

Seniors responding to the spring surveys are also asked about their postsecondary application status and Table 7.7 presents their responses across years. In 2010-11 a larger proportion of surveyed seniors reported that they either had been accepted (29\%) or had applied (23\%) to a community college than in previous years. While a smaller proportion of 2010-11 seniors had been accepted to a vocational school (4\%), a somewhat larger proportion (6\%) had applied than in prior years. Results for 4year colleges remain roughly consistent across years with about a third of seniors reporting that they had been accepted and between $13 \%$ and $19 \%$ reporting that they had applied to a 4 -year program at the time of spring surveys.

Table 7.4. Seniors at STAR Campuses Application Status, as a Percentage: 2007-08
Through 2010-11

|  | Application | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Seniors } \\ & \text { 2007-08 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Seniors } \\ & 2008-09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Seniors } \\ & 2009-10 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Seniors } \\ & 2010-11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program | Status | ( $\mathrm{N}=670$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=584$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=587$ ) | ( $\mathrm{N}=418$ ) |
| Four-Year University | Accepted | 34.2\% | 33.2\% | 33.9\% | 31.8\% |
|  | Applied | 17.1\% | 18.5\% | 12.8\% | 18.0\% |
|  | Plan to apply | 28.4\% | 30.1\% | 35.0\% | 33.3\% |
| Community College | Accepted | 21.8\% | 18.6\% | 17.9\% | 28.6\% |
|  | Applied | 16.8\% | 16.6\% | 15.3\% | 23.0\% |
|  | Plan to apply | 34.2\% | 32.8\% | 35.2\% | 27.2\% |
| Vocational School | Accepted | 5.0\% | 6.8\% | 5.0\% | 3.8\% |
|  | Applied | 3.1\% | 4.3\% | 3.1\% | 5.9\% |
|  | Plan to apply | 22.6\% | 21.9\% | 27.4\% | 25.1\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note .Percentages will not total to 100. Response category "Will not apply" is omitted from the table. Results from 2009-10 and 2010-11 only include data from five districts. One district did not administer student surveys to seniors.

## PARENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Recognizing that planning for postsecondary education is the charge of both students and parents, the evaluation also considers the extent to which parents of students attending STAR schools receive information that will support their ability to plan for students' ongoing education needs, including college entrance requirements, financial assistance, and required coursework. In measuring Parent Access to Information, the evaluation relies on three indicators: (1) Parent Access to Partial Information, (2) Parent Access to Full Information, and (3) Parent Awareness of GEAR UP/STAR (see Exhibit 7.1).

## Indicator Score: Parent Access to Partial Information

Parents responding to the evaluation's spring surveys indicated whether a GEAR UP representative or school staff member had spoken with them about college planning, including entrance requirements, financial assistance, and course selection. The Parent Access to Partial Information indicator measures the percentage of parents receiving information addressing at least one college planning topic, using a 5 -point scale: (1) $20 \%$ of parents, (2) $40 \%$ of parents, (3) $60 \%$ of parents, (4) $80 \%$ of parents, and (5) $100 \%$ of parents received information about at least one college planning topic.

Figure 7.9 presents indicator scores for parents of students attending STAR middle schools and high schools across 4 evaluation years. Results indicate $32 \%$ of surveyed parents received information about college entrance requirements, financial assistance, or course selection (1.62 overall) during the 2010-11 school year. Not surprisingly, a larger proportion of high school parents (36\%) received planning information from school staff than middle school parents (26\%) in 2010-11, which likely reflects a greater emphasis on college planning in high school. The proportion of parents receiving information has largely decreased across implementation years.


Figure 7.9. Average STAR scores for Parent Access to Partial Information, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) $20 \%$ of parents, (2) $40 \%$ of parents, (3) $60 \%$ of parents, (4) $80 \%$ of parents, and (5) 100\% of parents received information regarding at least one college planning topic. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Parent Access to Full Information

The Parent Access to Full Information indicator score represents the percentage of parents who received information about each college planning topics (i.e., college entrance requirements, financial assistance, and required coursework) using a 5-point scale: (1) $20 \%$ of parents, (2) $40 \%$ of parents, (3) $60 \%$ of parents, (4) $80 \%$ of parents, and (5) 100\% of parents received information about each topic. As presented in Figure 7.9 , on average, only $14 \%$ of surveyed parents ( 0.69 overall) received information about each planning topic in 2010-11. Similar to findings presented in Figure 7.8, a larger proportion of high school parents (16\%) reported receiving full information than middle school parents (5\%), which, again, reflects the greater emphasis on college planning at the high school level.


Figure 7.10. Average STAR scores for Parents Access to Full Information, as a mean by year: 200708 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) $20 \%$ of parents, (2) $40 \%$ of parents, (3) $60 \%$ of parents, (4) $80 \%$ of parents, and (5) 100\% of parents received information regarding all three college planning topics. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Parent Awareness of GEAR UPISTAR

The spring surveys also asked parents about their familiarity with the GEAR UP/STAR program (Parent Awareness of GEAR UP/STAR). Indicator scores are presented using a 5-point scale: not familiar at all (1.00-1.25), not very familiar (1.26-2.50), somewhat familiar (2.51-3.75), and very familiar (3.76-5.00). As presented in Figure 7.10, on average, parents were somewhat familiar (2.67) with the GEAR UP/STAR program in 2010-11. Findings indicate that parents at STAR middle schools (2.72) were more familiar with the program than high school parents (2.63). This result is likely a reflection of the characteristics of some STAR partner activities designed to engage parents in schooling as well as differences in parent involvement by level of schooling. Across STAR districts, administrators said that partner activities focused on engaging parents in school were more appropriate for middle school students than for high school students, and some districts limited these activities to the middle school. This result is discussed in more detail in chapter 10.


Figure 7.11. Average STAR scores for Parent Awareness of GEAR UP/STAR, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: not familiar at all (0.00-1.25), not very familiar (1.26-2.50), somewhat familiar (2.51-3.75), and very familiar (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Supporting Component Score: Parent Access to Information

The supporting component score for Parent Access to Information is the average of campuses' Parent Access to Partial Information, Parent Access to Full Information, and Parent Awareness of GEAR UP/STAR scores. Findings presented in Figure 7.11 indicate that STAR schools earned an overall Parent Access to Information score of 1.66, or STAR schools partially implemented activities and services designed to increase parents' access to postsecondary planning information.


Figure 7.12. Supporting component scores: Parent Access to Information, as a mean by year: 200708 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ 4.50 ), and full implementation ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## CORE COMPONENT SCORE: INCREASING STUDENT AND PARENT ACCESS TO INFORMATION

The core component score for Increasing Parent and Student Access to Information is the average of campuses' supporting component scores for (1) Student Access to Information and (2) Parent Access to Information. Because Student Informational Activities data were not collected in 2007-08, scores for that year are not included in the analysis. As presented in Figure 7.12, STAR campuses had an overall, average score of 2.01 for the 2010-11 school year, which indicates that schools partially provided parents and students with access to college planning information and represents a decline from scores in previous years. While results have remained fairly consistent at the high school level, scores have declined consistently across years at the middle school level. This pattern supports the conclusion that STAR has received less emphasis in middle schools since the grant's lead cohort moved to high school in 2008-09.


Figure 7.13. Core component score: Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Pre-College Outreach Center (POC) Summer Program Attendance Data, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. POC began implementing summer programs in summer 2009, so 2007-08 data is not available. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-4.50$ ), and full ( $4.51-$ 5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

The Educational Aspirations of Parents and Students at STAR Campuses
The evaluation's spring surveys ask students what level of education they expect to achieve and ask parents the level of education they expect their child to achieve. Table 7.8 presents students' responses, and Table 7.9 presents parents' responses. Results presented in Table 7.8 indicate that most students plan to participate in postsecondary education, but that students' aspirations have not changed much across STAR implementation years. For example, for each survey administration, roughly a third (33\%) of high school students have responded that they planned to earn a bachelor's degree and there is little variation in the percentages of high school students who responded that they would earn an associate's or graduate degree. Middle school students' responses also show little variation across years.

Table. 7.5. STAR Students' Educational Aspirations, as a Percentage: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

| Educational <br> Aspiration | Middle School $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | High School $^{\text {J }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Less than high <br> school | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ |  |
| High school | $4.8 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |  |
| High school plus <br> vocational | $1.1 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |  |
| Some college | $5.7 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |  |
| Associate's degree | $5.1 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $6.7 \%$ |  |
| Bachelor's degree | $23.7 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ | $28.2 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $32.9 \%$ |  |
| Graduate or <br> professional degree | $36.5 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ | $37.6 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ | $26.6 \%$ | $28.4 \%$ | $30.3 \%$ | $29.5 \%$ |  |
| Don't know | $22.0 \%$ | $22.6 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ | $16.9 \%$ | $16.3 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |  |

Source: STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
${ }^{2}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,940$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,887$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,521$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=1,675$ ).
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=3,371$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=2,991$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=3,075$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=2,263$ )
Most parents surveyed in spring 2011 also expected their children to obtain a bachelor's, or 4-year degree, and percentages in are roughly similar across parents of middle school and high school students ( $65 \% \mathrm{vs}$. $62 \%$ ). However, the percentage of both middle school and high school parents who expect their child to achieve a bachelor's degree has decreased across years. In 2010-11, the decrease in the percentage of parents' expecting a bachelor's degree is offset by a corresponding increase in the percentage of parents expecting their children to only complete high school. Trends across both middle schools and high school parents also reflect decreases in the percentages of parents who "don't know" the level of education their child will achieve, which may indicate parents are giving greater thought to postsecondary outcomes.

Table 7.6. Parents' Educational Aspirations for Their Children, as a Percentage: 2007-08 Through 2010-11

| Educational | Middle School Parents $^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | High School Parents $^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aspiration | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ |
| Less than high <br> school | $0.0 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| High school | $8.5 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ | $9.0 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ |
| Some college | $13.2 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | $19.7 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $21.8 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| 4-year degree | $70.5 \%$ | $69.2 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $64.8 \%$ | $64.0 \%$ | $66.3 \%$ | $69.3 \%$ | $62.4 \%$ |
| Don't know | $7.8 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $6.0 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |

Source: STAR Parent Survey, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=281$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=234$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=233$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=233$ )
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2007-08 ( $\mathrm{N}=528$ ); 2008-09 ( $\mathrm{N}=436$ ); 2009-10 ( $\mathrm{N}=436$ ); 2010-11 ( $\mathrm{N}=386$ )

## SUMMARY

This chapter's findings indicate that STAR districts partially implemented activities and services focused on increasing student and parent access to postsecondary planning information in 2010-11. Similar to results presented in other chapters, the analyses included here indicate that STAR implementation has diminished at the middle school level since the lead STAR cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) moved to high school. Middle school students are participating in fewer programs and activities designed to increase their awareness of and preparation for postsecondary education. Similarly, the parents of middle school students reported reduced access to college planning information since the lead cohort moved to high school in 2008-09. Middle school parents, however, tended to be more aware of GEAR UP implementation efforts at their students' schools.

Although not directly attributable to STAR, more high school seniors took college entrance exams in 2010-11 than in previous years, and larger percentages of surveyed seniors had applied to postsecondary programs. While the percentage of seniors who had been accepted to 4 -year colleges at the time of surveys (i.e., May) has remained about the same across evaluation years, the percentage of seniors who have been accepted to community colleges increased substantially in 2011. While seniors in 2011 did not participate in STAR services, their increased participation in college testing and application processes suggests that STAR's focus on preparing students for college has permeated the culture of high schools and is affecting student outcomes.

Chapter 8

## Building School and Community Cultures That Support Academic Achievement

Building school and community support for increased academic achievement is a core component of STAR, and participating districts strive to develop environments that foster postsecondary goals and to engage parents and the larger community in building college-going cultures. In measuring school and community support, the evaluation considers the environment of STAR campuses (School Environment), including buy-in for project goals and support for innovation. In addition, the evaluation examines Parent and Community Support, including parent support for students' academic goals. Exhibit 8.1 illustrates the structure of this analysis and its place within the larger context of STAR implementation. More information about core components, supporting components, and indicators is included in Appendix G.

## Exhibit 8.1



## DATA SOURCES: SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY CULTURES

The evaluation's measurement of school and community culture relies on data collected through (1) spring surveys of teachers on STAR campuses and (2) spring surveys of STAR parents. See Appendix G for more information on the measurement of the School Environment and Parent and Community Support supporting components. In addition, the discussion includes qualitative data collected through interviews with administrators and counselors, as well as focus group discussions with teachers conducted during spring 2011 site visits. The sections that follow discuss the evaluation's approach to measuring school and community cultures that support school and STAR initiatives, and provide measures of the degree to which positive school and community cultures were present in 2010-11. Results are presented for middle schools, high schools, and all STAR campuses across 4 implementation years (2007-08, 2008-09, 200910, and 2010-11).

## MEASURING THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

As presented in Exhibit 8.1, the evaluation considers two indicators-(1) Leadership and Buy-in and (2) Innovative Environment-in measuring STAR school environments. Both indicators rely on teachers' levels of agreement with spring survey items that use the following 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Responses are averaged at the teacher level and then at the school level to create a score for each campus. The figures included in the following sections present campus scores averaged across middle schools, high schools, and for all STAR campuses.

## Indicator Score: Leadership and Buy-In

Each year, teachers on STAR campuses indicate their level of agreement with statements addressing the level of Leadership and Buy-In for STAR implementation, including whether principals communicate STAR goals and establish clear expectations for students' academic outcomes, as well as whether principals and teachers support vertical teaming efforts. As presented in Figure 8.1, teachers generally agreed ( 3.71 overall) that staff were committed to implementing STAR in 2010-11 and that school leadership supported implementation efforts. Although scores for Leadership and Buy-In have been strong across years, in interviews, staff across districts said that high rates of administrative turnover created leadership challenges. For example, one STAR high school has had five principals since the beginning of the grant, and another has had five principals over the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years.


Figure 8.1. Average STAR scores for Leadership and Buy-In, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Innovative Environments

In addition, teachers responding to spring surveys also indicated their level of agreement with statements about campuses' Innovative Environments, including whether staff were encouraged to attend professional development, implement new strategies, and take risks. As presented in Figure 8.2, teachers generally agreed ( 3.86 overall) that their campuses supported innovation, but to a somewhat lesser extent
than levels reported in 2009-10 (3.94). The decline in overall agreement can be attributed to high school responses (3.77), which represent lower levels of agreement than reported in 2009-10 (3.91). In contrast, scores for middle schools increased in 2010-11.


Figure 8.2. Average STAR scores for Innovative Environments, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Supporting Component Score: School Environment

The School Environment supporting component score is the average of campuses' (1) Leadership and Buy-In and (2) Innovative Environments indicator scores. STAR schools earned high School Environment scores ( 3.79 overall) in 2010-11, which indicates substantial buy-in and support for the STAR program during the project's fifth year. Across implementation years, middle schools have had somewhat higher scores than high schools.


Figure 8.3. Supporting component scores: School Environment, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Scores are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ 4.50), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## MEASURING PARENT AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

As presented in Exhibit 8.1, the evaluation considers three indicators when measuring parent and community support for STAR school initiatives: (1) Parent and Community Engagement in School Activities, (2) Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home, and (3) Parents’ Participation in School and STAR Activities. The sections that follow present information about each indicator as well as the overall score for the Parent and Community Support component of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Parent and Community Engagement in School Activities

In measuring Parent and Community Engagement in School Activities, the evaluation's spring teacher surveys ask respondents to rate their level of agreement with statements asking about parents' and community members' awareness of STAR activities, opportunities for involvement in school activities, and support for college readiness goals using a using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. As in the previous chapter section, responses are averaged at the teacher level and then at the school level to create a score for each campus. Figure 8.4 presents campus scores averaged across middle schools, high schools, and for all STAR campuses.

On average, teachers tend to agree (3.59 overall) that parents and communities were engaged in school activities during the 2010-11 school year, with scores increasing at both the middle school and high school levels over those reported in 2009-10.


Figure 8.4. Average STAR scores for Parent and Community Engagement in School Activities, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) unsure, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home

The indicator score for Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home is measured using results from spring parent surveys. The parent survey asks respondents about the frequency with which they participate in home activities that support STAR goals. Such activities include providing tutoring, talking about college, selecting appropriate coursework, and so on. Parents indicate the frequency of their participation using a 4-point scale: (1) never, (2) several times a month, (3) several times a week, or (4) every day. Responses are converted to a 5 -point scale to align with other measures of implementation. The converted 5-point scale roughly approximates survey responses and includes: never ( $0.00-1.25$ ), several times a month (1.26-2.50), several times a week (2.51-3.75), and every day (3.76-5.00). (See Appendix G for the specific survey items.)

Figure 8.5 presents Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home scores disaggregated by school type and for all STAR campuses. Results indicate that parents provide support for most activities several times a week ( 3.35 overall) in 2010-11. This result has been consistent across survey years at both the middle school and high school levels and likely reflects parents ongoing involvement in their students' education unrelated to STAR.


Figure 8.5. Average STAR scores for Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5 -point scale: never (0.00-1.25), several times a month (1.26-2.50), several times a week (2.51-3.75), and every day (3.76-5.00). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Indicator Score: Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities

The evaluation also measures Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities using parents' responses to spring surveys. The survey asks parents whether they have participated in a range of school activities, such as parent-teacher conferences, PTA events, and meetings with school staff (e.g., counselors) to plan their student's education. Using responses, researchers found the percentage of parents at each campus that had attended at least five school activities and converted the percentages to a 5 -point scale relative to the STAR goal of $50 \%$ : (1) $10 \%$, (2) $20 \%$, (3) $30 \%$, (4) $40 \%$, and (5) $50 \%$ of parents attended five or more activities. See Appendix F for more detailed information about the STAR goals).

Figure 8.6 presents scores for Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities across 4 years. In comparison to the 2009-10 evaluation year, average scores for Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities increased in 2010-11 ( $44 \%$ vs. $42 \%$ in 2009-10), but still lagged levels observed in 2007-08 and 2008-09. To some extent, the decline in parent participation in the later years of the grant may be attributable to a reduced focus on parents in some districts. Noting the difficulty of increasing parent involvement in school activities, some administrators said that they focused their efforts on grant activities targeted to students and teachers because they saw a greater "return" on these efforts.


Figure 8.6. Average STAR scores for Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5 -point scale: (1) $10 \%$, (2) $20 \%$, (3) $30 \%$, (4) $40 \%$, and (5) $50 \%$ of parents attended five or more activities. Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## Supporting Component Score: Parent and Community Support

Parent and Community Support supporting component scores are the average of campuses' (1) Parent and Community Engagement in School Activities, (2) Parents' Support of STAR Goals at Home, and (3) Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities scores. As presented in Figure 8.7, STAR campuses earned relatively high Parent and Community Support scores (3.79 overall), which indicates substantial support from parents and the local community for STAR goals.


Figure 8.7. Supporting component scores: Parent and Community Support, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ 4.50 ), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix $G$ contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## The Challenge of Raising Community Expectations

Across STAR districts, school staff highlighted the challenge of raising their local communities' expectations for students. One administrator commented that "contentment is easily attained in this community," noting a general lack of academic ambition among residents. An administrator in another district shared a similar view, explaining that there was "mismatch of expectations" and that parents and students resisted the understanding that rigorous academic content was necessary for students to be prepared for postsecondary opportunities. As evidence of this trend, the administrator reported that even the district's high achieving students (those in the top 10\% of their class) had to take remedial courses when they went to college. In all districts, interviewed staff said that they worked to send a message to the parents and the larger community that expectations for students have to change. As one administrator explained:

We want to crank out of here college-ready students that are going to go to college, and that's the expectation. Yes, it's a dream, but it shouldn't be a dream-it's the expectation. The dream should be that they [students] graduate from college and go on to graduate school. That's the dream. But for us the expectation should be that they are going to go to college.

## CORE COMPONENT SCORE: BUILDING SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY CULTURES THAT SUPPORT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The core component score Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement is derived from the average of campuses’ (1) School Environment and (2) Parent and Community Support supporting component scores (see Exhibit 8.1). As presented in Figure 8.8, campuses implemented activities and services designed to Build School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement at a substantial level in 2010-11 (3.79 overall). STAR campuses earned slightly higher scores in 2010-11 relative to 2009-10 (3.79 overall), but trends across implementation years show little change in terms of the effects of STAR on school and community culture at either the middle school or high school level.


Figure 8.8. Core component scores: Building School and Community Cultures That Support Academic Achievement, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; STAR Parent Survey, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011.
Note. Responses are reported using a 5 -point scale: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-$ 4.50 ), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## SUMMARY

As in previous years, schools substantially implemented STAR activities and services designed to build school and community cultures that support academic goals in 2010-11. However, relative to previous years, scores declined somewhat in 2009-10 and 2010-11. In interviews, school staff said that it was difficult to change the culture of schools and communities and that some parents resisted the idea that rigorous instruction and challenging coursework were necessary to improve students' preparation for postsecondary education. As a result, administrators in at least one district reported that they focused their implementation efforts on aspects of STAR that directly affected students and focused less on parents and the larger community.

## Implementation Scores

Ultimately, STAR campuses earn aggregate implementation scores derived from the average of their scores for each of STAR's four core components: (1) Raising Academic Standards, (2) Engaging Teachers and Students, (3) Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, and (4) Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement (see Exhibit 9.1). Implementation scores are designed to provide an overall measure of districts' progress in implementing the STAR program, and in combination with scores for core components, supporting components, and indicators, to allow districts to gauge their areas of strength and weakness and develop strategies for ongoing implementation.

## Exhibit 9.1



## CORE COMPONENT SCORES

Figure 9.1 presents the average core component scores for each of STAR's program components (Raising Academic Standards, Engaging Teachers and Students, Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, and Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement) across implementation years (2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11). As noted in chapter 4, measurement of STAR implementation began in the project's second year (2007-08) because the short timeline available for 2006-07 implementation ${ }^{19}$ precluded STAR districts from fully addressing most program components during the project's first year. Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information scores were not available for the 2007-08 evaluation year because some data for this component were collected differently in the early years of STAR.

Results indicate that schools have implemented the Engaging Teachers and Students and Building School and Community Cultures components at a substantial level. The trend in scores for Raising Academic Standards is generally positive, although scores remain at the level of partial implementation. Scores for the Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information component also indicate partial implementation; however, the trend across years suggests reduced levels of implementation in 2010-11.

[^12]

Figure 9.1. Aggregate component scores, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; College Board School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview and Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicators System enrollment data: 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 201011; STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Surveys, Middle School and High School Student Surveys, and Parent Surveys spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 attendance data; POC Summer Program Attendance Records, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.
Notes. NA= not applicable. Some data were not collected across all evaluation years. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale: minimal $(0.00-1.50)$, partial $(1.51-3.00)$, substantial $(3.01-4.50)$, and full $(4.51-5.00)$. Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation.

## IMPLEMENTATION SCORES

Figure 9.2 presents overall Implementation scores, derived from an average of STAR campuses' scores across program components. For the 2007-08 school year, scores are based on only three components (i.e., Raising Academic Standards, Engaging Teachers and Students, and Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement) because some data used to measure the Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information were not available for this year. The scores for remaining are based on all four components.

STAR schools earned a score of 2.93 overall during the project's fifth year, which indicates that schools approached substantial implementation levels in 2010-11. Although changes are small, the trend in the STAR average suggests that implementation of STAR is diminishing across years. This trend is most apparent at the middle school level and may indicate that STAR implementation has received less emphasis since the grant's lead cohort moved to high school.


Figure 9.2. Aggregate implementation scores, as a mean by year: 2007-08 through 2010-11.
Sources: STAR Classroom Observations, spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; College Board School Integrated Summary Reports: Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview and Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicators System enrollment data: 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 201011; STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Surveys, Middle School and High School Student Surveys, and Parent Surveys spring 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011; Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 attendance data; POC Summer Program Attendance Records, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.
Notes. Responses are reported using a 5-point scale. Mean: Implementation Scores: minimal ( $0.00-1.50$ ), partial ( $1.51-3.00$ ), substantial ( $3.01-4.50$ ), and full ( $4.51-5.00$ ). Appendix G contains more information about each of the core components, supporting components, and indicators used in the measurement of STAR implementation. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The aggregate implementation scores for 2007-08 are the averages of schools' (1) Raising Academic Standards, (2) Engaging Teachers and Students, and (3)Building School and Community Cultures scores, and do not include scores for Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information.

## SUMMARY

As in previous years, STAR campuses neared substantial levels of implementation in 2010-11; however, overall trends suggest that implementation levels are decreasing as the grant enters its final years. This trend is most apparent at the middle school level and suggests that implementation has been less of a focus since the lead STAR cohort moved to high school. Although scores at the high school level have fluctuated somewhat over STAR's implementation period, they indicate a largely consistent focus on STAR's college readiness goals.

GEAR UP funding supports the involvement of partner organizations in grant activities, stressing the role of partnerships in increasing community involvement in schools and creating sustainable changes in schools and communities. As discussed in chapter 1, four partner organizations supported day-to-day implementation efforts in STAR districts during the 2010-11 school year. These partners included (1) the POC at TAMU-CC, (2) the Faculty Fellows mentoring program, (3) the College Board, and (4) FACE. TEA selected these partner organizations because they are focused on improving the college readiness of low-income students and engaging communities and parents in education.

## DATA SOURCES

The following sections describe the role of partner organizations during the 2010-11 school year as well as partners' plans for supporting the grant in its final year (i.e., 2011-12). The chapter relies on data collected through interviews with principals and counselors and focus group discussions with teachers conducted as part of site visits to the 12 STAR campuses in spring 2011, as well as phone interviews with representatives of partner organization conducted in summer 2011.

## PRE-COLLEGE OUTREACH CENTER (POC) AT TEXAS A\&M UNIVERSITY-CORPUS CHRISTI (TAMU-CC)

Across grant years, the POC at TAMU-CC has provided overarching services to improve GEAR UP implementation in each of the six STAR districts. The POC provides ongoing professional development to increase academic rigor, disseminates information about GEAR UP services and grant requirements, and organizes college tours, student leadership activities, and programs helping students transition from eighth to ninth grade. The POC also coordinates other partner organizations' services and facilitates the Faculty Fellows mentoring program.

Recognizing the need for more direct "in-district" support for GEAR UP implementation, the POC, in collaboration with TEA, created the position of college access coordinator, or CAC, during Year 3 of the grant (i.e., 2008-09). CACs are POC staff who provide implementation support to individual districts and monitor districts' progress toward meeting STAR's goals and objectives. CACs' offices are located in their assigned districts which enables coordinators to play an active role in day-to-day grant activities.

In interviews, district staff said they valued the support provided by the POC and CACs. Administrators noted that the POC was responsive to districts' individual needs and alerted staff to opportunities that would support individual grants. Administrators said that CACs helped them complete implementation plans and coordinate partner activities. CACs also assisted with grant documentation and reporting requirements, facilitated college tours, and encouraged staff, student, and community participation in STAR events. "[Our CAC] has been invaluable in helping our counselors do what they need to do, getting our data straight, and making sure we're communicating," explained one administrator in spring 2011.

The role of College Access Coordinators (CACs). The CAC job description outlines CACs' roles in providing support for STAR implementation. The description clarifies that CACs serve as collaborative partners who support school leadership in planning, coordinating, and monitoring the implementation of STAR and in disseminating information about the grant. In interviews, CACs highlighted their role in entering data in City Span software and generating reports from the system during the 2010-11 school year. CACs said that they met weekly with POC staff throughout the year to discuss districts' progress and review implementation reports. In addition to managing data and reviewing reports, CACs said they
also participated in professional development activities, conducted classroom observations, coordinated partner services, ensured communication about STAR activities in other districts, and served as liaisons between districts and the POC. Coordinators said their presence ensured greater accountability for meeting STAR goals and objectives. As one CAC noted during a focus group conducted in 2011:

I think our role is to help the districts understand the goals and objectives, because they have to be met... We [CACs] have played a key part in districts being as successful as they are and I think every single district [has been successful] and I think that reflects on us and our work.

CACs said that a central challenge of their jobs during the 2010-11 school year was to ensure that districts retained a focus on STAR implementation and maintained compliance with grant requirements. CACs said that it appeared districts were placing less of a priority on STAR as the grant entered its final years. One coordinator explained:

I think that since we're at the end... going into the sixth year of the grant... [STAR] is not so important to them [districts] as it was in year one, two, or three. It's a little more difficult to get them [district staff] to get what we need and I think that has to do with it being the last years of the grant.

## FACULTY FELLOWS

Beginning in Year 2 of the grant (i.e., 2007-08), STAR districts have participated the Faculty Fellows mentoring program, which recruits TAMU-CC and TAMU-K college faculty to work in STAR classrooms and mentor teachers. Faculty Fellows spend 60 hours each semester working with teachers to model engaging classroom instruction, implement AP instructional strategies, and ensure vertical alignment. The program's director explained that the goal of Faculty Fellows is to provide a connection to college and to improve parents' and students' awareness of the preparation needed to be successful in college. As a result of organizational changes at TAMU-CC, the Faculty Fellows program was only implemented in the spring of the 2010-11 school year, and Faculty Fellows worked primarily in math and science.

In interviews conducted in spring 2011, teachers were enthusiastic about the program and several school administrators expressed a desire to have more Faculty Fellows working on campuses and supporting a broader range of subject areas. In one focus group interview, teachers said their Faculty Fellow worked with all math teachers at the campus, providing feedback on their instruction and speaking with students about college expectations. The Faculty Fellow allowed students to view a syllabus for a college course and explained how tests for the course were administered. "It was an eye opener for kids," explained one teacher. "Instead of just hearing it from me, they [students] were hearing about [the rigor of college courses] from someone who actually does it."

Administrators credited the Faculty Fellows program with expanding teachers' resources and improving classroom instruction, although several principals noted that Faculty Fellows need to be carefully selected, noting that not everyone has the skills to work with middle school or high school students. Some administrators also underscored the difficulty of matching the expertise of Faculty Fellows to particular subject areas. For example, one middle school struggled to incorporate their Faculty Fellow in classroom activities because the Fellow taught physics at the university. Administrators explained that the school would have been better served by a Faculty Fellow who taught biology because physics is not taught in middle school.

In addition, to their work on STAR campuses during the school year, Faculty Fellows also supported a summer bridge program at TAMU-CC for rising ninth-grade students during the summer of 2011. The bridge program enabled students to attend courses developed by Faculty Fellows to meet their needs specifically. Students attended courses from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. each day for 2 weeks in the summer. Despite
extensive preparation for the summer bridge courses, the program was underused by STAR districts during the grant's fifth year. While the program had room for 125 students, only 40 students participated in summer 2011.

## THE COLLEGE BOARD

In previous grant years, the College Board supported STAR through ongoing professional development addressing vertical alignment of curricula, AP instructional strategies, and preparation for college testing offered to all teachers, including those teaching non-AP courses. During Years 1 through 3 of the grant (i.e., 2006-07 through 2008-09), the College Board provided training at workshops held in a central location. However, attendance at most workshops was low because of travel requirements, the need for substitutes to cover teachers' classes, and the preferences of some district administrators that teachers not miss class time. To address these issues, the College Board revised its approach and offered professional development during the school day on individual campuses during the grants fourth year (i.e., 2009-10). The goal of this approach was to increase teachers' participation in training; however, College Board representatives said attendance remained low because training consultants were unable to schedule time when all district teachers were available for training.

To address the ongoing challenges in providing professional development, in 2010-11, the POC contracted with several independent consultants who provided job-embedded, or in-class, training to teachers. Such training included modeling effective strategies in the classroom, observing individual teachers' instruction, and offering constructive feedback, as well as training offered during teachers' conference periods. Consultants also worked with counselors to ensure the alignment of counseling services across grade levels.

Although the College Board played a smaller role in STAR professional development activities STAR's fifth year, it continued to support districts' efforts to increase the rigor of instruction and prepare students for college. Four STAR districts began using SpringBoard, the College Board's standardized pre-AP curriculum, in 2010-11, and College Board consultants provided training to support its use. The College Board also provided students with access to online SAT prep courses that address test-taking strategies and allow students to take practice exams.

## FATHERS ACTIVE IN COMMUNITIES AND EDUCATION (FACE)

FACE coordinates activities designed to increase parental involvement in education, and focuses on the role of fathers in particular. FACE creates opportunities for parents to form relationships with school staff and through teambuilding exercises and interactive games that enable parents to connect to the curriculum. FACE focuses on four types of activities: (1) on-campus interactive teambuilding exercises, (2) college tours in collaboration with the Faculty Fellows program (3) large inter-district activities, and (4) the FACE father-student Leadership Team. FACE activities generally are offered during the school day; however, some campuses, administrators did not allow students to miss classroom instruction to participate in activities, which limited FACE's ability to implement its program.

Consistent with findings from prior evaluation years, most districts reported that FACE activities were more effective with middle school than high school students in 2011, and some districts limited FACE participation to middle schools. Administrators said that FACE activities were more appropriate for younger students and that middle school parents were more likely than high school parents to participate in school activities. Administrators also noted that parents who had participated in FACE activities when their students were in middle school were not interested in repeating activities when their students were in high school. As one principal explained, "FACE is getting old for the parents after so many years of having these types of activities, so are numbers are not as big [as they have been in the past]."

## ONGOING IMPLEMENTATION OF PARTNER SERVICES

The 2011-12 school year marks STAR's sixth and final implementation year and is the year in which the lead STAR cohort (i.e., seventh graders in 2006-07) will be in the twelfth grade. As such, the central focus of partner activities in 2011-12 will be twelfth-grade students with the goal that $100 \%$ of twelfthgraders graduate prepared for some form of postsecondary education. To reach this goal, TEA worked with a production company to create the "STAR Senior Year Plan"-a package of resources for districts to use in promoting college planning to twelfth-grade students. The package includes multimedia activities and monthly lessons that will guide seniors through the college application process as well as ads, posters, and $t$-shirts that promote college planning. Resources are designed so that they may be tailored to reflect the culture of individual communities and districts.

As a means to ensure sustainability after the grant ends, STAR partners will train school staff to use grant-provided resources and tools. Throughout the 2011-12 implementation year, CACs will work within districts to maintain the focus on STAR goals and ensure that resources are used effectively. During the 2011-12 school year, FACE and the Faculty Fellows program plan to work within communities to develop partnerships with businesses and local organizations that will provide the financial support needed to sustain their services when grant funds expire.

## SUMMARY

During Year 5, partners focused on building the sustainability of STAR's initiatives and supported districts in strategic planning and building community support for the program's goals. Some partner representatives reported that the focus on STAR implementation was waning as the grant entered its final years and that changes in some district and campus leadership teams also weakened implementation efforts. Changes were particularly challenging when new leaders established policies that restricted teachers' and students' ability to be out of class, which limited participation in partner activities offered during the school day. As a consequence, partners such as the Faculty Fellows mentoring program and professional development consultants who worked in classrooms with students and teachers tended to experience fewer challenges in providing services.

## Chapter 11

## Summary of Findings

The federal GEAR UP grant program provides funding to improve low-income students' readiness for and participation in postsecondary educational programs. Grants extend across 6 school years and require that participating districts begin providing services to students no later than the seventh grade and that services continue until students graduate from high school. GEAR UP operates using a cohort model in which services are provided to all students in participating grade levels, rather than to a selected group of students. Texas' state-level GEAR UP grant, known as STAR, began serving seventh-grade students in the 2006-07 school year, and has expanded grant services to include additional grade levels as the lead seventh-grade cohort has progressed through school. During the 2010-11 school year, STAR's fifth implementation year, the lead seventh-grade cohort was in the eleventh grade and STAR services were provided to students in Grades 7 through 11.

The findings presented in this report comprise the fifth-year evaluation of the STAR project. This chapter provides a summary of the report's findings, including the characteristics of students participating in STAR and performance indicators for STAR schools during the 2010-11 school year, as well as information about the implementation of STAR and the role of partner organizations. The chapter concludes with a discussion of results and the project's ongoing evaluation.

## THE CHARACTERISTICS STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN STAR AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR STAR SCHOOLS

The 12 campuses ( 6 middle schools and 6 high schools) that participate in STAR enroll large proportions of Hispanic and low-income students. Of the students included in the STAR cohort (i.e., Grades 7 through 11 in 2010-11), $89 \%$ were Hispanic and $75 \%$ were from low-income backgrounds. Despite the high percentage of Hispanic students participating in STAR, only $2 \%$ of cohort students were characterized as LEP and only $2 \%$ received bilingual or ESL services. Across campuses, the trends in the TAKS passing rates $^{20}$ for students receiving STAR services reflected the trends of peer campuses ${ }^{21}$ and the state as a whole. Students in STAR's first cohort (i.e., students in Grade 11 in 2010-11) saw increases in their math and reading/ELA passing rates as well as in "all tests taken." However, students in the remaining STAR cohorts (i.e., students in Grades 7 through 10) experienced either no changes or declines in their passing rates. State-assigned accountability ratings reflect the lack of growth in TAKS passing rates. Half of STAR campuses (four high schools and two middle schools) were rated Academically Unacceptable in 2010-11.
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## STAR IMPLEMENTATION

Recognizing that STAR is unlikely to positively impact students, schools, or communities if campuses minimally or partially implement the program, researchers developed a measurement of STAR implementation to support the overarching program evaluation. The analysis measures the extent to which STAR schools implement activities and services aligned with the project's four core components: (1) Raising Academic Standards, (2) Engaging Teachers and Students, (3) Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information, and (4) Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement. The sections that follow discuss findings for each of the STAR components and its associated supporting components. Appendix G contains detailed information about the data sources and methods used to measure each STAR component and supporting component.

## Raising Academic Standards

The measurement of Raising Academic Standards reflects the extent to which teachers increase instructional rigor (Academic Rigor) and align curriculum (Curricular Alignment), and the extent to which STAR schools engage high school students in advanced coursework (Advanced Academics). On average, STAR schools partially implemented instructional and curricular reforms designed to raise academic standards during the 2010-11 school year, although trends over time indicate increases in students' engagement in classroom instruction, as well as in the proportions of high school students completing advanced coursework and participating in AP testing.

Academic Rigor. The measurement of Academic Rigor relies on data collected during classroom observations conducted during site visits to STAR campuses in the spring of each evaluation year. During observations, researchers collect data addressing teachers' use of higher order questioning strategies and subject-specific AP strategies, as well as information about the level of student engagement in class activities. In spring 2011, researchers observed decreases in teachers’ use of questioning strategies that required higher order thinking relative to observations conducted in 2010. In addition, researchers observed, on average, fewer subject-specific instructional strategies in all core content areas at the high school level and in science and math at the middle school level. Middle school teachers in ELA and social studies implemented subject-specific strategies to a greater extent in spring 2011 relative to the previous year. Despite uneven implementation of subject-specific strategies and weaker overall use of higher order questioning strategies in 2011, students in observed classrooms exhibited greater engagement in classroom activities. At the middle school level, students have shown progressively higher levels of engagement across STAR's implementation years. Results at the high school level have fluctuated across years, but reached their highest level in 2011.

Curricular Alignment. In 2009-10, College Board and POC training consultants began providing monthly, individualized, onsite training at each district high school throughout the school year. This approach was continued in 2010-11 as a means to ensure that training was tailored to individual campus needs. Across districts, training in 2010-11 addressed the use of student data to inform decision making, strategies to align curriculum and implement effective vertical teams, as well as a range of instructional techniques. To measure the effects of these efforts, the evaluation uses indicators related to teachers' use of vertical team strategies and participation in vertical team meetings drawn from spring survey data. Across implementation years, there has been little variation in the implementation of vertical teams at both the middle school and high school levels. On average, teachers report they meet in vertical teams once or twice a semester, and middle school teachers tend to meet somewhat more often than high school teachers. Across years, surveyed teachers at both levels of schooling have indicated that they sometimes use vertical teaming strategies, such as working with peers to develop lessons or observing another teachers' instruction, and middle school teachers report somewhat greater use of strategies than high school teachers.

Across evaluation years, teachers participating in surveys and focus group have consistently reported that it is difficult to coordinate schedules to accommodate vertical team meetings, particularly when meetings include both middle school and high school teachers. In some districts, teachers have encountered additional challenges because of policies that limit the amount of time they may work together out of class, and teachers in several focus groups have said that the increased use of vertically-aligned curricula, such as CSCOPE, has reduced the need for teachers to work in vertical teams. Despite the difficulties of meeting as vertical teams, focus group teachers in 2011 pointed to the value of teams, noting that time spent collaborating with colleagues allows them to develop lessons that better prepare students for subsequent grade levels and college coursework.

Advanced Academics. At the high school level, the evaluation measures students' participation in advanced coursework using TEA-collected data on the students' completion of advanced coursework, such as AP or dual credit courses, for the previous year, ${ }^{22}$ as well as College Board data documenting the proportion of students' who participate in AP testing and earn a score of 3 or higher on AP tests each year. (Although policies vary, most colleges award credit for AP test scores of 3 or higher.)

Advanced coursework. STAR establishes the goal that $50 \%$ of high school students will participate in advanced courses, and while high schools fell short of this goal in 2010-11, they have demonstrated substantial progress in improving advanced course completion rates over the grant's implementation period. About $14 \%$ of students in STAR high schools completed advanced courses in 2006-07 (the grant's first year). In 2009-10, however, nearly $20 \%$ of students completed advanced courses - an increase of more than $40 \%$. This trend is expected to continue as the lead STAR cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) moves into their final years of high school because many advanced courses are limited to students in the eleventh and twelfth grades.

AP exam participation. In addition, STAR high schools have seen dramatic increases in the proportions of students who participate in AP testing. STAR sets goals for participation in AP testing relative to the state average reported in AEIS, and asks that schools meet or exceed the state average by the project's fifth year. This report's findings indicate that STAR high schools met this goal in the grant's fourth year (i.e., 2009-10) and continued to improve participation rates in its fifth year (i.e., 2010-11). In the grant's first year (i.e., 2006-07) about 9\% of students in STAR high schools participated in AP testing relative to the state rate of $10 \%$. In STAR's fourth year $16 \%$ of students at STAR high schools participated in testing relative to the state rate of about $13 \%$, and in 2010-11 (Year 5), about $19 \%$ of students in STAR high schools took AP tests relative to the state rate of $14 \%$. Across project years, STAR high schools have increased percentage of students participating in AP testing by more than $100 \%$. Although state-level trends across this period also reflect an increase in the percentage of students taking AP tests, the percentage increase for the state is only $40 \%$.

AP exam scores. Despite increases in the percentages of students taking advanced coursework and participating in AP testing, STAR high schools have not achieved similar gains in the percentage of tested students earning a score of 3 or higher on AP exams. In the grant's first year, about $8 \%$ of students in STAR high schools who took AP tests earned a score of 3 or higher, but by its fifth year, only $5 \%$ of students earned such a score (see Table I. 4 in Appendix I). This result suggests that STAR high schools have been successful in encouraging students to enroll in AP courses and participate in testing, but they have not provided students with the level of academic preparation necessary to be awarded college credit for AP courses.
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## Engaging Teachers and Students

A second component of STAR implementation is the degree to which teachers and students are engaged in achieving program goals. The evaluation considers (1) teacher engagement in STAR professional development opportunities and (2) student engagement in activities that address STAR goals, as well as their attendance rates in measuring this component. Overall, STAR campuses substantially engaged teachers and students in the project's fifth year, although scores for this component declined in 2010-11 relative to previous evaluation years.

Teacher Engagement in Professional Development. Data used to measure teachers' participation in professional development activities are drawn from surveys administered teachers in the spring of each evaluation year. The surveys ask a range of questions about the training teachers receive, including whether they have had sufficient training to implement AP strategies and use data to plan instruction, as well as whether they are encouraged to use new instructional strategies. Across evaluation years, teachers have consistently reported high levels of engagement in professional development, although survey responses in 2010-11 reflected a small decrease at the high school level. In interviews, some teachers said that STAR was receiving less emphasis as it entered its final years, which may partly explain the decline in teachers' engagement. As teachers in one focus group noted, "[We] haven't seen as much [emphasis on STAR] this year."

Student Engagement in Schooling. The evaluation uses student survey data and PEIMS attendance data to measure students' engagement in their schools. The student surveys ask respondents to identify the types of activities they participate in each year, including tutoring, counseling, and STAR partner activities, such as FACE events or Faculty Fellows instruction. Similar to results for teachers, STAR campuses have had high levels of student engagement across evaluation years, but scores declined somewhat in 2010-11, particularly at the middle school level. As noted in the previous section, this finding is likely related to a reduced focus on STAR implementation as the grant enters its last years. Results for middle schools also suggest that STAR has received less attention since its lead cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) moved to high school.

## Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information

In order to increase academic achievement and develop college-going cultures among low-income students and their families, STAR provides increased access to informational resources about postsecondary educational opportunities. STAR resources are designed to improve parents' and students' ability to plan and prepare for long-term educational goals. The evaluation measures this component of STAR-Increasing Student and Parent Access to Information-by examining two supporting components: STAR campus' implementation of services that provide informational resources to (1) students (Student Access to Information) and (2) parents (Parent Access to Information).

Students' Access to Information. This component of STAR is measured using information collected through surveys that ask about students' familiarity with a variety of postsecondary educational opportunities, entrance requirements, and financial aid options, as well as students' participation in activities, such as college visits, career fairs, and summer programs, that are focused on improving their understanding of postsecondary education. Across years, STAR campuses have provided students with access to information that approached substantial levels; however, results for 2010-11 mark a decline from the levels observed in previous years, particularly at middle schools. Proportionately, fewer middle school students reported familiarity with postsecondary opportunities, such as 4-year colleges, community colleges, and vocational/technical schools. Middle school students' awareness of college entrance requirements and financial aid also declined. In contrast, these measures generally increased at the high school level. Similar to results presented in the previous section, this finding suggests that STAR implementation has decreased at middle schools.

Parents' Access to Information. Data from the parent and staff surveys are used to measure Parents’ Access to Information. The teacher survey asks respondents about parents' level of involvement in school activities, and the parent survey asks about parents participation in a range of school and home-based activities focused on educational goals. Across years, the evaluation has found that parents have had partial access to information, and results for 2010-11 indicate that both high school and middle school parents had less access to information than in previous grant years. Less than a third of surveyed parents reported receiving information about college planning topics from their students' school in 2010-11, although most parents said they talked to their students about college planning and provided support for academic goals.

## Building School and Community Cultures That Support Academic Achievement

STAR campuses are expected to develop environments that foster postsecondary goals and to engage parents and the larger community in supporting the schools' college-going cultures. In measuring school and community support for STAR, the evaluation considers the School Environment of STAR campuses, including staff buy-in to project goals and support for innovation, as well as Parent and Community Support of students' academic goals.

STAR School Environments. The School Environment indicator is measured using data from surveys of staff on STAR campuses, and across grant years results for both middle schools and high schools have indicated substantial levels of buy-in and support for STAR. Despite considerable administrative turnover in some districts, staffs on STAR campuses have generally agreed that school leaders support grant goals, foster buy-in among staff, and encourage innovation in instruction.

Parent and Community Support. The level of Parent and Community Support for students' academic goals incorporates results from the spring surveys of parents and school staff. Across STAR implementation years, school staff have consistently agreed that parents and the larger community are engaged in school activities; however, results from the parent survey suggest that parents' participation in school activities has been lower in the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years than in previous grant years. In interviews, school administrators highlighted the challenge of increasing parents' engagement in school activities and raising their expectations for students' academic outcomes, noting that some parents were resistant to schools' efforts to engage students in rigorous coursework.

## STAR PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

The STAR project includes partnerships with organizations that provide services aligned with GEAR UP's mission and goals. For the 2010-11 school year, STAR partner organizations included (1) the POC at TAMU-CC, (2) the Faculty Fellows mentoring program, (3) the College Board, and (4) FACE. The POC at TAMU-CC supports districts' implementation of GEAR UP by assisting with grant planning, providing information sessions and training, and coordinating grant activities with the university. Faculty Fellows provide mentoring services to secondary educators and model engaging instruction in the classroom. The College Board offers district staff professional development designed to support vertical alignment of districts' curricula and improve classroom instruction. FACE coordinates activities designed to increase fathers' involvement in their child's education through positive interactions and teambuilding exercises.

In 2010-11, partner organizations focused on building capacity to sustain STAR's focus on college readiness once grant funds expire in 2012. To this end, partners worked with district staff to develop sustainability plans and provide training in the use of student data to inform decision making. Leadership changes in some districts created challenges for partners whose services are delivered outside of the classroom setting when new administrators limited the amount of time students' and teachers' spent in activities outside of class.

## DISCUSSION

Across most indicators, measures of STAR implementation declined in 2010-11, and declines were most notable at middle schools. For some indicators, declines at the middle school started when the lead STAR cohort moved to high school for the 2008-09 school year. This result suggests that middle schools reduced their focus on STAR implementation when grant resources were spread across middle school and high school students. The overall declining trend at both levels of schooling also points to implementation fatigue. In interviews, school staff said that there was less of an emphasis on STAR in 2010-11 than in previous years, and project partners highlighted the challenge of keeping districts focused on implementation as the grant entered its final years.

While most indicators of implementation declined in 2010-11, STAR high schools continued to increase the numbers of students who participate in AP coursework and testing. Across grant years, STAR high schools have increased the percentage of students participating in advanced courses by $40 \%$ and increased the percentage of students participating in AP testing by more than $100 \%$. This trend is expected to continue in 2011-12 as the lead STAR cohort enters the twelfth grade. Although STAR high schools have been successful in improving students' participation in advanced courses and AP testing, they have not seen a corresponding increase in the percentage of students earning an AP test score of 3 or better. This suggests that STAR schools are not yet providing the level of instructional rigor needed to prepare students to be successful in college coursework.

## THE ONGOING EVALUATION

The evaluation of STAR will continue through the grant's final year (i.e., 2011-12). During the 2011-12 school year, the lead STAR cohort (i.e., seventh graders in 2006-07) will be in the twelfth grade and participating high schools will focus more intensely on activities designed to engage students and their parents in applying to postsecondary educational programs. The evaluation will focus on how these efforts may affect students' participation in postsecondary programs as well as how the full six-year implementation of STAR has shaped school and community cultures. In addition, the evaluation will consider the ongoing challenges districts encountered in improving the college readiness of students and the strategies they implemented to overcome challenges.
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Table A.1. Number of Respondents (Teachers, Counselors, Librarians) by School

| District/School | Number in Database | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { Completed } \end{gathered}$ | Response Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alice ISD |  |  |  |
| Adams Middle School | 64 | 62 | 96.8\% |
| Alice High School | 120 | 114 | 95.0\% |
| Brooks County ISD |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 28 | 28 | 100.0\% |
| Falfurrias High School | 35 | 35 | 100.0\% |
| Corpus Christi ISD |  |  |  |
| Driscoll Middle School | 43 | 43 | 100.0\% |
| Miller High School | 95 | 95 | 100.0\% |
| Kingsville ISD |  |  |  |
| Memorial Middle School | 39 | 39 | 100.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 78 | 69 | 88.5\% |
| Mathis ISD |  |  |  |
| athis Middle School | 21 | 21 | 100.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 40 | 37 | 92.5\% |
| Odem-Edroy ISD |  |  |  |
| Odem Junior High | 21 | 21 | 100.0\% |
| Odem High School | 30 | 26 | 86.7\% |
| Total | 615 | 590 | 95.9\% |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.2. Indicate the Position in Which You Currently Work

|  | Teacher |  | Counselor |  | Librarian |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campus | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias High School | 32 | $91.4 \%$ | 2 | $5.7 \%$ | 1 | $2.9 \%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 26 | $92.9 \%$ | 1 | $3.6 \%$ | 1 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Alice High School | 109 | $95.6 \%$ | 4 | $3.5 \%$ | 1 | $0.9 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School | 59 | $95.2 \%$ | 2 | $3.2 \%$ | 1 | $1.6 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | 64 | $92.8 \%$ | 4 | $5.8 \%$ | 1 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | 36 | $92.3 \%$ | 2 | $5.1 \%$ | 1 | $2.6 \%$ |
| Miller High School | 88 | $92.6 \%$ | 7 | $7.4 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | 40 | $93.0 \%$ | 2 | $4.7 \%$ | 1 | $2.3 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | 34 | $91.9 \%$ | 3 | $8.1 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | 20 | $95.2 \%$ | 1 | $4.8 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Odem High School | 24 | $92.3 \%$ | 1 | $3.8 \%$ | 1 | $3.8 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | 20 | $95.2 \%$ | 1 | $4.8 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{5 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 3 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 \%}$ |
| Sol |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.3. Grade Levels Respondents Work With

| Grades | Falfurrias High School |  | Falfurrias Junior High |  | Alice High School |  | Adams Middle School |  | H. M. King High School |  | Memorial Middle School |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Grade 6 | 2 | 5.7\% | 18 | 64.3\% | 1 | 0.9\% | 2 | 3.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Grade 7 | 2 | 5.7\% | 17 | 60.7\% | 2 | 1.8\% | 44 | 71.0\% | 1 | 1.4\% | 26 | 66.7\% |
| Grade 8 | 2 | 5.7\% | 19 | 67.9\% | 3 | 2.6\% | 43 | 69.4\% | 1 | 1.4\% | 26 | 66.7\% |
| Grade 9 | 25 | 71.4\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 83 | 72.8\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 52 | 75.4\% | 1 | 2.6\% |
| Grade 10 | 24 | 68.6\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 85 | 74.6\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 58 | 84.1\% | 1 | 2.6\% |
| Grade 11 | 28 | 80.0\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 85 | 74.6\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 59 | 85.5\% | 1 | 2.6\% |
| Grade 12 | 25 | 71.4\% | 1 | 3.6\% | 81 | 71.1\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 55 | 79.7\% | 1 | 2.6\% |

Table A.3. Grade Levels Respondents Work With (Continued)

| Grades | Miller High School |  | Driscoll Middle School |  | Mathis High School |  | Mathis Middle School |  | Odem High School |  | Odem Junior High |  | All Campuses |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Grade 6 | 2 | 2.1\% | 25 | 58.1\% | 1 | 2.7\% | 8 | 38.1\% | 1 | 3.8\% | 12 | 57.1\% | 72 | 12.2\% |
| Grade 7 | 2 | 2.1\% | 27 | 62.8\% | 2 | 5.4\% | 13 | 61.9\% | 5 | 19.2\% | 12 | 57.1\% | 153 | 25.9\% |
| Grade 8 | 3 | 3.2\% | 28 | 65.1\% | 2 | 5.4\% | 15 | 71.4\% | 7 | 26.9\% | 11 | 52.4\% | 160 | 27.1\% |
| Grade 9 | 77 | 81.1\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 27 | 73.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 22 | 84.6\% | 2 | 9.5\% | 292 | 49.5\% |
| Grade 10 | 83 | 87.4\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 29 | 78.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 23 | 88.5\% | 2 | 9.5\% | 308 | 52.2\% |
| Grade 11 | 81 | 85.3\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 28 | 75.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 20 | 76.9\% | 2 | 9.5\% | 307 | 52.0\% |
| Grade 12 | 78 | 82.1\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 27 | 73.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 19 | 73.1\% | 2 | 9.5\% | 291 | 49.3\% |

Note. Percentages will not total to $100 \%$. Some respondents work with multiple grade levels.
Table A.4. If You Are a Teacher, What Is Your Primary Teaching Assignment?
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline & & & \begin{array}{c}\text { English language } \\ \text { arts, reading }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Social studies, } \\ \text { social science }\end{array} & \text { Self-contained }\end{array}\right)$

Table A.5. Years Employed in This Position and Years Working at This School

| Campus | Years Employed in Current Position |  | Years Employed in Current Position at This School |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Mean | N | Mean |
| Falfurrias High School | 35 | 13.5 | 35 | 9.0 |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 28 | 11.1 | 28 | 8.4 |
| Alice High School | 113 | 11.4 | 114 | 7.2 |
| Adams Middle School | 62 | 8.3 | 61 | 5.5 |
| H. M. King High School | 69 | 10.9 | 69 | 7.1 |
| Memorial Middle School | 39 | 11.8 | 39 | 7.1 |
| Miller High School | 95 | 8.8 | 95 | 5.8 |
| Driscoll Middle School | 43 | 10.8 | 43 | 7.3 |
| Mathis High School | 37 | 10.8 | 37 | 4.5 |
| Mathis Middle School | 21 | 9.9 | 21 | 7.5 |
| Odem High School | 26 | 13.9 | 26 | 6.7 |
| Odem Junior High | 21 | 9.4 | 21 | 4.6 |
| Total | 589 | 10.6 | 589 | 6.7 |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.6. Ethnicity of Respondents

| Campus | African <br> American | Hispanic, <br> Latino | White, Anglo | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Falfurrias High School (N=35) | $2.9 \%$ | $82.9 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High (N=28) | $0.0 \%$ | $82.1 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Alice High School (N=114) | $0.9 \%$ | $58.6 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School (N=62) | $3.2 \%$ | $54.8 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | $4.3 \%$ | $62.3 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School (N=39) | $0.0 \%$ | $71.8 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ | $5.1 \%$ |
| Miller High School (N=95) | $7.4 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School (N=43) | $7.0 \%$ | $55.8 \%$ | $34.9 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Mathis High School (N=37) | $0.0 \%$ | $54.1 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School (N=21) | $0.0 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $38.1 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Odem High School (N=26) | $3.8 \%$ | $42.3 \%$ | $46.2 \%$ | $7.7 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High (N=21) | $0.0 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| All Campuses (N=590) | $\mathbf{3 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 9 \%}$ |
| Soll |  |  |  |  |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.

Table A.7. Gender of Respondents

| Campus | Male | Female |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Falfurrias High School (N=35) | $34.3 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High (N=28) | $25.0 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ |
| Alice High School (N=114) | $39.3 \%$ | $60.7 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School (N=62) | $24.2 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | $42.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School (N=39) | $34.2 \%$ | $65.8 \%$ |
| Miller High School (N=95) | $54.7 \%$ | $45.3 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School (N=43) | $14.0 \%$ | $86.0 \%$ |
| Mathis High School (N=37) | $43.2 \%$ | $56.8 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School (N=21) | $33.3 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| Odem High School (N=26) | $34.6 \%$ | $65.4 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High (N=21) | $38.1 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ |
| All Campuses (N=590) | $\mathbf{3 7 . 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 . 9 \%}$ |
| S |  |  |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.8. What Is Your Highest Educational Attainment?

|  | Enrolled in <br> Bachelors <br> degree | Enrolled in <br> coursework | Masters degree | doctoral <br> coursework | Doctorate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements

| Campus | Teachers in this school share an understanding about how Advanced Placement (AP) strategies may be used to enhance learning. |  |  |  |  | The principal consults with staff before making decisions that may affect our ability to work in vertical teams. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 17.1\% | 60.0\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 68.6\% | 22.9\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 14.3\% | 71.4\% | 7.1\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 64.3\% | 25.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 1.8\% | 8.8\% | 36.0\% | 48.2\% | 5.3\% | 7.0\% | 24.6\% | 38.6\% | 27.2\% | 2.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 1.6\% | 9.7\% | 24.2\% | 51.6\% | 12.9\% | 1.6\% | 17.7\% | 21.0\% | 38.7\% | 21.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 4.3\% | 17.4\% | 31.9\% | 42.0\% | 4.3\% | 4.3\% | 29.0\% | 24.6\% | 37.7\% | 4.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 5.1\% | 7.7\% | 12.8\% | 61.5\% | 12.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.1\% | 66.7\% | 28.2\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 1.1\% | 8.4\% | 23.2\% | 60.0\% | 7.4\% | 2.1\% | 12.6\% | 25.3\% | 49.5\% | 10.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 14.0\% | 72.1\% | 11.6\% | 7.0\% | 7.0\% | 20.9\% | 48.8\% | 16.3\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 21.6\% | 51.4\% | 18.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.2\% | 45.9\% | 37.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 61.9\% | 19.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 66.7\% | 19.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 11.5\% | 65.4\% | 11.5\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 23.1\% | 50.0\% | 19.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 81.0\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 61.9\% | 33.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 2.2\% | 8.6\% | 23.1\% | 56.8\% | 9.3\% | 3.2\% | 12.9\% | 21.9\% | 46.4\% | 15.6\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | In this school, there are clear expectations that all students will be prepared for postsecondary educational opportunities. |  |  |  |  | I incorporate information about college readiness into my content-area lessons. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 5.7\% | 60.0\% | 31.4\% | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 0.0\% | 62.9\% | 31.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 3.6\% | 67.9\% | 17.9\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 10.7\% | 64.3\% | 21.4\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 5.3\% | 18.4\% | 18.4\% | 52.6\% | 5.3\% | 0.9\% | 4.4\% | 8.8\% | 64.0\% | 21.9\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 1.6\% | 9.7\% | 11.3\% | 59.7\% | 17.7\% | 1.6\% | 3.2\% | 6.5\% | 66.1\% | 22.6\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 1.4\% | 18.8\% | 10.1\% | 56.5\% | 13.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 4.3\% | 68.1\% | 24.6\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 7.7\% | 7.7\% | 56.4\% | 25.6\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 7.7\% | 61.5\% | 25.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 1.1\% | 11.6\% | 9.5\% | 54.7\% | 23.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 68.4\% | 25.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 2.3\% | 51.2\% | 39.5\% | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 67.4\% | 30.2\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.4\% | 54.1\% | 37.8\% | 0.0\% | 5.4\% | 2.7\% | 59.5\% | 32.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 61.9\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 61.9\% | 33.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 19.2\% | 65.4\% | 11.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 19.2\% | 53.8\% | 26.9\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 61.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 85.7\% | 14.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 2.0\% | 10.5\% | 10.2\% | 56.8\% | 20.5\% | 0.7\% | 2.5\% | 6.1\% | 65.4\% | 25.3\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas. |  |  |  |  | The principal in my school actively encourages teachers to pursue professional development geared towards AP strategies and vertical teaming. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 11.4\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 51.4\% | 40.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 78.6\% | 10.7\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 60.7\% | 21.4\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 0.0\% | 6.1\% | 15.8\% | 66.7\% | 11.4\% | 4.4\% | 13.2\% | 30.7\% | 45.6\% | 6.1\% |
| Adams Middle School (N=62) | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 11.3\% | 61.3\% | 19.4\% | 1.6\% | 12.9\% | 22.6\% | 45.2\% | 17.7\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 0.0\% | 10.1\% | 14.5\% | 62.3\% | 13.0\% | 7.2\% | 29.0\% | 27.5\% | 29.0\% | 7.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 12.8\% | 64.1\% | 17.9\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 10.3\% | 53.8\% | 30.8\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 13.7\% | 60.0\% | 26.3\% | 1.1\% | 8.4\% | 32.6\% | 46.3\% | 11.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 65.1\% | 27.9\% | 4.7\% | 9.3\% | 16.3\% | 41.9\% | 27.9\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.4\% | 67.6\% | 24.3\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 8.1\% | 51.4\% | 37.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 61.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 19.0\% | 61.9\% | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 11.5\% | 65.4\% | 11.5\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 23.1\% | 50.0\% | 19.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 71.4\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 57.1\% | 42.9\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 0.5\% | 4.6\% | 11.5\% | 64.4\% | 19.0\% | 2.9\% | 10.2\% | 21.9\% | 46.6\% | 18.5\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Teachers are not afraid to learn about new educational approaches and use them with their class(es). |  |  |  |  | I have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in my classes. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 11.4\% | 11.4\% | 62.9\% | 14.3\% | 2.9\% | 22.9\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 14.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 64.3\% | 25.0\% | 3.6\% | 32.1\% | 14.3\% | 46.4\% | 3.6\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 0.9\% | 2.6\% | 30.7\% | 56.1\% | 9.6\% | 8.8\% | 33.3\% | 20.2\% | 29.8\% | 7.9\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 1.6\% | 9.7\% | 8.1\% | 61.3\% | 19.4\% | 4.8\% | 21.0\% | 16.1\% | 51.6\% | 6.5\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 2.9\% | 13.0\% | 15.9\% | 55.1\% | 13.0\% | 8.7\% | 42.0\% | 17.4\% | 21.7\% | 10.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 12.8\% | 66.7\% | 17.9\% | 5.1\% | 10.3\% | 17.9\% | 59.0\% | 7.7\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 14.7\% | 66.3\% | 15.8\% | 4.2\% | 29.5\% | 15.8\% | 40.0\% | 10.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 11.6\% | 58.1\% | 27.9\% | 7.0\% | 20.9\% | 20.9\% | 32.6\% | 18.6\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 13.5\% | 59.5\% | 24.3\% | 5.4\% | 13.5\% | 16.2\% | 48.6\% | 16.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 66.7\% | 14.3\% | 4.8\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 52.4\% | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 15.4\% | 65.4\% | 11.5\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 30.8\% | 53.8\% | 7.7\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 47.6\% | 47.6\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 14.3\% | 52.4\% | 19.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 1.0\% | 5.3\% | 15.8\% | 60.5\% | 17.5\% | 5.9\% | 25.3\% | 18.1\% | 40.2\% | 10.5\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Parents support our school's emphasis on college readiness. |  |  |  |  | The principal is an effective leader for vertical teams in this school. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 2.9\% | 20.0\% | 22.9\% | 45.7\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 54.3\% | 37.1\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 7.1\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 42.9\% | 7.1\% | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 75.0\% | 14.3\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 4.4\% | 21.9\% | 40.4\% | 30.7\% | 2.6\% | 6.1\% | 9.6\% | 40.4\% | 39.5\% | 4.4\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 9.7\% | 16.1\% | 17.7\% | 50.0\% | 6.5\% | 3.2\% | 12.9\% | 17.7\% | 40.3\% | 25.8\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 2.9\% | 24.6\% | 23.2\% | 43.5\% | 5.8\% | 4.3\% | 24.6\% | 30.4\% | 33.3\% | 7.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 15.4\% | 23.1\% | 48.7\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.1\% | 64.1\% | 30.8\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 6.3\% | 21.1\% | 26.3\% | 42.1\% | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 8.4\% | 24.2\% | 49.5\% | 13.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 16.3\% | 20.9\% | 46.5\% | 14.0\% | 4.7\% | 4.7\% | 16.3\% | 37.2\% | 37.2\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 8.1\% | 2.7\% | 37.8\% | 40.5\% | 10.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 2.7\% | 56.8\% | 37.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 47.6\% | 19.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 71.4\% | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 7.7\% | 3.8\% | 19.2\% | 61.5\% | 7.7\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 15.4\% | 61.5\% | 15.4\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 19.0\% | 52.4\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 52.4\% | 47.6\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 5.1\% | 17.3\% | 27.1\% | 43.2\% | 7.3\% | 3.4\% | 8.6\% | 20.3\% | 48.1\% | 19.5\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Overall, considering the uses of vertical teams in my school today, I am confident that this use is leading to increased student achievement. |  |  |  |  | The principal encourages teachers to be innovative and try new methods. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 22.9\% | 54.3\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 51.4\% | 48.6\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 21.4\% | 57.1\% | 14.3\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 60.7\% | 32.1\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 3.5\% | 20.2\% | 40.4\% | 31.6\% | 4.4\% | 6.1\% | 10.5\% | 21.9\% | 52.6\% | 8.8\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 3.2\% | 6.5\% | 24.2\% | 53.2\% | 12.9\% | 1.6\% | 9.7\% | 4.8\% | 51.6\% | 32.3\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 1.4\% | 17.4\% | 31.9\% | 40.6\% | 8.7\% | 0.0\% | 15.9\% | 13.0\% | 55.1\% | 15.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 69.2\% | 15.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.1\% | 51.3\% | 43.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 3.2\% | 5.3\% | 28.4\% | 50.5\% | 12.6\% | 4.2\% | 6.3\% | 15.8\% | 51.6\% | 22.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School (N=43) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 18.6\% | 58.1\% | 23.3\% | 2.3\% | 7.0\% | 11.6\% | 39.5\% | 39.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 13.5\% | 70.3\% | 13.5\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 2.7\% | 56.8\% | 37.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 71.4\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 76.2\% | 19.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 26.9\% | 61.5\% | 7.7\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.5\% | 65.4\% | 19.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 61.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 38.1\% | 57.1\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 2.0\% | 8.6\% | 26.1\% | 51.2\% | 12.0\% | 2.5\% | 6.6\% | 11.2\% | 53.1\% | 26.6\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to parents and the community. |  |  |  |  | The principal is willing to support--through funding or manpower--teachers' efforts at vertical teaming. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 11.4\% | 25.7\% | 48.6\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 62.9\% | 22.9\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 53.6\% | 28.6\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 75.0\% | 17.9\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 38.6\% | 48.2\% | 6.1\% | 5.3\% | 9.6\% | 39.5\% | 40.4\% | 5.3\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 1.6\% | 12.9\% | 16.1\% | 48.4\% | 21.0\% | 3.2\% | 11.3\% | 17.7\% | 46.8\% | 21.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 8.7\% | 17.4\% | 36.2\% | 27.5\% | 10.1\% | 4.3\% | 14.5\% | 33.3\% | 42.0\% | 5.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 10.3\% | 12.8\% | 61.5\% | 12.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 71.8\% | 25.6\% |
| Miller High School (N=95) | 3.2\% | 6.3\% | 28.4\% | 53.7\% | 8.4\% | 2.1\% | 5.3\% | 27.4\% | 53.7\% | 11.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 11.6\% | 60.5\% | 25.6\% | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 20.9\% | 46.5\% | 25.6\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 24.3\% | 43.2\% | 24.3\% | 0.0\% | 5.4\% | 10.8\% | 56.8\% | 27.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 61.9\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 76.2\% | 9.5\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 19.2\% | 46.2\% | 30.8\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 15.4\% | 53.8\% | 23.1\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 9.5\% | 42.9\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 52.4\% | 47.6\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 2.9\% | 7.8\% | 25.4\% | 48.6\% | 15.3\% | 2.7\% | 6.4\% | 22.4\% | 52.2\% | 16.3\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Teachers receive adequate administrative support to incorporate vertical teams. |  |  |  |  | Teachers and administrators rely on research-proven teaching and learning principles in making decisions about instruction. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly <br> Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.7\% | 48.6\% | 25.7\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 5.7\% | 62.9\% | 22.9\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 57.1\% | 25.0\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 78.6\% | 14.3\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 3.5\% | 21.1\% | 39.5\% | 35.1\% | 0.9\% | 1.8\% | 10.5\% | 28.1\% | 54.4\% | 5.3\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 4.8\% | 11.3\% | 19.4\% | 46.8\% | 17.7\% | 3.2\% | 6.5\% | 19.4\% | 54.8\% | 16.1\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 4.3\% | 26.1\% | 23.2\% | 42.0\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 8.7\% | 27.5\% | 49.3\% | 14.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 69.2\% | 20.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 74.4\% | 15.4\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 1.1\% | 9.5\% | 20.0\% | 55.8\% | 13.7\% | 0.0\% | 7.4\% | 9.5\% | 70.5\% | 12.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 20.9\% | 48.8\% | 23.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 72.1\% | 20.9\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 10.8\% | 16.2\% | 45.9\% | 27.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.2\% | 56.8\% | 27.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 19.0\% | 71.4\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 76.2\% | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 19.2\% | 53.8\% | 19.2\% | 0.0\% | 7.7\% | 15.4\% | 61.5\% | 15.4\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 57.1\% | 38.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 57.1\% | 33.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 2.2\% | 11.5\% | 22.5\% | 49.2\% | 14.6\% | 0.8\% | 5.9\% | 16.1\% | 62.0\% | 15.1\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | When our school has professional development focused on vertical teams, the principal often participates. |  |  |  |  | The surrounding community actively supports our emphasis on college readiness. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 17.1\% | 54.3\% | 22.9\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 22.9\% | 51.4\% | 5.7\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 17.9\% | 50.0\% | 21.4\% | 3.6\% | 14.3\% | 32.1\% | 46.4\% | 3.6\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 4.4\% | 22.8\% | 43.0\% | 28.1\% | 1.8\% | 4.4\% | 23.7\% | 30.7\% | 38.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 8.1\% | 14.5\% | 24.2\% | 40.3\% | 12.9\% | 8.1\% | 12.9\% | 22.6\% | 48.4\% | 8.1\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 5.8\% | 34.8\% | 30.4\% | 20.3\% | 8.7\% | 4.3\% | 20.3\% | 23.2\% | 42.0\% | 10.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 15.4\% | 69.2\% | 12.8\% | 0.0\% | 17.9\% | 28.2\% | 35.9\% | 17.9\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 5.3\% | 11.6\% | 18.9\% | 50.5\% | 13.7\% | 3.2\% | 12.6\% | 26.3\% | 50.5\% | 7.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 14.0\% | 55.8\% | 25.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.6\% | 53.5\% | 20.9\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 8.1\% | 13.5\% | 48.6\% | 29.7\% | 2.7\% | 10.8\% | 18.9\% | 48.6\% | 18.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 76.2\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 38.1\% | 47.6\% | 4.8\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 19.2\% | 53.8\% | 15.4\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 26.9\% | 57.7\% | 7.7\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 61.9\% | 23.8\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 19.0\% | 61.9\% | 14.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 3.7\% | 13.9\% | 24.1\% | 44.7\% | 13.6\% | 3.2\% | 14.7\% | 26.3\% | 46.6\% | 9.2\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | Teachers in this school are generally supportive of vertical teaming efforts. |  |  |  |  | This school provides a variety of opportunities for parent involvement. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 11.4\% | 5.7\% | 71.4\% | 11.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 71.4\% | 20.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 71.4\% | 10.7\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 64.3\% | 21.4\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 0.9\% | 7.0\% | 28.9\% | 59.6\% | 3.5\% | 0.9\% | 5.3\% | 25.4\% | 58.8\% | 9.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 4.8\% | 3.2\% | 12.9\% | 64.5\% | 14.5\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 6.5\% | 59.7\% | 29.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 0.0\% | 10.1\% | 30.4\% | 52.2\% | 7.2\% | 1.4\% | 18.8\% | 21.7\% | 49.3\% | 8.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 12.8\% | 74.4\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 61.5\% | 28.2\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 14.7\% | 71.6\% | 10.5\% | 0.0\% | 2.1\% | 7.4\% | 61.1\% | 29.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.3\% | 58.1\% | 25.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 51.2\% | 48.8\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 13.5\% | 70.3\% | 16.2\% | 0.0\% | 10.8\% | 10.8\% | 59.5\% | 18.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 71.4\% | 19.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 71.4\% | 19.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 15.4\% | 69.2\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 73.1\% | 15.4\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 66.7\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 57.1\% | 33.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 1.0\% | 4.7\% | 17.6\% | 65.1\% | 11.5\% | 0.5\% | 5.4\% | 12.2\% | 59.8\% | 22.0\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

| Campus | GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to staff. |  |  |  |  | I am aware of an advisory committee that assists with GEAR UP implementation. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree | Strongly <br> Disagree | Disagree | Unsure | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 0.0\% | 17.1\% | 17.1\% | 54.3\% | 11.4\% | 5.7\% | 28.6\% | 5.7\% | 51.4\% | 8.6\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 60.7\% | 21.4\% | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 32.1\% | 46.4\% | 10.7\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 2.6\% | 13.2\% | 21.1\% | 56.1\% | 7.0\% | 3.5\% | 20.2\% | 28.1\% | 43.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 3.2\% | 16.1\% | 12.9\% | 46.8\% | 21.0\% | 6.5\% | 11.3\% | 24.2\% | 41.9\% | 16.1\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 8.7\% | 29.0\% | 24.6\% | 30.4\% | 7.2\% | 10.1\% | 26.1\% | 31.9\% | 27.5\% | 4.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School (N=39) | 0.0\% | 5.1\% | 15.4\% | 61.5\% | 17.9\% | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 12.8\% | 61.5\% | 15.4\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 4.2\% | 15.8\% | 14.7\% | 54.7\% | 10.5\% | 6.3\% | 13.7\% | 18.9\% | 53.7\% | 7.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 4.7\% | 55.8\% | 32.6\% | 0.0\% | 7.0\% | 14.0\% | 55.8\% | 23.3\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 0.0\% | 13.5\% | 13.5\% | 48.6\% | 24.3\% | 0.0\% | 13.5\% | 18.9\% | 43.2\% | 24.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 14.3\% | 66.7\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 61.9\% | 4.8\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 7.7\% | 61.5\% | 23.1\% | 3.8\% | 3.8\% | 34.6\% | 46.2\% | 11.5\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 61.9\% | 23.8\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 57.1\% | 23.8\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 3.1\% | 13.7\% | 15.4\% | 52.7\% | 15.1\% | 4.4\% | 15.1\% | 22.4\% | 46.9\% | 11.2\% |

Table A.9. Extent of Agreement With Each of the Following Statements (Continued)

Table A.10. How Often Do You Provide Students With Counseling or Advice About the Following?

| Campus | Recommended high school program or distinguished achievement program |  |  |  |  | Post-secondary admissions requirements |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 2.9\% | 14.3\% | 37.1\% | 40.0\% | 5.7\% | 5.7\% | 8.6\% | 28.6\% | 48.6\% | 8.6\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 21.4\% | 17.9\% | 39.3\% | 21.4\% | 0.0\% | 17.9\% | 28.6\% | 35.7\% | 14.3\% | 3.6\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 7.9\% | 20.2\% | 37.7\% | 30.7\% | 3.5\% | 3.5\% | 11.4\% | 42.1\% | 36.8\% | 6.1\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 6.5\% | 17.7\% | 45.2\% | 25.8\% | 4.8\% | 6.5\% | 19.4\% | 45.2\% | 24.2\% | 4.8\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 10.1\% | 29.0\% | 29.0\% | 23.2\% | 8.7\% | 4.3\% | 26.1\% | 29.0\% | 29.0\% | 11.6\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 12.8\% | 56.4\% | 28.2\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 23.1\% | 48.7\% | 25.6\% | 2.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 6.3\% | 17.9\% | 37.9\% | 32.6\% | 5.3\% | 2.1\% | 10.5\% | 32.6\% | 48.4\% | 6.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 4.7\% | 11.6\% | 27.9\% | 46.5\% | 9.3\% | 11.6\% | 11.6\% | 23.3\% | 51.2\% | 2.3\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 5.4\% | 8.1\% | 37.8\% | 37.8\% | 10.8\% | 2.7\% | 8.1\% | 21.6\% | 51.4\% | 16.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 47.6\% | 33.3\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 4.8\% | 42.9\% | 42.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 3.8\% | 11.5\% | 42.3\% | 34.6\% | 7.7\% | 7.7\% | 11.5\% | 38.5\% | 34.6\% | 7.7\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 42.9\% | 23.8\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 42.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 6.9\% | 17.6\% | 38.8\% | 31.2\% | 5.4\% | 5.6\% | 14.9\% | 35.9\% | 37.1\% | 6.4\% |

Table A.10. How Often Do You Provide Students With Counseling or Advice About the Following? (Continued)

| Campus | Post-secondary financial aid, scholarships, or college applications |  |  |  |  | ACT/SAT preparation/testing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 5.7\% | 17.1\% | 31.4\% | 40.0\% | 5.7\% | 2.9\% | 20.0\% | 48.6\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 28.6\% | 21.4\% | 17.9\% | 28.6\% | 3.6\% | 25.0\% | 39.3\% | 25.0\% | 10.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 3.5\% | 14.9\% | 41.2\% | 36.8\% | 3.5\% | 8.8\% | 17.5\% | 37.7\% | 32.5\% | 3.5\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 9.7\% | 29.0\% | 35.5\% | 22.6\% | 3.2\% | 11.3\% | 37.1\% | 30.6\% | 17.7\% | 3.2\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 7.2\% | 30.4\% | 21.7\% | 29.0\% | 11.6\% | 11.6\% | 24.6\% | 23.2\% | 30.4\% | 10.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 23.1\% | 56.4\% | 15.4\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 25.6\% | 59.0\% | 12.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 2.1\% | 16.8\% | 28.4\% | 44.2\% | 8.4\% | 4.2\% | 15.8\% | 43.2\% | 33.7\% | 3.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 14.0\% | 16.3\% | 32.6\% | 34.9\% | 2.3\% | 20.9\% | 32.6\% | 30.2\% | 14.0\% | 2.3\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 5.4\% | 8.1\% | 18.9\% | 48.6\% | 18.9\% | 10.8\% | 8.1\% | 21.6\% | 43.2\% | 16.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 19.0\% | 47.6\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 19.0\% | 42.9\% | 23.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 15.4\% | 19.2\% | 23.1\% | 23.1\% | 19.2\% | 15.4\% | 30.8\% | 15.4\% | 30.8\% | 7.7\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 61.9\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 66.7\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 7.5\% | 19.5\% | 33.7\% | 32.7\% | 6.6\% | 10.3\% | 22.9\% | 36.3\% | 26.3\% | 4.2\% |

Table A.10. How Often Do You Provide Students With Counseling or Advice About the Following? (Continued)

| Campus | Career counseling |  |  |  |  | Vocational and technical programs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 8.6\% | 25.7\% | 17.1\% | 48.6\% | 0.0\% | 8.6\% | 25.7\% | 22.9\% | 40.0\% | 2.9\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 10.7\% | 21.4\% | 42.9\% | 17.9\% | 7.1\% | 10.7\% | 25.0\% | 39.3\% | 14.3\% | 10.7\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 7.0\% | 18.4\% | 34.2\% | 34.2\% | 6.1\% | 7.0\% | 19.3\% | 32.5\% | 31.6\% | 9.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 9.7\% | 33.9\% | 33.9\% | 16.1\% | 6.5\% | 11.3\% | 35.5\% | 29.0\% | 17.7\% | 6.5\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 1.4\% | 20.3\% | 39.1\% | 24.6\% | 14.5\% | 7.2\% | 26.1\% | 29.0\% | 23.2\% | 14.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 5.1\% | 17.9\% | 48.7\% | 23.1\% | 5.1\% | 5.1\% | 12.8\% | 51.3\% | 28.2\% | 2.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 2.1\% | 10.5\% | 32.6\% | 43.2\% | 11.6\% | 4.2\% | 11.6\% | 31.6\% | 35.8\% | 16.8\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 9.3\% | 23.3\% | 27.9\% | 27.9\% | 11.6\% | 7.0\% | 23.3\% | 34.9\% | 25.6\% | 9.3\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 2.7\% | 10.8\% | 27.0\% | 43.2\% | 16.2\% | 8.1\% | 2.7\% | 37.8\% | 29.7\% | 21.6\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 23.8\% | 38.1\% | 28.6\% | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 14.3\% | 52.4\% | 19.0\% | 4.8\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 7.7\% | 11.5\% | 26.9\% | 42.3\% | 11.5\% | 7.7\% | 23.1\% | 26.9\% | 30.8\% | 11.5\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 19.0\% | 4.8\% | 57.1\% | 19.0\% | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 14.3\% | 57.1\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 6.3\% | 18.8\% | 34.6\% | 31.7\% | 8.6\% | 7.8\% | 19.8\% | 34.4\% | 27.5\% | 10.5\% |

Table A.11. How Often Do You Provide Parents With Counseling or Advice About the Following?

| Campus | Recommended high school program or distinguished achievement program |  |  |  |  | Post-secondary admissions requirements |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School (N=35) | 11.4\% | 45.7\% | 34.3\% | 8.6\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 37.1\% | 37.1\% | 11.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 32.1\% | 39.3\% | 21.4\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 39.3\% | 17.9\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 21.9\% | 40.4\% | 27.2\% | 8.8\% | 1.8\% | 22.8\% | 35.1\% | 28.9\% | 11.4\% | 1.8\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 17.7\% | 40.3\% | 32.3\% | 9.7\% | 0.0\% | 17.7\% | 40.3\% | 30.6\% | 11.3\% | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 31.9\% | 24.6\% | 31.9\% | 8.7\% | 2.9\% | 31.9\% | 20.3\% | 34.8\% | 10.1\% | 2.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 12.8\% | 41.0\% | 41.0\% | 5.1\% | 0.0\% | 23.1\% | 43.6\% | 25.6\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 16.8\% | 31.6\% | 34.7\% | 12.6\% | 4.2\% | 13.7\% | 33.7\% | 33.7\% | 17.9\% | 1.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 20.9\% | 30.2\% | 25.6\% | 16.3\% | 7.0\% | 23.3\% | 30.2\% | 30.2\% | 16.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 21.6\% | 27.0\% | 24.3\% | 27.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.2\% | 27.0\% | 32.4\% | 21.6\% | 2.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 19.0\% | 33.3\% | 23.8\% | 23.8\% | 0.0\% | 23.8\% | 28.6\% | 23.8\% | 23.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 23.1\% | 26.9\% | 30.8\% | 19.2\% | 0.0\% | 19.2\% | 23.1\% | 26.9\% | 30.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 38.1\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 33.3\% | 38.1\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 21.0\% | 34.7\% | 30.7\% | 11.7\% | 1.9\% | 21.0\% | 32.9\% | 30.7\% | 14.4\% | 1.0\% |

Table A.11. How Often Do You Provide Parents With Counseling or Advice About the Following? (Continued)

| Campus | Post-secondary financial aid, scholarships, or college applications |  |  |  |  | ACT/SAT preparation/testing |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometime S | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometime s | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 17.1\% | 28.6\% | 40.0\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 37.1\% | 31.4\% | 11.4\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 39.3\% | 32.1\% | 25.0\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% | 42.9\% | 39.3\% | 14.3\% | 3.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 23.7\% | 33.3\% | 31.6\% | 9.6\% | 1.8\% | 25.4\% | 37.7\% | 28.1\% | 7.0\% | 1.8\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 19.4\% | 41.9\% | 27.4\% | 11.3\% | 0.0\% | 22.6\% | 45.2\% | 22.6\% | 9.7\% | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 34.8\% | 23.2\% | 27.5\% | 10.1\% | 4.3\% | 37.7\% | 24.6\% | 21.7\% | 14.5\% | 1.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 23.1\% | 38.5\% | 30.8\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 51.3\% | 30.8\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 14.7\% | 31.6\% | 31.6\% | 18.9\% | 3.2\% | 20.0\% | 33.7\% | 31.6\% | 12.6\% | 2.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 25.6\% | 34.9\% | 23.3\% | 16.3\% | 0.0\% | 27.9\% | 37.2\% | 27.9\% | 7.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 18.9\% | 21.6\% | 29.7\% | 27.0\% | 2.7\% | 21.6\% | 21.6\% | 32.4\% | 18.9\% | 5.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 28.6\% | 33.3\% | 19.0\% | 19.0\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 38.1\% | 23.8\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 23.1\% | 30.8\% | 19.2\% | 26.9\% | 0.0\% | 23.1\% | 38.5\% | 15.4\% | 23.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 28.6\% | 33.3\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 23.4\% | 32.0\% | 29.2\% | 13.9\% | 1.5\% | 25.6\% | 35.9\% | 26.8\% | 10.5\% | 1.2\% |

Table A.11. How Often Do You Provide Parents With Counseling or Advice About the Following? (Continued)

| Campus | Career counseling |  |  |  |  | Vocational and technical programs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost every day |
| Falfurrias High School (N=35) | 20.0\% | 34.3\% | 31.4\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 37.1\% | 25.7\% | 17.1\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 32.1\% | 32.1\% | 28.6\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 32.1\% | 25.0\% | 32.1\% | 10.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 26.3\% | 36.8\% | 25.4\% | 9.6\% | 1.8\% | 23.7\% | 35.1\% | 28.1\% | 9.6\% | 3.5\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 17.7\% | 48.4\% | 25.8\% | 6.5\% | 1.6\% | 21.0\% | 45.2\% | 29.0\% | 3.2\% | 1.6\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 31.9\% | 23.2\% | 26.1\% | 15.9\% | 2.9\% | 29.0\% | 26.1\% | 26.1\% | 13.0\% | 5.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 17.9\% | 41.0\% | 33.3\% | 5.1\% | 2.6\% | 17.9\% | 38.5\% | 41.0\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 15.8\% | 30.5\% | 27.4\% | 20.0\% | 6.3\% | 15.8\% | 27.4\% | 32.6\% | 20.0\% | 4.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 27.9\% | 32.6\% | 20.9\% | 14.0\% | 4.7\% | 23.3\% | 34.9\% | 25.6\% | 11.6\% | 4.7\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 18.9\% | 24.3\% | 29.7\% | 27.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.2\% | 24.3\% | 27.0\% | 29.7\% | 2.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 19.0\% | 33.3\% | 23.8\% | 19.0\% | 4.8\% | 19.0\% | 38.1\% | 23.8\% | 14.3\% | 4.8\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 26.9\% | 23.1\% | 23.1\% | 23.1\% | 3.8\% | 19.2\% | 26.9\% | 26.9\% | 23.1\% | 3.8\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 42.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 23.8\% | 42.9\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 23.1\% | 33.4\% | 27.3\% | 13.6\% | 2.7\% | 21.7\% | 33.1\% | 29.3\% | 12.9\% | 3.1\% |

Table A.12. Responses to Statements Regarding Vertical Teams

| Campus | I have attended or will attend a vertical teaming training this year. |  | My school requires that I participate in vertical team training. |  | My school provides release time or paid time to participate in vertical team training. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 48.6\% | 51.4\% | 45.7\% | 54.3\% | 28.6\% | 71.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 28.6\% | 71.4\% | 25.0\% | 75.0\% | 10.7\% | 89.3\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 45.6\% | 54.4\% | 51.8\% | 48.2\% | 47.4\% | 52.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 46.8\% | 53.2\% | 41.9\% | 58.1\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 55.1\% | 44.9\% | 56.5\% | 43.5\% | 55.1\% | 44.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 25.6\% | 74.4\% | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 20.5\% | 79.5\% |
| Miller High School (N=95) | 22.1\% | 77.9\% | 25.3\% | 74.7\% | 24.2\% | 75.8\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 97.7\% | 2.3\% | 97.7\% | 7.0\% | 93.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 29.7\% | 70.3\% | 29.7\% | 70.3\% | 27.0\% | 73.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 42.9\% | 57.1\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 42.3\% | 57.7\% | 57.7\% | 42.3\% | 23.1\% | 76.9\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 23.8\% | 76.2\% | 23.8\% | 76.2\% | 23.8\% | 76.2\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 35.9\% | 64.1\% | 38.3\% | 61.7\% | 33.1\% | 66.9\% |

Table A.12. Responses to Statements Regarding Vertical Teams (Continued)

| Campus | My school provides release time or paid time to <br> participate in vertical team planning. | My school provides release time or paid time <br> for team Curriculum Writing. |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  |  |  |
|  | $42.9 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | No | Yes |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.13. How Frequently During the School Year Did Your Vertical Team Meet This Year?

| Campus | At least once a week | At least once a month | 1-2 times a semester | 1-2 times a year | We have never had a meeting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 2.9\% | 22.9\% | 25.7\% | 17.1\% | 31.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 10.7\% | 21.4\% | 39.3\% | 21.4\% | 7.1\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 8.8\% | 7.0\% | 7.9\% | 38.6\% | 37.7\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 1.6\% | 6.5\% | 16.1\% | 41.9\% | 33.9\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 18.8\% | 5.8\% | 10.1\% | 20.3\% | 44.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 38.5\% | 5.1\% | 20.5\% | 20.5\% | 15.4\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 5.3\% | 15.8\% | 26.3\% | 40.0\% | 12.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 25.6\% | 27.9\% | 44.2\% | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 10.8\% | 18.9\% | 13.5\% | 40.5\% | 16.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 19.0\% | 9.5\% | 19.0\% | 23.8\% | 28.6\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 15.4\% | 50.0\% | 19.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 38.1\% | 14.3\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 9.8\% | 12.5\% | 18.6\% | 34.2\% | 24.7\% |

Table A.14. To What Extent Have Each of the Following Been a Challenge in Implementing Vertical Teams in Your School?

| Campus | Time/scheduling constraints |  |  |  | Inadequate leadership or guidance |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all |
| Falfurrias High School (N=35) | 48.6\% | 31.4\% | 5.7\% | 14.3\% | 11.4\% | 22.9\% | 37.1\% | 28.6\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 57.1\% | 21.4\% | 21.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 17.9\% | 21.4\% | 60.7\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 44.7\% | 29.8\% | 14.9\% | 10.5\% | 23.7\% | 31.6\% | 26.3\% | 18.4\% |
| Adams Middle School (N=62) | 46.8\% | 29.0\% | 16.1\% | 8.1\% | 11.3\% | 24.2\% | 32.3\% | 32.3\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 46.4\% | 20.3\% | 15.9\% | 17.4\% | 36.2\% | 20.3\% | 26.1\% | 17.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 33.3\% | 17.9\% | 28.2\% | 20.5\% | 0.0\% | 20.5\% | 28.2\% | 51.3\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 32.6\% | 41.1\% | 20.0\% | 6.3\% | 13.7\% | 29.5\% | 29.5\% | 27.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 34.9\% | 34.9\% | 18.6\% | 11.6\% | 2.3\% | 18.6\% | 25.6\% | 53.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 37.8\% | 27.0\% | 21.6\% | 13.5\% | 5.4\% | 18.9\% | 32.4\% | 43.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 38.1\% | 47.6\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 23.8\% | 47.6\% | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 38.5\% | 26.9\% | 11.5\% | 23.1\% | 11.5\% | 19.2\% | 34.6\% | 34.6\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 28.6\% | 47.6\% | 19.0\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 33.3\% | 38.1\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 41.0\% | 30.7\% | 17.3\% | 11.0\% | 14.4\% | 24.6\% | 29.7\% | 31.4\% |

Table A.14. To What Extent Have Each of the Following Been a Challenge in Implementing Vertical Teams in Your School? (Continued)

| Campus | Insufficient teacher participation |  |  |  | Poor communication between teachers |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 14.3\% | 34.3\% | 31.4\% | 20.0\% | 25.7\% | 37.1\% | 17.1\% | 20.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 3.6\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 53.6\% | 3.6\% | 21.4\% | 35.7\% | 39.3\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 9.6\% | 24.6\% | 36.8\% | 28.9\% | 12.3\% | 23.7\% | 39.5\% | 24.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 8.1\% | 25.8\% | 35.5\% | 30.6\% | 16.1\% | 25.8\% | 27.4\% | 30.6\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=69$ ) | 18.8\% | 31.9\% | 21.7\% | 27.5\% | 23.2\% | 30.4\% | 23.2\% | 23.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 0.0\% | 20.5\% | 35.9\% | 43.6\% | 5.1\% | 20.5\% | 35.9\% | 38.5\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 8.4\% | 22.1\% | 41.1\% | 28.4\% | 10.5\% | 20.0\% | 36.8\% | 32.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=43$ ) | 2.3\% | 16.3\% | 34.9\% | 46.5\% | 4.7\% | 20.9\% | 34.9\% | 39.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 13.5\% | 16.2\% | 24.3\% | 45.9\% | 5.4\% | 21.6\% | 40.5\% | 32.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 9.5\% | 19.0\% | 38.1\% | 33.3\% | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 38.1\% | 28.6\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 11.5\% | 19.2\% | 34.6\% | 34.6\% | 11.5\% | 15.4\% | 34.6\% | 38.5\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 42.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 42.9\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=590$ ) | 9.2\% | 23.6\% | 34.1\% | 33.2\% | 12.0\% | 23.9\% | 33.4\% | 30.7\% |

Table A.14. To What Extent Have Each of the Following Been a Challenge in Implementing Vertical Teams in Your School? (Continued)

| Campus | Teacher Turnover |  |  |  | Vertical Teaming is not a Priority |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all | Large extent | Moderate extent | Small extent | Not at all |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=35$ ) | 8.6\% | 22.9\% | 40.0\% | 28.6\% | 8.6\% | 31.4\% | 28.6\% | 31.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=28$ ) | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 57.1\% | 3.6\% | 10.7\% | 42.9\% | 42.9\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=114$ ) | 15.8\% | 25.4\% | 35.1\% | 23.7\% | 15.8\% | 26.3\% | 32.5\% | 25.4\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=62$ ) | 35.5\% | 16.1\% | 24.2\% | 24.2\% | 19.4\% | 16.1\% | 30.6\% | 33.9\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=69) | 31.9\% | 23.2\% | 20.3\% | 24.6\% | 26.1\% | 21.7\% | 24.6\% | 27.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=39$ ) | 2.6\% | 23.1\% | 51.3\% | 23.1\% | 5.1\% | 10.3\% | 38.5\% | 46.2\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=95$ ) | 7.4\% | 27.4\% | 35.8\% | 29.5\% | 10.5\% | 21.1\% | 33.7\% | 34.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School (N=43) | 4.7\% | 4.7\% | 39.5\% | 51.2\% | 0.0\% | 11.6\% | 25.6\% | 62.8\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=37$ ) | 21.6\% | 21.6\% | 21.6\% | 35.1\% | 8.1\% | 24.3\% | 21.6\% | 45.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 9.5\% | 33.3\% | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 38.1\% | 33.3\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 7.7\% | 23.1\% | 30.8\% | 38.5\% | 11.5\% | 11.5\% | 30.8\% | 46.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=21$ ) | 4.8\% | 9.5\% | 38.1\% | 47.6\% | 9.5\% | 9.5\% | 28.6\% | 52.4\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=\mathbf{5 9 0}$ ) | 14.9\% | 21.5\% | 32.4\% | 31.2\% | 12.7\% | 19.5\% | 31.0\% | 36.8\% |

Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011
Table A.15. Rank the Importance of Each Counseling Task (Counselor Only)

| Campus | Assisting students with grades and achievement issues |  |  |  |  | Providing support for students' career goals |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Least } \\ \text { Important } \end{gathered}$ | Between Least Important and Neutral | Neutral | Between Neutral and Most Important | Most important | Least Important | Between Least Important and Neutral | Neutral | Between Neutral and Most Important | Most important |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=4) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 75.0\% | 25.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School (N=7) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 42.9\% | 57.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 71.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 66.7\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 66.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=30$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 70.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 36.7\% | 56.7\% |

Table A.15. Rank the Importance of Each Counseling Task (Counselor Only) (Continued)

| Campus | Helping students plan and prepare for postsecondary education |  |  |  |  | Assisting students with matters related to personal growth |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Least Important | Between Least Important and Neutral | Neutral | Between Neutral and Most Important | Most important | Least Important | Between <br> Least <br> Important and Neutral | Neutral | Between Neutral and Most Important | Most important |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 0.0\% | 75.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Adams Middle School (N=2) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 75.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 75.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=7$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 85.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% | 71.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=30$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 20.0\% | 76.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 26.7\% | 66.7\% |

Table A.15. Rank the Importance of Each Counseling Task (Counselor Only) (Continued)
Table A.15. Rank the Importance of Each Counseling Task (Counselor Only) (Continued)

| Campus | Providing parents with support and services |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Least Important | Between Least Important and Neutral | Neutral | Between Neutral and Most Important | Most important |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% | 25.0\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=4$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 75.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=2$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=7$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 42.9\% | 57.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School (N=2) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=3$ ) | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 66.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=1$ ) | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=30$ ) | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 6.7\% | 26.7\% | 63.3\% |

Table A.16. Mean Percentage of Time Spent on Specific Counseling Tasks (Counselors Only)

| Task | Falfurrias <br> High School <br> $\mathrm{N}=2$ | Alice High School $\mathrm{N}=4$ | H. M. King High School $\mathrm{N}=4$ | Miller High School $\mathrm{N}=7$ | Mathis High School $\mathrm{N}=3$ | Odem High School $\mathrm{N}=1$ | All High School Campuses $\mathrm{N}=21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scheduling courses | 10.0\% | 23.8\% | 25.0\% | 11.1\% | 20.0\% | 5.0\% | 17.1\% |
| Assisting students in course selections | 10.0\% | 8.5\% | 12.5\% | 7.1\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 9.2\% |
| Counseling for postsecondary admissions | 10.0\% | 20.3\% | 7.5\% | 18.6\% | 3.3\% | 30.0\% | 14.3\% |
| Testing | 22.5\% | 12.3\% | 11.0\% | 2.3\% | 11.7\% | 40.0\% | 10.9\% |
| Career counseling | 5.0\% | 4.5\% | 8.3\% | 14.4\% | 11.7\% | 3.0\% | 9.5\% |
| Counseling related to students' personal issues and concerns | 20.0\% | 8.0\% | 16.3\% | 17.9\% | 8.3\% | 5.0\% | 13.9\% |
| Other counseling tasks | 7.5\% | 7.8\% | 7.5\% | 5.1\% | 10.0\% | 2.0\% | 6.9\% |
| Coordinating GEAR UP activities | 5.0\% | 1.8\% | 2.0\% | 4.1\% | 5.0\% | 1.0\% | 3.3\% |
| Providing parents with college planning information | 5.0\% | 3.3\% | 5.0\% | 10.4\% | 6.7\% | 2.0\% | 6.6\% |
| Providing parents/families with non-academic support and services | 5.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.0\% | 8.9\% | 13.3\% | 2.0\% | 6.9\% |

Table A.16. Mean Percentage of Time Spent on Specific Counseling Tasks (Counselors Only) (Continued)

| Task | Falfurrias Junior High $\mathrm{N}=1$ | Adams Middle School $\mathrm{N}=2$ | Memorial Middle School $\mathrm{N}=2$ | Driscoll <br> Middle <br> School $\mathrm{N}=2$ | Mathis Middle School $\mathrm{N}=1$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Odem Junior } \\ \text { High } \\ \mathrm{N}=1 \end{gathered}$ | All Middle School Campuses $\mathrm{N}=9$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scheduling courses | 30.0\% | 20.0\% | 12.5\% | 42.5\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 22.2\% |
| Assisting students in course selections | 5.0\% | 7.5\% | 6.0\% | 7.5\% | 10.0\% | 5.0\% | 6.9\% |
| Counseling for postsecondary admissions | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 1.0\% | 3.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 5.3\% |
| Testing | 30.0\% | 7.5\% | 25.0\% | 6.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 16.3\% |
| Career counseling | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 3.0\% | 5.5\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 6.9\% |
| Counseling related to students' personal issues and concerns | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 25.0\% | 12.5\% | 10.0\% | 15.0\% | 14.4\% |
| Other counseling tasks | 0.0\% | 12.5\% | 6.0\% | 5.5\% | 10.0\% | 5.0\% | 7.0\% |
| Coordinating GEAR UP activities | 10.0\% | 7.5\% | 15.0\% | 9.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.3\% |
| Providing parents with college planning information | 0.0\% | 7.5\% | 1.5\% | 5.5\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 4.3\% |
| Providing parents/families with non-academic support and services | 10.0\% | 7.5\% | 5.0\% | 3.0\% | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 6.2\% |

[^15]Table A.17. About How Often Do You Interact With Colleagues in Each of the Following Ways? (Teachers Only)

| Campus | Have informal discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for vertical teams |  |  |  |  | Receive feedback from other teachers based on their observations of my teaching |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 21.9\% | 28.1\% | 31.3\% | 15.6\% | 3.1\% | 28.1\% | 28.1\% | 21.9\% | 21.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 11.5\% | 15.4\% | 42.3\% | 30.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.5\% | 42.3\% | 38.5\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 14.7\% | 22.9\% | 32.1\% | 21.1\% | 9.2\% | 22.0\% | 28.4\% | 32.1\% | 14.7\% | 2.8\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 6.8\% | 18.6\% | 42.4\% | 27.1\% | 5.1\% | 16.9\% | 22.0\% | 42.4\% | 16.9\% | 1.7\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ) | 12.5\% | 21.9\% | 29.7\% | 17.2\% | 18.8\% | 18.8\% | 26.6\% | 35.9\% | 15.6\% | 3.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 2.8\% | 11.1\% | 38.9\% | 27.8\% | 19.4\% | 16.7\% | 30.6\% | 33.3\% | 11.1\% | 8.3\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 3.4\% | 25.0\% | 36.4\% | 23.9\% | 11.4\% | 8.0\% | 36.4\% | 37.5\% | 13.6\% | 4.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 5.0\% | 15.0\% | 45.0\% | 27.5\% | 7.5\% | 10.0\% | 37.5\% | 45.0\% | 5.0\% | 2.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 8.8\% | 20.6\% | 29.4\% | 32.4\% | 8.8\% | 11.8\% | 35.3\% | 29.4\% | 20.6\% | 2.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 0.0\% | 15.0\% | 40.0\% | 30.0\% | 15.0\% | 15.0\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% | 25.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 12.5\% | 20.8\% | 37.5\% | 16.7\% | 12.5\% | 20.8\% | 41.7\% | 16.7\% | 20.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 10.0\% | 15.0\% | 50.0\% | 15.0\% | 10.0\% | 15.0\% | 15.0\% | 60.0\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 9.4\% | 20.5\% | 36.4\% | 23.4\% | 10.3\% | 16.3\% | 30.4\% | 35.3\% | 14.9\% | 3.1\% |

## Table continues <br> Table A.17. About How Often Do You Interact With Colleagues in Each of the Following Ways? (Teachers Only) (Continued)

| Campus | Provide feedback to other teachers based on my observations of their teaching |  |  |  |  | Consult with other teachers about students' academic performance |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometime s | Often | Almost daily | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 31.3\% | 34.4\% | 18.8\% | 12.5\% | 3.1\% | 3.1\% | 6.3\% | 37.5\% | 34.4\% | 18.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 19.2\% | 38.5\% | 34.6\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.5\% | 34.6\% | 26.9\% | 26.9\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 28.4\% | 30.3\% | 28.4\% | 11.9\% | 0.9\% | 6.4\% | 5.5\% | 41.3\% | 30.3\% | 16.5\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 13.6\% | 22.0\% | 42.4\% | 20.3\% | 1.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.7\% | 28.8\% | 40.7\% | 25.4\% |
| H. M. King High School (N=64) | 20.3\% | 23.4\% | 35.9\% | 15.6\% | 4.7\% | 4.7\% | 6.3\% | 40.6\% | 34.4\% | 14.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 16.7\% | 30.6\% | 33.3\% | 16.7\% | 2.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 25.0\% | 44.4\% | 27.8\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 6.8\% | 30.7\% | 43.2\% | 14.8\% | 4.5\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 45.5\% | 40.9\% | 12.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 15.0\% | 45.0\% | 32.5\% | 5.0\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 27.5\% | 47.5\% | 22.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 8.8\% | 35.3\% | 35.3\% | 17.6\% | 2.9\% | 2.9\% | 5.9\% | 20.6\% | 52.9\% | 17.6\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 15.0\% | 20.0\% | 35.0\% | 20.0\% | 10.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 15.0\% | 35.0\% | 40.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 16.7\% | 37.5\% | 25.0\% | 20.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 37.5\% | 37.5\% | 8.3\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 55.0\% | 15.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 30.0\% | 60.0\% | 10.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 17.6\% | 30.3\% | 35.0\% | 14.5\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 4.3\% | 35.1\% | 38.8\% | 18.7\% |

Table A.17. About How Often Do You Interact With Colleagues in Each of the Following Ways? (Teachers Only) (Continued)

| Campus | Work with a subject-area peer(s) on my campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity |  |  |  |  | Work with a subject-area peer(s) from a feeder pattern campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 15.6\% | 28.1\% | 31.3\% | 21.9\% | 3.1\% | 37.5\% | 28.1\% | 25.0\% | 6.3\% | 3.1\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 15.4\% | 7.7\% | 34.6\% | 30.8\% | 11.5\% | 50.0\% | 15.4\% | 26.9\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 8.3\% | 11.0\% | 25.7\% | 33.9\% | 21.1\% | 41.3\% | 22.9\% | 21.1\% | 9.2\% | 5.5\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 5.1\% | 6.8\% | 20.3\% | 37.3\% | 30.5\% | 33.9\% | 16.9\% | 27.1\% | 18.6\% | 3.4\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ) | 7.8\% | 14.1\% | 25.0\% | 34.4\% | 18.8\% | 51.6\% | 21.9\% | 12.5\% | 7.8\% | 6.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 0.0\% | 13.9\% | 22.2\% | 27.8\% | 36.1\% | 27.8\% | 16.7\% | 27.8\% | 22.2\% | 5.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 3.4\% | 14.8\% | 31.8\% | 35.2\% | 14.8\% | 25.0\% | 26.1\% | 26.1\% | 15.9\% | 6.8\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 7.5\% | 12.5\% | 40.0\% | 32.5\% | 7.5\% | 37.5\% | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 10.0\% | 2.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 8.8\% | 20.6\% | 26.5\% | 38.2\% | 5.9\% | 23.5\% | 35.3\% | 20.6\% | 17.6\% | 2.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 30.0\% | 45.0\% | 15.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 15.0\% | 20.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 20.8\% | 29.2\% | 25.0\% | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 41.7\% | 33.3\% | 4.2\% | 20.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 45.0\% | 30.0\% | 10.0\% | 35.0\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 5.0\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 7.6\% | 13.8\% | 28.4\% | 32.8\% | 17.4\% | 36.8\% | 23.4\% | 22.5\% | 13.0\% | 4.3\% |

Table A.17. About How Often Do You Interact With Colleagues in Each of the Following Ways? (Teachers Only) (Continued)

| Campus | Work with a colleague(s) in a different subject area to develop a lesson plan or class activity |  |  |  |  | Act as a vertical team coach or mentor to other teachers or staff at my school |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometime s | Often | Almost daily | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 25.0\% | 34.4\% | 28.1\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 46.9\% | 34.4\% | 12.5\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 23.1\% | 34.6\% | 34.6\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 19.2\% | 26.9\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 33.9\% | 36.7\% | 17.4\% | 10.1\% | 1.8\% | 60.6\% | 20.2\% | 15.6\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 25.4\% | 32.2\% | 28.8\% | 13.6\% | 0.0\% | 44.1\% | 18.6\% | 25.4\% | 8.5\% | 3.4\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ) | 34.4\% | 29.7\% | 25.0\% | 7.8\% | 3.1\% | 56.3\% | 15.6\% | 17.2\% | 6.3\% | 4.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 19.4\% | 44.4\% | 19.4\% | 11.1\% | 5.6\% | 33.3\% | 19.4\% | 30.6\% | 11.1\% | 5.6\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 15.9\% | 36.4\% | 33.0\% | 10.2\% | 4.5\% | 40.9\% | 22.7\% | 23.9\% | 9.1\% | 3.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 17.5\% | 32.5\% | 30.0\% | 15.0\% | 5.0\% | 47.5\% | 10.0\% | 27.5\% | 12.5\% | 2.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 14.7\% | 17.6\% | 44.1\% | 20.6\% | 2.9\% | 38.2\% | 32.4\% | 14.7\% | 11.8\% | 2.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 5.0\% | 25.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 10.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 25.0\% | 33.3\% | 29.2\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 54.2\% | 20.8\% | 16.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 35.0\% | 15.0\% | 0.0\% | 45.0\% | 15.0\% | 35.0\% | 5.0\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 24.1\% | 33.2\% | 28.1\% | 12.0\% | 2.7\% | 48.2\% | 20.5\% | 21.6\% | 7.1\% | 2.7\% |

Table A.17. About How Often Do You Interact With Colleagues in Each of the Following

| Campus | Receive vertical team coaching or mentoring from external source such as a professional curriculum developer, or university faculty fellow |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Almost daily |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 34.4\% | 25.0\% | 28.1\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 42.3\% | 23.1\% | 26.9\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 43.1\% | 30.3\% | 21.1\% | 4.6\% | 0.9\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 28.8\% | 30.5\% | 35.6\% | 5.1\% | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ) | 46.9\% | 14.1\% | 23.4\% | 10.9\% | 4.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 27.8\% | 19.4\% | 38.9\% | 13.9\% | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 34.1\% | 25.0\% | 28.4\% | 10.2\% | 2.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 35.0\% | 22.5\% | 25.0\% | 15.0\% | 2.5\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 17.6\% | 17.6\% | 44.1\% | 17.6\% | 2.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 35.0\% | 15.0\% | 35.0\% | 15.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 33.3\% | 20.8\% | 25.0\% | 16.7\% | 4.2\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | 45.0\% | 5.0\% | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 35.5\% | 23.7\% | 29.2\% | 10.0\% | 1.6\% |

Table A.18.a. Responses to Statements Regarding Advanced Placement (Teachers Only)

| Campus | I am teaching one or more AP courses this school year. |  | I have attended an AP summer institute offered by the College Board. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Falfurrias High School ( $\mathrm{N}=32$ ) | 75.0\% | 25.0\% | 56.3\% | 43.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=26$ ) | 73.1\% | 26.9\% | 73.1\% | 26.9\% |
| Alice High School ( $\mathrm{N}=109$ ) | 82.6\% | 17.4\% | 62.4\% | 37.6\% |
| Adams Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=59$ ) | 76.3\% | 23.7\% | 66.1\% | 33.9\% |
| H. M. King High School ( $\mathrm{N}=64$ ) | 85.9\% | 14.1\% | 76.6\% | 23.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=36$ ) | 55.6\% | 44.4\% | 63.9\% | 36.1\% |
| Miller High School ( $\mathrm{N}=88$ ) | 85.2\% | 14.8\% | 71.6\% | 28.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=40$ ) | 62.5\% | 37.5\% | 70.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Mathis High School ( $\mathrm{N}=34$ ) | 73.5\% | 26.5\% | 70.6\% | 29.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 70.0\% | 30.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| Odem High School ( $\mathrm{N}=24$ ) | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 33.3\% |
| Odem Junior High ( $\mathrm{N}=20$ ) | 90.0\% | 10.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |
| All Campuses ( $\mathrm{N}=552$ ) | 77.2\% | 22.8\% | 66.5\% | 33.5\% |

Table A.18.b. Responses to Statements Regarding Advanced Placement (AP Teachers Only)


Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.
Table A.19. Responses to Statements Regarding Faculty Fellows (Teachers Only)

| Campus | Did you attend a Faculty Fellows orientation meeting? |  | Have you been assigned a faculty mentor through the Faculty Fellows program at Texas A\&M Kingsville or Texas A\&M Corpus Christi? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Falfurrias High School | 84.4\% | 15.6\% | 81.3\% | 18.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 92.3\% | 7.7\% | 80.8\% | 19.2\% |
| Alice High School | 98.2\% | 1.8\% | 95.4\% | 4.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 96.6\% | 3.4\% | 94.9\% | 5.1\% |
| H. M. King High School | 95.3\% | 4.7\% | 87.5\% | 12.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 94.4\% | 5.6\% | 77.8\% | 22.2\% |
| Miller High School | 95.5\% | 4.5\% | 94.3\% | 5.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 97.5\% | 2.5\% | 90.0\% | 10.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 88.2\% | 11.8\% | 85.3\% | 14.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 100.0\% | 0.0\% | 80.0\% | 20.0\% |
| Odem High School | 75.0\% | 25.0\% | 87.5\% | 12.5\% |
| Odem Junior High | 90.0\% | 10.0\% | 95.0\% | 5.0\% |
| All Campuses | 94.0\% | 6.0\% | 89.7\% | 10.3\% |

Table A.20. How Frequently Do You Communicate With Your University Faculty Fellow? (Only Teachers Assigned a Faculty Fellow) | Campus | At least once a week | At least once a month | $1-2$ times a semester | Other |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Falfurrias High School | $66.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High | $0.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ |
| Alice High School | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | $12.5 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | $12.5 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Miller High School | $60.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | $25.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | $60.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | $50.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Odem High School | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| All Campuses | $35.1 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ |  |
| Source GEAR UP (STAR) Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011 |  |  |  |  |

Table A.21. How Useful Were Any Lectures, Presentations, or Demonstrations Given by a University Faculty Fellow in Your Class? (Only Teachers Assigned a Faculty Fellow)

|  |  |  |  | My Faculty Fellow <br> did not give a <br> lecture/ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campus | Very useful | Somewhat <br> useful | Not very <br> useful <br> presentation/ |  |
| Falfurrias High School | $50.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High | $20.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Alice High School | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School | $0.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | $12.5 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | $25.0 \%$ | $75.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Miller High School | $20.0 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | $50.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | $25.0 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| Odem High School | $66.7 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $35.1 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $24.6 \%$ |
| Sole GEAR UP |  |  |  |  |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.

Table B.1. Which of the Following School Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School Year?

| Campus | PTA/PTO meeting |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 10 | 22.7\% | 34 | 77.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 6 | 26.1\% | 17 | 73.9\% |
| Alice High School | 16 | 20.8\% | 61 | 79.2\% |
| Adams Middle School | 37 | 47.4\% | 41 | 52.6\% |
| H. M. King High School | 9 | 8.7\% | 94 | 91.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 11 | 20.4\% | 43 | 79.6\% |
| Miller High School | 27 | 28.7\% | 67 | 71.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 24 | 58.5\% | 17 | 41.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 12 | 25.0\% | 36 | 75.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 5 | 21.7\% | 18 | 78.3\% |
| Odem High School | 2 | 8.0\% | 23 | 92.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 4 | 25.0\% | 12 | 75.0\% |
| All Campuses | 163 | 26.0\% | 463 | 74.0\% |

Table continues
Table B.1. Which of the Following School Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School Year? (Continued)

| Campus | Volunteer activities for your child's school |  |  |  | Parent-teacher conferences |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 9 | 20.5\% | 35 | 79.5\% | 30 | 68.2\% | 14 | 31.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 8 | 34.8\% | 15 | 65.2\% | 13 | 56.5\% | 10 | 43.5\% |
| Alice High School | 14 | 18.2\% | 63 | 81.8\% | 44 | 57.1\% | 33 | 42.9\% |
| Adams Middle School | 16 | 20.5\% | 62 | 79.5\% | 49 | 62.8\% | 29 | 37.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 24 | 23.3\% | 79 | 76.7\% | 67 | 65.0\% | 36 | 35.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 12 | 22.2\% | 42 | 77.8\% | 45 | 83.3\% | 9 | 16.7\% |
| Miller High School | 12 | 12.8\% | 82 | 87.2\% | 55 | 58.5\% | 39 | 41.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 8 | 19.5\% | 33 | 80.5\% | 30 | 73.2\% | 11 | 26.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 20 | 41.7\% | 28 | 58.3\% | 31 | 64.6\% | 17 | 35.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 10 | 43.5\% | 13 | 56.5\% | 14 | 60.9\% | 9 | 39.1\% |
| Odem High School | 13 | 52.0\% | 12 | 48.0\% | 21 | 84.0\% | 4 | 16.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 9 | 56.3\% | 7 | 43.8\% | 13 | 81.3\% | 3 | 18.8\% |
| All Campuses | 155 | 24.8\% | 471 | 75.2\% | 412 | 65.8\% | 214 | 34.2\% |

Table B.1. Which of the Following School Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School Year? (Continued)

Table B.1. Which of the Following School Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School Year? (Continued)

| Campus | Received college planning information or other counseling services from the school counselor |  |  |  | Received a home visit from a teacher, counselor, or administrator at your child's school |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 22 | 50.0\% | 22 | 50.0\% | 3 | 6.8\% | 41 | 93.2\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 4 | 17.4\% | 19 | 82.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 23 | 100.0\% |
| Alice High School | 28 | 36.4\% | 49 | 63.6\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 75 | 97.4\% |
| Adams Middle School | 20 | 25.6\% | 58 | 74.4\% | 3 | 3.8\% | 75 | 96.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 41 | 39.8\% | 62 | 60.2\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 94 | 91.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 11 | 20.4\% | 43 | 79.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 54 | 100.0\% |
| Miller High School | 33 | 35.1\% | 61 | 64.9\% | 10 | 10.6\% | 84 | 89.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 13 | 31.7\% | 28 | 68.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 41 | 100.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 22 | 45.8\% | 26 | 54.2\% | 6 | 12.5\% | 42 | 87.5\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 6 | 26.1\% | 17 | 73.9\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% |
| Odem High School | 14 | 56.0\% | 11 | 44.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 23 | 92.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 6 | 37.5\% | 10 | 62.5\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 15 | 93.8\% |
| All Campuses | 220 | 35.1\% | 406 | 64.9\% | 37 | 5.9\% | 589 | 94.1\% |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Table B.2. Which of the Following College and Career Awareness Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School

| Campus | Visited a college campus with your child's school |  |  |  | Attended a college or career fair at your child's school ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 4 | 9.1\% | 40 | 90.9\% | 9 | 20.5\% | 35 | 79.5\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 23 | 100.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% |
| Alice High School | 10 | 13.0\% | 67 | 87.0\% | 22 | 28.6\% | 55 | 71.4\% |
| Adams Middle School | 6 | 7.7\% | 72 | 92.3\% | 11 | 14.1\% | 67 | 85.9\% |
| H. M. King High School | 12 | 11.7\% | 91 | 88.3\% | 13 | 12.6\% | 90 | 87.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 3 | 5.6\% | 51 | 94.4\% | 6 | 11.1\% | 47 | 87.0\% |
| Miller High School | 8 | 8.5\% | 86 | 91.5\% | 19 | 20.2\% | 74 | 78.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 8 | 19.5\% | 33 | 80.5\% | 9 | 22.0\% | 32 | 78.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 10 | 20.8\% | 38 | 79.2\% | 10 | 20.8\% | 38 | 79.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 2 | 8.7\% | 21 | 91.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 21 | 91.3\% |
| Odem High School | 3 | 12.0\% | 22 | 88.0\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 18 | 72.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 1 | 6.3\% | 15 | 93.8\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 13 | 81.3\% |
| All Campuses | 67 | 10.7\% | 559 | 89.3\% | 112 | 17.9\% | 512 | 81.8\% |

Table B.2. Which of the Following College and Career Awareness Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School

| Campus | Attended a workshop on preparing for college (learning about applications, financial aid, entrance exams) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  | Received assistance in completing financial aid, scholarships, and college applications |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 12 | 27.3\% | 32 | 72.7\% | 10 | 22.7\% | 34 | 77.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 23 | 100.0\% |
| Alice High School | 11 | 14.3\% | 66 | 85.7\% | 15 | 19.5\% | 62 | 80.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 9 | 11.5\% | 69 | 88.5\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 76 | 97.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 15 | 14.6\% | 87 | 84.5\% | 15 | 14.6\% | 88 | 85.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 5 | 9.3\% | 49 | 90.7\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 51 | 94.4\% |
| Miller High School | 18 | 19.1\% | 76 | 80.9\% | 13 | 13.8\% | 81 | 86.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 7 | 17.1\% | 34 | 82.9\% | 3 | 7.3\% | 38 | 92.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 12 | 25.0\% | 36 | 75.0\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 39 | 81.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% |
| Odem High School | 6 | 24.0\% | 19 | 76.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 20 | 80.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 3 | 18.8\% | 13 | 81.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 16 | 100.0\% |
| All Campuses | 100 | 16.0\% | 525 | 83.9\% | 76 | 12.1\% | 550 | 87.9\% |

Table continues
Table B.2. Which of the Following College and Career Awareness Activities Have You Participated in Over the Course of the Past School Year? (Continued)

| Campus | Attended a workshop on careers with your child (available careers, applying for careers, creating resumes, educational and training requirements for specific careers) |  |  |  | Attend a FACE activity with your child ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  | Other ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | $\mathrm{N} \quad$ Yes $\%$ |  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 8 | 18.2\% | 36 | 81.8\% | 7 | 15.9\% | 37 | 84.1\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 42 | 95.5\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 20 | 87.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 21 | 91.3\% |
| Alice High School | 13 | 16.9\% | 64 | 83.1\% | 4 | 5.2\% | 73 | 94.8\% | 3 | 3.9\% | 74 | 96.1\% |
| Adams Middle School | 15 | 19.2\% | 63 | 80.8\% | 14 | 17.9\% | 64 | 82.1\% | 8 | 10.3\% | 70 | 89.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 6 | 5.8\% | 97 | 94.2\% | 10 | 9.7\% | 93 | 90.3\% | 5 | 4.9\% | 98 | 95.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 3 | 5.6\% | 51 | 94.4\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 51 | 94.4\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 50 | 92.6\% |
| Miller High School | 9 | 9.6\% | 85 | 90.4\% | 8 | 8.5\% | 85 | 90.4\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 90 | 95.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 6 | 14.6\% | 35 | 85.4\% | 3 | 7.3\% | 38 | 92.7\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 40 | 97.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 13 | 27.1\% | 35 | 72.9\% | 7 | 14.6\% | 41 | 85.4\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 46 | 95.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 22 | 95.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 20 | 87.0\% | 0 | .0\% | 23 | 100.0\% |
| Odem High School | 6 | 24.0\% | 19 | 76.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 24 | 96.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 24 | 96.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 5 | 31.3\% | 11 | 68.8\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 13 | 81.3\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 15 | 93.8\% |
| All Campuses | 86 | 13.7\% | 540 | 86.3\% | 66 | 10.5\% | 559 | 89.3\% | 32 | 5.1\% | 593 | 94.7\% |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Two respondents, one from Memorial Middle School and one from Miller High School, did not know or declined to answer.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ One respondent from H.M. King High School did not know or declined to answer.
${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ One respondent from Miller High School did not know or declined to answer.
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ One respondent from Memorial Middle School did not know or declined to answer.
Table B.3. How Familiar Are You with the GEAR UP/STAR Program at Your Child's School?

| Campus | Not familiar at all |  | Not very familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 13 | 29.5\% | 8 | 18.2\% | 10 | 22.7\% | 12 | 27.3\% | 1 | 2.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 12 | 52.2\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 0 | .0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 31 | 40.3\% | 19 | 24.7\% | 19 | 24.7\% | 8 | 10.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 21 | 26.9\% | 20 | 25.6\% | 23 | 29.5\% | 14 | 17.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 47 | 45.6\% | 26 | 25.2\% | 14 | 13.6\% | 12 | 11.7\% | 4 | 3.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 24 | 44.4\% | 10 | 18.5\% | 8 | 14.8\% | 11 | 20.4\% | 1 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 45 | 47.9\% | 22 | 23.4\% | 20 | 21.3\% | 6 | 6.4\% | 1 | 1.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 18 | 43.9\% | 13 | 31.7\% | 5 | 12.2\% | 4 | 9.8\% | 1 | 2.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 16 | 33.3\% | 11 | 22.9\% | 12 | 25.0\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 4 | 17.4\% | 10 | 43.5\% | 7 | 30.4\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School | 1 | 4.0\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 11 | 44.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 2 | 12.5\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 6 | 37.5\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 234 | 37.4\% | 157 | 25.1\% | 140 | 22.4\% | 87 | 13.9\% | 8 | 1.3\% |

Table B.4. Over the Past School Year, How Often Did You Do Each of the Following Activities?

| Campus | Assist with or monitor your child's homework at home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Several times a month |  | Several times a week |  | Every day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 11 | 25.0\% | 11 | 25.0\% | 13 | 29.5\% | 9 | 20.5\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 5 | 21.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 8 | 34.8\% | 7 | 30.4\% |
| Alice High School | 16 | 20.8\% | 20 | 26.0\% | 21 | 27.3\% | 20 | 26.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 8 | 10.3\% | 14 | 17.9\% | 23 | 29.5\% | 33 | 42.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 15 | 14.6\% | 27 | 26.2\% | 31 | 30.1\% | 30 | 29.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 8 | 14.8\% | 6 | 11.1\% | 13 | 24.1\% | 27 | 50.0\% |
| Miller High School | 33 | 35.1\% | 16 | 17.0\% | 22 | 23.4\% | 23 | 24.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 3 | 7.3\% | 8 | 19.5\% | 14 | 34.1\% | 16 | 39.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 11 | 22.9\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 18 | 37.5\% | 10 | 20.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 4 | 17.4\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 8 | 34.8\% |
| Odem High School | 3 | 12.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% | , | 36.0\% | 10 | 40.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 2 | 12.5\% | 2 | 12.5\% | 2 | 12.5\% | 10 | 62.5\% |
| All Campuses | 119 | 19.0\% | 124 | 19.8\% | 180 | 28.8\% | 203 | 32.4\% |

Table B.4. Over the Past School Year, How Often Did You Do Each of the Following Activities? (Continued)

| Campus | Tutor your child at home using materials and instructions provided by the teacher ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Several times a month |  | Several times a week |  | Every day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 27 | 61.4\% | 8 | 18.2\% | 6 | 13.6\% | 3 | 6.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 11 | 47.8\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 8 | 34.8\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Alice High School | 46 | 59.7\% | 14 | 18.2\% | 8 | 10.4\% | 9 | 11.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 45 | 57.7\% | 6 | 7.7\% | 17 | 21.8\% | 10 | 12.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 60 | 58.3\% | 20 | 19.4\% | 13 | 12.6\% | 10 | 9.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 21 | 38.9\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 18 | 33.3\% | 6 | 11.1\% |
| Miller High School | 55 | 58.5\% | 15 | 16.0\% | 19 | 20.2\% | 5 | 5.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 13 | 31.7\% | 11 | 26.8\% | 10 | 24.4\% | 6 | 14.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 29 | 60.4\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 7 | 14.6\% | 3 | 6.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 13 | 56.5\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 2 | 8.7\% |
| Odem High School | 10 | 40.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% | 11 | 44.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 9 | 56.3\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 2 | 12.5\% | 4 | 25.0\% |
| All Campuses | 339 | 54.2\% | 103 | 16.5\% | 123 | 19.6\% | 60 | 9.6\% |

Table B.4. Over the Past School Year, How Often Did You Do Each of the Following Activities? (Continued)

| Campus | Read with your child at home |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Several times a month |  | Several times a week |  | Every day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 25 | 56.8\% | 7 | 15.9\% | 7 | 15.9\% | 5 | 11.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 12 | 52.2\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% |
| Alice High School | 43 | 55.8\% | 15 | 19.5\% | 12 | 15.6\% | 7 | 9.1\% |
| Adams Middle School | 29 | 37.2\% | 23 | 29.5\% | 20 | 25.6\% | 6 | 7.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 49 | 47.6\% | 27 | 26.2\% | 17 | 16.5\% | 10 | 9.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 23 | 42.6\% | 8 | 14.8\% | 12 | 22.2\% | 11 | 20.4\% |
| Miller High School | 53 | 56.4\% | 15 | 16.0\% | 20 | 21.3\% | 6 | 6.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 13 | 31.7\% | 9 | 22.0\% | 13 | 31.7\% | 6 | 14.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 29 | 60.4\% | 12 | 25.0\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 3 | 6.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 9 | 39.1\% | 8 | 34.8\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 2 | 8.7\% |
| Odem High School | 11 | 44.0\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 3 | 18.8\% | 2 | 12.5\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 6 | 37.5\% |
| All Campuses | 299 | 47.8\% | 136 | 21.7\% | 124 | 19.8\% | 67 | 10.7\% |

Table B.4. Over the Past School Year, How Often Did You Do Each of the Following Activities? (Continued)

| Campus | Discuss school with your child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Several times a month |  | Several times a week |  | Every day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 13 | 29.5\% | 28 | 63.6\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 2 | 8.7\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 14 | 60.9\% |
| Alice High School | 3 | 3.9\% | 6 | 7.8\% | 16 | 20.8\% | 52 | 67.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 1 | 1.3\% | 5 | 6.4\% | 18 | 23.1\% | 54 | 69.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 4 | 3.9\% | 7 | 6.8\% | 17 | 16.5\% | 75 | 72.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 3 | 5.6\% | 2 | 3.7\% | 10 | 18.5\% | 39 | 72.2\% |
| Miller High School | 8 | 8.5\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 16 | 17.0\% | 66 | 70.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 6 | 14.6\% | 6 | 14.6\% | 29 | 70.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 3 | 6.3\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 14 | 29.2\% | 27 | 56.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 15 | 65.2\% |
| Odem High School | 1 | 4.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% | 4 | 16.0\% | 17 | 68.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 4 | 25.0\% | 11 | 68.8\% |
| All Campuses | 28 | 4.5\% | 44 | 7.0\% | 127 | 20.3\% | 427 | 68.2\% |

Table B.4. Over the Past School Year, How Often Did You Do Each of the Following Activities? (Continued)

| Campus | Talk to other parents about your child's school ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Several times a month |  | Several times a week |  | Every day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 12 | 27.3\% | 18 | 40.9\% | 9 | 20.5\% | 5 | 11.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 11 | 47.8\% | 9 | 39.1\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% |
| Alice High School | 30 | 39.0\% | 28 | 36.4\% | 10 | 13.0\% | 9 | 11.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 27 | 34.6\% | 26 | 33.3\% | 17 | 21.8\% | 7 | 9.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 35 | 34.0\% | 27 | 26.2\% | 20 | 19.4\% | 20 | 19.4\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 18 | 33.3\% | 16 | 29.6\% | 13 | 24.1\% | 7 | 13.0\% |
| Miller High School | 46 | 48.9\% | 23 | 24.5\% | 13 | 13.8\% | 12 | 12.8\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 19 | 46.3\% | 10 | 24.4\% | 6 | 14.6\% | 6 | 14.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 16 | 33.3\% | 17 | 35.4\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 6 | 12.5\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 9 | 39.1\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 7 | 30.4\% | 3 | 13.0\% |
| Odem High School | 5 | 20.0\% | 13 | 52.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 7 | 43.8\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 3 | 18.8\% |
| All Campuses | 235 | 37.5\% | 196 | 31.3\% | 111 | 17.7\% | 82 | 13.1\% |
| Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011. <br> ${ }^{\text {a }}$ One respondent from Driscoll Middle School did not know or declined to answer. <br> ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ One respondent from Adams Middle School and one respondent from H.M. King High School did not know or declined to answer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table B.5. Has Your Child Expressed an Interest in Going to College?

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  | Don't know or declined toanswer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 37 | 84.1\% | 6 | 13.6\% | 1 | 2.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 14 | 60.9\% | 9 | 39.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 66 | 85.7\% | 10 | 13.0\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 66 | 84.6\% | 11 | 14.1\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 96 | 93.2\% | 7 | 6.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 51 | 94.4\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School | 86 | 91.5\% | 7 | 7.4\% | 1 | 1.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 34 | 82.9\% | 7 | 17.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 42 | 87.5\% | 5 | 10.4\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 18 | 78.3\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 23 | 92.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 15 | 93.8\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 548 | 87.5\% | 72 | 11.5\% | 6 | 1.0\% |

Table B.6. What Is the Highest Level of Education That You Think Your Child Will Achieve?

| Campus | Less than high school |  | High school |  | Some college but less than a four-year degree |  | Four-year degree or higher |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 1 | 2.3\% | 6 | 13.6\% | 9 | 20.5\% | 26 | 59.1\% | 2 | 4.5\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 9 | 39.1\% | 10 | 43.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 12 | 15.6\% | 20 | 26.0\% | 43 | 55.8\% | 2 | 2.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 1 | 1.3\% | 15 | 19.2\% | 13 | 16.7\% | 48 | 61.5\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 2 | 1.9\% | 11 | 10.7\% | 14 | 13.6\% | 74 | 71.8\% | 2 | 1.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 5 | 9.3\% | 5 | 9.3\% | 43 | 79.6\% | 1 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 1 | 1.1\% | 17 | 18.1\% | 14 | 14.9\% | 59 | 62.8\% | 3 | 3.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 1 | 2.4\% | 4 | 9.8\% | 6 | 14.6\% | 28 | 68.3\% | 2 | 4.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 2 | 4.2\% | 8 | 16.7\% | 9 | 18.8\% | 27 | 56.3\% | 2 | 4.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 12 | 52.2\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 1 | 4.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 4 | 16.0\% | 15 | 60.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 12.5\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 11 | 68.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 10 | 1.6\% | 93 | 14.9\% | 111 | 17.7\% | 396 | 63.3\% | 16 | 2.6\% |

Table B.7. How Often Do You Do Each of the Following with Your Child?


Table B.7. How Often Do You Do Each of the Following with Your Child? (Continued)
Table B.7. How Often Do You Do Each of the Following with Your Child? (Continued)

| Campus | Talk about taking one or more of the college entrance exams (SAT, ACT, PSAT, PLAN) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Not very often |  | Sometimes |  | Very often |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 8 | 18.2\% | 5 | 11.4\% | 17 | 38.6\% | 14 | 31.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 9 | 39.1\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% |
| Alice High School | 28 | 36.4\% | 4 | 5.2\% | 17 | 22.1\% | 28 | 36.4\% |
| Adams Middle School | 27 | 34.6\% | 11 | 14.1\% | 21 | 26.9\% | 18 | 23.1\% |
| H. M. King High School | 27 | 26.2\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 25 | 24.3\% | 39 | 37.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 24 | 44.4\% | 8 | 14.8\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 13 | 24.1\% |
| Miller High School | 26 | 27.7\% | 5 | 5.3\% | 28 | 29.8\% | 33 | 35.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 14 | 34.1\% | 5 | 12.2\% | 9 | 22.0\% | 13 | 31.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 12 | 25.0\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 18 | 37.5\% | 17 | 35.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 6 | 26.1\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 8 | 34.8\% |
| Odem High School | 6 | 24.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 9 | 36.0\% | 9 | 36.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 3 | 18.8\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 3 | 18.8\% |
| All Campuses | 190 | 30.4\% | 62 | 9.9\% | 169 | 27.0\% | 198 | 31.6\% |

Table B.7. How Often Do You Do Each of the Following with Your Child? (Continued)

|  |
| :--- |

Table B.8. What Obstacle(s) May Limit Your Child's Ability to Postsecondary Education?

| Obstacle | Child not likely to have an obstacle |  | It costs too much, can't afford it |  | He (she) needs (wants) to work |  | His (her) grades are not good enough |  | He (she) is not interested in college |  | He (she) has a disability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 8 | 18.2\% | 18 | 40.9\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 6.8\% | 5 | 11.4\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 1 | 4.3\% | 9 | 39.1\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% |
| Alice High School | 10 | 13.0\% | 34 | 44.2\% | 4 | 5.2\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 11 | 14.3\% | 5 | 6.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 16 | 20.5\% | 26 | 33.3\% | 10 | 12.8\% | 5 | 6.4\% | 7 | 9.0\% | 3 | 3.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 25 | 24.3\% | 18 | 17.5\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 4 | 3.9\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 12 | 11.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 15 | 27.8\% | 14 | 25.9\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 2 | 3.7\% | 4 | 7.4\% | 4 | 7.4\% |
| Miller High School | 15 | 16.0\% | 35 | 37.2\% | 11 | 11.7\% | 1 | 1.1\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 7 | 7.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 8 | 19.5\% | 15 | 36.6\% | 5 | 12.2\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | 9.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 7 | 14.6\% | 18 | 37.5\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 4 | 8.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 10 | 43.5\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 5 | 21.7\% |
| Odem High School | 4 | 16.0\% | 9 | 36.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 3 | 18.8\% | 7 | 43.8\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 0 | .0\% | 3 | 18.8\% |
| All Campuses | 113 | 18.1\% | 213 | 34.0\% | 51 | 8.1\% | 24 | 3.8\% | 44 | 7.0\% | 55 | 8.8\% |

Table B.8. What Obstacle(s) May Limit Your Child’s Ability to Postsecondary Education? (Continued)

| Obstacle | He (she) wants to go into the military |  | He (she) wants to get married |  | He (she) hasresponsibilities toparents, brothersand sisters |  | He (she) has children |  | Other |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 3 | 6.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 3 | 13.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% |
| Alice High School | 3 | 3.9\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 5 | 6.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 4 | 5.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |  | 1.3\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 3 | 3.8\% | 2 | 2.6\% |
| H. M. King High School | 8 | 7.8\% | 2 | 1.9\% | 1 | 1.0\% | 3 | 2.9\% | 5 | 4.9\% | 7 | 6.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 4 | 7.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 5.6\% | 6 | 11.1\% |
| Miller High School | 7 | 7.4\% | 1 | 1.1\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 2 | 2.1\% | 3 | 3.2\% | 4 | 4.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 1 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 1 | 2.4\% | 5 | 12.2\% |
| Mathis High School | 4 | 8.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 1 | 4.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 1 | 4.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 38 | 6.1\% | 7 | 1.1\% | 8 | 1.3\% | 12 | 1.9\% | 25 | 4.0\% | 36 | 5.8\% |

Table B.9. In the Past Year, Has Anyone from Your Child's School or the GEAR UP Program Ever Spoken with You About...

| Campus | College entrance requirements. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | The availability of financial aid for college. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  | The courses your child should take to prepare for college. ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 12 | 27.3\% | 32 | 72.7\% | 12 | 27.3\% | 32 | 72.7\% | 17 | 38.6\% | 26 | 59.1\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 2 | 8.7\% | 21 | 91.3\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 20 | 87.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 21 | 91.3\% |
| Alice High School | 16 | 20.8\% | 61 | 79.2\% | 20 | 26.0\% | 57 | 74.0\% | 20 | 26.0\% | 56 | 72.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 12 | 15.4\% | 66 | 84.6\% | 13 | 16.7\% | 65 | 83.3\% | 15 | 19.2\% | 63 | 80.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 20 | 19.4\% | 82 | 79.6\% | 18 | 17.5\% | 84 | 81.6\% | 23 | 22.3\% | 78 | 75.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 9 | 16.7\% | 44 | 81.5\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 44 | 81.5\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 44 | 81.5\% |
| Miller High School | 27 | 28.7\% | 67 | 71.3\% | 28 | 29.8\% | 66 | 70.2\% | 26 | 27.7\% | 67 | 71.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 7 | 17.1\% | 34 | 82.9\% | 5 | 12.2\% | 36 | 87.8\% | 9 | 22.0\% | 32 | 78.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 13 | 27.1\% | 35 | 72.9\% | 14 | 29.2\% | 34 | 70.8\% | 14 | 29.2\% | 34 | 70.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 5 | 21.7\% | 18 | 78.3\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 18 | 78.3\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 17 | 73.9\% |
| Odem High School | 7 | 28.0\% | 18 | 72.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 20 | 80.0\% | 10 | 40.0\% | 15 | 60.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 5 | 31.3\% | 11 | 68.8\% | 7 | 43.8\% | 9 | 56.3\% | 8 | 50.0\% | 8 | 50.0\% |
| All Campuses | 135 | 21.6\% | 489 | 78.1\% | 138 | 22.0\% | 485 | 77.5\% | 159 | 25.4\% | 461 | 73.6\% |
| Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ One respondent from H.M. King High School, one respondent from Memorial Middle School, and one respondent from Mathis Middle School did not declined to answer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {c }}$ One respondent from Falfu Memorial Middle School, a | Hig ne re | hool, o ndent fr |  | from <br> Sc |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { from } H \text {. } \\ & \text { er. } \end{aligned}$ | King | School | respo | nt from |

Table B.10. Do You Think That Your Child Could Afford to Attend a Public Four-Year College Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources?

| Campus | Definitely not |  | Probably not |  | Not sure |  | Probably |  | Definitely |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 4 | 9.1\% | 17 | 38.6\% | 21 | 47.7\% | 1 | 2.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 9 | 39.1\% | 12 | 52.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 2 | 2.6\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 6 | 7.8\% | 24 | 31.2\% | 43 | 55.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 1 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 5 | 6.4\% | 18 | 23.1\% | 54 | 69.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 2 | 1.9\% | 2 | 1.9\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 30 | 29.1\% | 58 | 56.3\% | 2 | 1.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 1 | 1.9\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 2 | 3.7\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 40 | 74.1\% | 1 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 1 | 1.1\% | 2 | 2.1\% | 9 | 9.6\% | 29 | 30.9\% | 52 | 55.3\% | 1 | 1.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 7.3\% | 2 | 4.9\% | 13 | 31.7\% | 21 | 51.2\% | 2 | 4.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 1 | 2.1\% | 2 | 4.2\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 15 | 31.3\% | 25 | 52.1\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 14 | 60.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School | 1 | 4.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 16 | 64.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 1 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 9 | 56.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 10 | 1.6\% | 14 | 2.2\% | 50 | 8.0\% | 179 | 28.6\% | 365 | 58.3\% | 8 | 1.3\% |

Table B.11. Do You Think That Your Child Could Afford to Attend a Public Community College Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources?


Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Table B.12. Have You Received any Information from Your Child's School About the Graduation Plan Called the Recommended High School Program in Texas? (Parents of High School Students Only)

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 13 | 29.5\% | 29 | 65.9\% | 2 | 4.5\% |
| Alice High School | 18 | 23.4\% | 55 | 71.4\% | 4 | 5.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 18 | 17.5\% | 77 | 74.8\% | 8 | 7.8\% |
| Miller High School | 21 | 22.3\% | 67 | 71.3\% | 6 | 6.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 10 | 20.8\% | 37 | 77.1\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Odem High School | 8 | 32.0\% | 14 | 56.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% |
| All High School Campuses | 88 | 22.5\% | 279 | 71.4\% | 24 | 6.1\% |

Table B.13. Do You Know Which of the Following Graduation Plans Your Child Is Enrolled in? Is It... (Parents of High School Students Only)

| Campus | The Minimum Graduation Program |  | The Recommended High School Program |  | The Distinguished Achievement Program |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 3 | 6.8\% | 14 | 31.8\% | 7 | 15.9\% | 20 | 45.5\% |
| Alice High School | 8 | 10.4\% | 22 | 28.6\% | 9 | 11.7\% | 38 | 49.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 10 | 9.7\% | 14 | 13.6\% | 25 | 24.3\% | 54 | 52.4\% |
| Miller High School | 3 | 3.2\% | 12 | 12.8\% | 13 | 13.8\% | 66 | 70.2\% |
| Mathis High School | 1 | 2.1\% | 11 | 22.9\% | 10 | 20.8\% | 26 | 54.2\% |
| Odem High School | 2 | 8.0\% | 10 | 40.0\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% |
| All High School Campuses | 27 | 6.9\% | 83 | 21.2\% | 71 | 18.2\% | 210 | 53.7\% |

Table B.14. How Familiar Are You with the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) Form That a High School Student Must Complete to Qualify for Federal Financial Aid for College? (Parents of High School Students Only)

| Campus | Not familiar at all |  | Not very familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 14 | 31.8\% | 10 | 22.7\% | 7 | 15.9\% | 12 | 27.3\% | 1 | 2.3\% |
| Alice High School | 33 | 42.9\% | 9 | 11.7\% | 16 | 20.8\% | 18 | 23.4\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 31 | 30.1\% | 17 | 16.5\% | 22 | 21.4\% | 30 | 29.1\% | 3 | 2.9\% |
| Miller High School | 32 | 34.0\% | 21 | 22.3\% | 24 | 25.5\% | 16 | 17.0\% | 1 | 1.1\% |
| Mathis High School | 14 | 29.2\% | 8 | 16.7\% | 15 | 31.3\% | 10 | 20.8\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Odem High School | 7 | 28.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 7 | 28.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All High School Campuses | 131 | 33.5\% | 70 | 17.9\% | 90 | 23.0\% | 93 | 23.8\% | 7 | 1.8\% |

Table B.15. Do You Know if Your Child Has Completed the FAFSA Form and Is Eligible for Federal Financial Aid for College? (Parents of High School Students Only)
Table B.16. Have You Begun Saving for Your Child's Education After High School? (Parents of High School Students Only)

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 21 | 47.7\% | 23 | 52.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 35 | 45.5\% | 41 | 53.2\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 40 | 38.8\% | 61 | 59.2\% | 2 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 33 | 35.1\% | 61 | 64.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 20 | 41.7\% | 28 | 58.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School | 11 | 44.0\% | 14 | 56.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All High School Campuses | 160 | 40.9\% | 228 | 58.3\% | 3 | 0.8\% |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Table B.17. What is the Primary Language Spoken in Your Home?

| Campus | English |  | Spanish |  | Vietnamese |  | Japanese |  | Chinese |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 43 | 97.7\% | 16 | 36.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 22 | 95.7\% | 11 | 47.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 74 | 96.1\% | 22 | 28.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 77 | 98.7\% | 25 | 32.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 96 | 93.2\% | 39 | 37.9\% | 1 | 1.0\% | 1 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 52 | 96.3\% | 17 | 31.5\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School | 83 | 88.3\% | 46 | 48.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 34 | 82.9\% | 18 | 43.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 46 | 95.8\% | 19 | 39.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 21 | 91.3\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem High School | 24 | 96.0\% | 5 | 20.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 16 | 100.0\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 6.3\% |
| All Campuses | 588 | 93.9\% | 227 | 36.3\% | 2 | 0.3\% | 3 | 0.5\% | 1 | 0.2\% | 3 | 0.5\% |

## Table B.18. Which best describes your household?

| Campus | Which best describes your household? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single parent or guardian |  | Two parents or guardians |  | Other |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 16 | 36.4\% | 28 | 63.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 3 | 13.0\% | 19 | 82.6\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 37 | 48.1\% | 39 | 50.6\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 23 | 29.5\% | 54 | 69.2\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 38 | 36.9\% | 64 | 62.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 18 | 33.3\% | 35 | 64.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 42 | 44.7\% | 51 | 54.3\% | 1 | 1.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 11 | 26.8\% | 29 | 70.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 12 | 25.0\% | 33 | 68.8\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 2 | 4.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 9 | 39.1\% | 13 | 56.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 4 | 16.0\% | 21 | 84.0\% |  | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 3 | 18.8\% | 13 | 81.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 216 | 34.5\% | 399 | 63.7\% | 5 | 0.8\% | 6 | 1.0\% |

Table B.19. How many years have you lived at your current address?

|  | How many years have you lived at your <br> current address? <br> Average years |
| :--- | :---: |
| Campus | 16.1 |
| Falfurrias High School | 12.7 |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 11.0 |
| Alice High School | 8.6 |
| Adams Middle School | 10.9 |
| H. M. King High School | 8.8 |
| Memorial Middle School | 10.9 |
| Miller High School | 10.7 |
| Driscoll Middle School | 12.2 |
| Mathis High School | 11.7 |
| Mathis Middle School | 11.2 |
| Odem High School | 9.4 |
| Odem Junior High | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0}$ |
| All Campuses |  |
| Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011. |  |

Table B.20. How Do You Think of Yourself? (Ethnicity)

| Campus | Black, nonHispanic |  | Asian/AsianAmerican |  | Latino/Hispanic |  | White, nonHispanic |  | Native American/ American Indian |  | Other |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 39 | 88.6\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 1 | 2.3\% | 1 | 2.3\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 21 | 91.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 65 | 84.4\% | 9 | 11.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 1 | 1.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 1 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 65 | 83.3\% | 10 | 12.8\% | 2 | 2.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 4 | 3.9\% | 2 | 1.9\% | 70 | 68.0\% | 19 | 18.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 6 | 5.8\% | 2 | 1.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 3.7\% | 41 | 75.9\% | 7 | 13.0\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 1 | 1.9\% | 2 | 3.7\% |
| Miller High School | 6 | 6.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 75 | 79.8\% | 8 | 8.5\% | 1 | 1.1\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 3 | 7.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 31 | 75.6\% | 4 | 9.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 4.9\% | 1 | 2.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 36 | 75.0\% | 10 | 20.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 2.1\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 20 | 87.0\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 16 | 64.0\% | 8 | 32.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 11 | 68.8\% | 5 | 31.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 14 | 2.2\% | 5 | 0.8\% | 490 | 78.3\% | 84 | 13.4\% | 5 | 0.8\% | 18 | 2.9\% | 10 | 1.6\% |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.

Table B.21. How Many Years of Formal Schooling Have You Completed?

| Campus | Average number of years |
| :--- | :---: |
| Falfurrias High School | 11.9 |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 11.6 |
| Alice High School | 11.9 |
| Adams Middle School | 12.1 |
| H. M. King High School | 11.9 |
| Memorial Middle School | 12.1 |
| Miller High School | 10.0 |
| Driscoll Middle School | 10.5 |
| Mathis High School | 11.1 |
| Mathis Middle School | 11.7 |
| Odem High School | 12.2 |
| Odem Junior High | 9.8 |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4}$ |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Table B.22. Have You Attended College?

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 21 | 47.7\% | 23 | 52.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 13 | 56.5\% | 10 | 43.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 41 | 53.2\% | 36 | 46.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 54 | 69.2\% | 24 | 30.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 63 | 61.2\% | 39 | 37.9\% | 1 | 1.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 29 | 53.7\% | 24 | 44.4\% | 1 | 1.9\% |
| Miller High School | 26 | 27.7\% | 68 | 72.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 15 | 36.6\% | 26 | 63.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 19 | 39.6\% | 28 | 58.3\% | 1 | 2.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 11 | 47.8\% | 11 | 47.8\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 14 | 56.0\% | 11 | 44.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 7 | 43.8\% | 9 | 56.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 313 | 50.0\% | 309 | 49.4\% | 4 | 0.6\% |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.

Table B.23. How Many Years of College Have You Completed? (Only Respondents Who Answered Yes to Attending College)

| Campus | Average number of years |
| :--- | :---: |
| Falfurrias High School | 2.7 |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 1.5 |
| Alice High School | 2.2 |
| Adams Middle School | 2.4 |
| H. M. King High School | 3.0 |
| Memorial Middle School | 3.4 |
| Miller High School | 1.7 |
| Driscoll Middle School | 2.3 |
| Mathis High School | 2.2 |
| Mathis Middle School | 2.5 |
| Odem High School | 3.3 |
| Odem Junior High | 2.4 |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ |
| Source: | GEAR UP |
|  |  |

Source: GEAR UP (STAR) Parent Survey, spring 2011.
Table B.24. What Is Your Current Yearly Household Income?

| Campus | Less than$\$ 15,000$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15,000- \\ 24,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 25,000- \\ 34,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 35,0000- \\ 49,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ 50,000- \\ 74,999 \end{gathered}$ |  | More than$\$ 75,000$ |  | Don't know or declined to answer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 12 | 27.3\% | 11 | 25.0\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 4 | 9.1\% | 3 | 6.8\% | 9 | 20.5\% | 3 | 6.8\% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 3 | 13.0\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 6 | 26.1\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 1 | 4.3\% | 4 | 17.4\% | 3 | 13.0\% |
| Alice High School | 16 | 20.8\% | 15 | 19.5\% | 11 | 14.3\% | 9 | 11.7\% | 13 | 16.9\% | 8 | 10.4\% | 5 | 6.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 10 | 12.8\% | 10 | 12.8\% | 13 | 16.7\% | 8 | 10.3\% | 13 | 16.7\% | 20 | 25.6\% | 4 | 5.1\% |
| H. M. King High School | 21 | 20.4\% | 19 | 18.4\% | 14 | 13.6\% | 13 | 12.6\% | 9 | 8.7\% | 19 | 18.4\% | 8 | 7.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 14 | 25.9\% | 8 | 14.8\% | 7 | 13.0\% | 2 | 3.7\% | 7 | 13.0\% | 9 | 16.7\% | 7 | 13.0\% |
| Miller High School | 39 | 41.5\% | 30 | 31.9\% | 3 | 3.2\% | 10 | 10.6\% | 4 | 4.3\% | 2 | 2.1\% | 6 | 6.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 13 | 31.7\% | 4 | 9.8\% | 8 | 19.5\% | 4 | 9.8\% | 6 | 14.6\% | 2 | 4.9\% | 4 | 9.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 16 | 33.3\% | 5 | 10.4\% | 5 | 10.4\% | 4 | 8.3\% | 11 | 22.9\% | 3 | 6.3\% | 4 | 8.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 5 | 21.7\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 5 | 21.7\% | 2 | 8.7\% | 3 | 13.0\% | 1 | 4.3\% |
| Odem High School | 4 | 16.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% | 2 | 8.0\% | 1 | 4.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 6 | 24.0\% | 3 | 12.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 2 | 12.5\% | 1 | 6.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 3 | 18.8\% | 4 | 25.0\% |
| All Campuses | 155 | 24.8\% | 115 | 18.4\% | 73 | 11.7\% | 65 | 10.4\% | 78 | 12.5\% | 88 | 14.1\% | 52 | 8.3\% |

## Appendix C

Results from the Spring 2011 Middle School Student Survey

Table C.1. Number of Middle School Students Responding by District and School

| Campus | Number of Students | Surveys Received | Response Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brooks County ISD |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 229 | 153 | 67\% |
| Alice ISD |  |  |  |
| Adams Middle School | 830 | 554 | 67\% |
| Kingsville ISD |  |  |  |
| Memorial Middle School | 508 | 438 | 86\% |
| Corpus Christi ISD |  |  |  |
| Driscoll Middle School | 413 | 324 | 78\% |
| Mathis ISD |  |  |  |
| Mathis Middle School | 214 | 182 | 85\% |
| Odem-Edroy ISD |  |  |  |
| Odem Junior High | 171 | 151 | 88\% |
| All Campuses | 2,365 | 1,801 | 76\% |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Note. Number of students based on AEIS 2009-10 counts.
Table C.2. Prior Year Enrollment Status of Students Responding to the Middle School Survey

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 130 | $85.5 \%$ | 22 | $14.5 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School | 248 | $45.3 \%$ | 300 | $54.7 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | 239 | $54.8 \%$ | 197 | $45.2 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | 280 | $87.5 \%$ | 40 | $12.5 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | 148 | $82.2 \%$ | 32 | $17.8 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | 122 | $81.9 \%$ | 27 | $18.1 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{1 , 1 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 5 . 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 6 \%}$ |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table C.3. Grade Levels of Students Responding to the Middle School Survey

| Campus | 7 |  | 8 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
|  | 75 | $49.0 \%$ | 78 | $51.0 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | 324 | $58.9 \%$ | 222 | $40.4 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | 217 | $50.0 \%$ | 215 | $49.5 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | 169 | $52.2 \%$ | 153 | $47.2 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | 74 | $46.4 \%$ | 97 | $53.6 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{9 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 . 7 \%}$ |

[^16]Table C.4. Gender of Students Responding to the Middle School Survey

| Campus | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 84 | $55.6 \%$ | 67 | $44.4 \%$ |
| Adams Middle School | 273 | $49.9 \%$ | 274 | $50.1 \%$ |
| Memorial Middle School | 219 | $50.2 \%$ | 217 | $49.8 \%$ |
| Driscoll Middle School | 159 | $49.8 \%$ | 160 | $50.2 \%$ |
| Mathis Middle School | 86 | $47.5 \%$ | 95 | $52.5 \%$ |
| Odem Junior High | 65 | $43.3 \%$ | 85 | $56.7 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{8 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 3 \%}$ |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table C.5. Ethnicity of Students Responding to the Middle School Survey

| Campus | Hispanic, Latino |  | African American |  | White |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 145 | 95.4\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 3 | 2.0\% | 2 | 1.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 487 | 88.4\% | 6 | 1.1\% | 44 | 8.0\% | 14 | 2.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 357 | 81.9\% | 23 | 5.3\% | 39 | 8.9\% | 17 | 3.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 271 | 84.2\% | 27 | 8.4\% | 13 | 4.0\% | 11 | 3.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 167 | 91.8\% | 3 | 1.6\% | 10 | 5.5\% | 2 | 1.1\% |
| Odem Junior High | 119 | 79.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 22 | 14.8\% | 8 | 5.4\% |
| All Campuses | 1,546 | 86.3\% | 61 | 3.4\% | 131 | 7.3\% | 54 | 3.0\% |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table C.6. How Much Time Do You Usually Spend on Homework Each Day?

| Campus | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } 30 \\ \text { minutes } \end{gathered}$ |  | 30 to 59 minutes |  | 1 to 2 hours |  | More than 2 hours |  | My teacher does not assign homework |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 84 | 55.6\% | 42 | 27.8\% | 9 | 6.0\% | 1 | 0.7\% | 15 | 9.9\% |
| Adams Middle School | 217 | 40.4\% | 198 | 36.9\% | 42 | 7.8\% | 11 | 2.0\% | 69 | 12.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 136 | 31.2\% | 121 | 27.8\% | 20 | 4.6\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 155 | 35.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 137 | 42.7\% | 123 | 38.3\% | 17 | 5.3\% | 6 | 1.9\% | 38 | 11.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 76 | 42.0\% | 74 | 40.9\% | 16 | 8.8\% | 5 | 2.8\% | 10 | 5.5\% |
| Odem Junior High | 55 | 36.9\% | 69 | 46.3\% | 17 | 11.4\% | 7 | 4.7\% | 1 | 0.7\% |
| All Campuses | 705 | 39.7\% | 627 | 35.3\% | 121 | 6.8\% | 34 | 1.9\% | 288 | 16.2\% |

Table C.7. Which of the Following Courses or Programs Are You Enrolled in This Year?

| Campus | Enrolled in basic math this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in Algebra 1 this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in Algebra 2 this year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 5 | 3.3\% | 148 | 96.7\% | 135 | 88.2\% | 18 | 11.8\% | 153 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 53 | 9.6\% | 501 | 90.4\% | 517 | 93.3\% | 37 | 6.7\% | 554 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 51 | 11.6\% | 387 | 88.4\% | 396 | 90.4\% | 42 | 9.6\% | 437 | 99.8\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 127 | 39.2\% | 197 | 60.8\% | 268 | 82.7\% | 56 | 17.3\% | 324 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 7 | 3.8\% | 175 | 96.2\% | 168 | 92.3\% | 14 | 7.7\% | 182 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 27 | 18.0\% | 123 | 82.0\% | 126 | 84.0\% | 24 | 16.0\% | 150 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 270 | 15.0\% | 1,531 | 85.0\% | 1,610 | 89.4\% | 191 | 10.6\% | 1,800 | 99.9\% | 1 | 0.1\% |

Table C.7. Which of the Following Courses or Programs Are You Enrolled in This Year? (Continued)

|  | Enrolled in geometry this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in other math course this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in gifted and talented program this year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 153 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 151 | 98.7\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 132 | 86.3\% | 21 | 13.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 549 | 99.1\% | 5 | 0.9\% | 518 | 93.5\% | 36 | 6.5\% | 422 | 76.2\% | 132 | 23.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 434 | 99.1\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 425 | 97.0\% | 13 | 3.0\% | 393 | 89.7\% | 45 | 10.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 323 | 99.7\% | 1 | 0.3\% | 247 | 76.2\% | 77 | 23.8\% | 304 | 93.8\% | 20 | 6.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 182 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 153 | 84.1\% | 29 | 15.9\% | 171 | 94.0\% | 11 | 6.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 147 | 98.0\% | 3 | 2.0\% | 149 | 99.3\% | 1 | 0.7\% | 135 | 90.0\% | 15 | 10.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,788 | 99.3\% | 13 | 0.7\% | 1,643 | 91.2\% | 158 | 8.8\% | 1,557 | 86.5\% | 244 | 13.5\% |

Table C.7. Which of the Following Courses or Programs Are You Enrolled in This Year? (Continued)

|  | Enrolled in career and technology courses this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in special education this year |  |  |  | Enrolled in Pre-AP or AP courses this year |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 143 | 93.5\% | 10 | 6.5\% | 151 | 98.7\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 41 | 26.8\% | 112 | 73.2\% |
| Adams Middle School | 433 | 78.2\% | 121 | 21.8\% | 530 | 95.7\% | 24 | 4.3\% | 263 | 47.5\% | 291 | 52.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 414 | 94.5\% | 24 | 5.5\% | 421 | 96.1\% | 17 | 3.9\% | 217 | 49.5\% | 221 | 50.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 321 | 99.1\% | 3 | 0.9\% | 315 | 97.2\% | 9 | 2.8\% | 169 | 52.2\% | 155 | 47.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 152 | 83.5\% | 30 | 16.5\% | 181 | 99.5\% | 1 | 0.5\% | 22 | 12.1\% | 160 | 87.9\% |
| Odem Junior High | 122 | 81.3\% | 28 | 18.7\% | 143 | 95.3\% | 7 | 4.7\% | 102 | 68.0\% | 48 | 32.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,585 | 88.0\% | 216 | 12.0\% | 1,741 | 96.7\% | 60 | 3.3\% | 814 | 45.2\% | 987 | 54.8\% |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year

| Campus | Tutoring for an academic subject |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 49 | 32.0\% | 27 | 17.6\% | 18 | 11.8\% | 50 | 32.7\% | 9 | 5.9\% |
| Adams Middle School | 192 | 35.3\% | 104 | 19.1\% | 112 | 20.6\% | 93 | 17.1\% | 43 | 7.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 160 | 36.7\% | 98 | 22.5\% | 83 | 19.0\% | 72 | 16.5\% | 23 | 5.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 59 | 18.3\% | 47 | 14.6\% | 114 | 35.4\% | 73 | 22.7\% | 29 | 9.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 73 | 40.6\% | 38 | 21.1\% | 36 | 20.0\% | 14 | 7.8\% | 19 | 10.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 67 | 45.3\% | 26 | 17.6\% | 16 | 10.8\% | 35 | 23.6\% | 4 | 2.7\% |
| All Campuses | 600 | 33.7\% | 340 | 19.1\% | 379 | 21.3\% | 337 | 18.9\% | 127 | 7.1\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Mentoring by an adult who is not your parent, guardian, or a teacher |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely ( 1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes ( 1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often ( 1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 107 | 70.9\% | 12 | 7.9\% | 15 | 9.9\% | 7 | 4.6\% | 10 | 6.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 349 | 65.2\% | 61 | 11.4\% | 50 | 9.3\% | 39 | 7.3\% | 36 | 6.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 289 | 66.9\% | 43 | 10.0\% | 42 | 9.7\% | 29 | 6.7\% | 29 | 6.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 228 | 71.7\% | 30 | 9.4\% | 21 | 6.6\% | 27 | 8.5\% | 12 | 3.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 131 | 74.9\% | 23 | 13.1\% | 12 | 6.9\% | 5 | 2.9\% | 4 | 2.3\% |
| Odem Junior High | 95 | 64.6\% | 21 | 14.3\% | 11 | 7.5\% | 15 | 10.2\% | 5 | 3.4\% |
| All Campuses | 1,199 | 68.2\% | 190 | 10.8\% | 151 | 8.6\% | 122 | 6.9\% | 96 | 5.5\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Counseling about your grades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 104 | 68.9\% | 19 | 12.6\% | 17 | 11.3\% | 6 | 4.0\% | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 313 | 58.3\% | 67 | 12.5\% | 75 | 14.0\% | 48 | 8.9\% | 34 | 6.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 279 | 64.4\% | 55 | 12.7\% | 55 | 12.7\% | 34 | 7.9\% | 10 | 2.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 108 | 33.9\% | 56 | 17.6\% | 40 | 12.5\% | 89 | 27.9\% | 26 | 8.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 118 | 66.3\% | 32 | 18.0\% | 16 | 9.0\% | 5 | 2.8\% | 7 | 3.9\% |
| Odem Junior High | 110 | 74.8\% | 20 | 13.6\% | 8 | 5.4\% | 5 | 3.4\% | 4 | 2.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,032 | 58.5\% | 249 | 14.1\% | 211 | 12.0\% | 187 | 10.6\% | 86 | 4.9\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Workshop on study skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 126 | 84.6\% | 12 | 8.1\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 7 | 4.7\% | 2 | 1.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 359 | 67.0\% | 52 | 9.7\% | 52 | 9.7\% | 52 | 9.7\% | 21 | 3.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 348 | 81.7\% | 40 | 9.4\% | 24 | 5.6\% | 10 | 2.3\% | 4 | 0.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 161 | 52.3\% | 80 | 26.0\% | 38 | 12.3\% | 14 | 4.5\% | 15 | 4.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 128 | 72.3\% | 19 | 10.7\% | 9 | 5.1\% | 9 | 5.1\% | 12 | 6.8\% |
| Odem Junior High | 119 | 81.5\% | 15 | 10.3\% | 7 | 4.8\% | 3 | 2.1\% | 2 | 1.4\% |
| All Campuses | 1,241 | 71.2\% | 218 | 12.5\% | 132 | 7.6\% | 95 | 5.5\% | 56 | 3.2\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Workshop to learn about the ACT, SAT, or other college entrance exam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely ( 1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 137 | 91.3\% | 11 | 7.3\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 422 | 79.3\% | 75 | 14.1\% | 23 | 4.3\% | 6 | 1.1\% | 6 | 1.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 376 | 87.0\% | 37 | 8.6\% | 11 | 2.5\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 4 | 0.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 235 | 74.4\% | 50 | 15.8\% | 13 | 4.1\% | 10 | 3.2\% | 8 | 2.5\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 124 | 70.5\% | 46 | 26.1\% | 3 | 1.7\% | 2 | 1.1\% | 1 | 0.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 110 | 75.3\% | 25 | 17.1\% | 9 | 6.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 1.4\% |
| All Campuses | 1,404 | 80.1\% | 244 | 13.9\% | 61 | 3.5\% | 22 | 1.3\% | 21 | 1.2\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Class field trip to a museum, park, or other site to learn more about a subject discussed in class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 51 | 33.8\% | 88 | 58.3\% | 10 | 6.6\% | 1 | 0.7\% | 1 | 0.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 447 | 82.3\% | 82 | 15.1\% | 7 | 1.3\% | 6 | 1.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 307 | 70.6\% | 105 | 24.1\% | 19 | 4.4\% | 4 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 121 | 37.8\% | 160 | 50.0\% | 34 | 10.6\% | 3 | 0.9\% | 2 | 0.6\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 72 | 40.2\% | 104 | 58.1\% | 3 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 23 | 15.4\% | 113 | 75.8\% | 9 | 6.0\% | 1 | 0.7\% | 3 | 2.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,021 | 57.5\% | 652 | 36.7\% | 82 | 4.6\% | 15 | 0.8\% | 7 | 0.4\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Attending a family activity at school with a parent or guardian (including events with Fathers Active in Communities and Education [FACE]) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 99 | 65.6\% | 39 | 25.8\% | 13 | 8.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 306 | 56.2\% | 155 | 28.5\% | 65 | 11.9\% | 13 | 2.4\% | 5 | 0.9\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 326 | 75.1\% | 80 | 18.4\% | 21 | 4.8\% | 6 | 1.4\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 177 | 55.3\% | 90 | 28.1\% | 45 | 14.1\% | 8 | 2.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 107 | 60.1\% | 49 | 27.5\% | 19 | 10.7\% | 3 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 60 | 41.1\% | 46 | 31.5\% | 32 | 21.9\% | 5 | 3.4\% | 3 | 2.1\% |
| All Campuses | 1,075 | 60.6\% | 459 | 25.9\% | 195 | 11.0\% | 35 | 2.0\% | 9 | 0.5\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Attending a presentation by a business person or attended a Junior Achievement activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely ( 1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes ( 1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often ( 1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 114 | 75.0\% | 28 | 18.4\% | 7 | 4.6\% | 3 | 2.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 323 | 60.1\% | 174 | 32.4\% | 30 | 5.6\% | 6 | 1.1\% | 4 | 0.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 274 | 63.9\% | 104 | 24.2\% | 20 | 4.7\% | 27 | 6.3\% | 4 | 0.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 188 | 59.3\% | 82 | 25.9\% | 39 | 12.3\% | 8 | 2.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 118 | 66.3\% | 47 | 26.4\% | 13 | 7.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 44 | 30.3\% | 83 | 57.2\% | 16 | 11.0\% | 1 | 0.7\% |  | 0.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,061 | 60.4\% | 518 | 29.5\% | 125 | 7.1\% | 45 | 2.6\% | 9 | 0.5\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | University professor visits to your class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely (1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes (1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 14 | 9.3\% | 53 | 35.1\% | 76 | 50.3\% | 8 | 5.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 396 | 73.6\% | 121 | 22.5\% | 14 | 2.6\% | 6 | 1.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 238 | 55.2\% | 116 | 26.9\% | 34 | 7.9\% | 38 | 8.8\% | 5 | 1.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 119 | 37.5\% | 101 | 31.9\% | 63 | 19.9\% | 25 | 7.9\% | 9 | 2.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 106 | 59.6\% | 48 | 27.0\% | 18 | 10.1\% | 6 | 3.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 43 | 29.5\% | 60 | 41.1\% | 22 | 15.1\% | 20 | 13.7\% | 1 | 0.7\% |
| All Campuses | 916 | 52.0\% | 499 | 28.3\% | 227 | 12.9\% | 103 | 5.8\% | 16 | 0.9\% |

Table C.8. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Used the Go Center for college or career information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely ( 1 or 2 times a YEAR) |  | Sometimes ( 1 or 2 times a MONTH) |  | Often (1 or 2 times a WEEK) |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 138 | 90.8\% | 10 | 6.6\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 2 | 1.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 494 | 91.8\% | 29 | 5.4\% | 7 | 1.3\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 6 | 1.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 387 | 88.8\% | 31 | 7.1\% | 10 | 2.3\% | 6 | 1.4\% | 2 | 0.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 222 | 70.3\% | 67 | 21.2\% | 17 | 5.4\% | 9 | 2.8\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 155 | 86.6\% | 14 | 7.8\% | 8 | 4.5\% | 1 | 0.6\% | 1 | 0.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 110 | 75.3\% | 29 | 19.9\% | 4 | 2.7\% | 2 | 1.4\% | 1 | 0.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,506 | 85.2\% | 180 | 10.2\% | 48 | 2.7\% | 22 | 1.2\% | 11 | 0.6\% |

Table C.9. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following College and Career Awareness Activities During This School

| Campus | Visited a college campus with your school |  |  |  | Attended a college or career fair at your school |  |  |  | Attended a college planning workshop at your school (learning about college entrance exams and entrance requirements) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 86 | 56.6\% | 66 | 43.4\% | 29 | 19.0\% | 124 | 81.0\% | 16 | 10.5\% | 137 | 89.5\% |
| Adams Middle School | 77 | 14.2\% | 466 | 85.8\% | 99 | 18.3\% | 442 | 81.7\% | 47 | 8.7\% | 493 | 91.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 178 | 40.7\% | 259 | 59.3\% | 113 | 25.9\% | 323 | 74.1\% | 85 | 19.5\% | 351 | 80.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 105 | 32.7\% | 216 | 67.3\% | 78 | 24.5\% | 241 | 75.5\% | 96 | 29.7\% | 227 | 70.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 134 | 73.6\% | 48 | 26.4\% | 28 | 15.4\% | 154 | 84.6\% | 43 | 23.6\% | 139 | 76.4\% |
| Odem Junior High | 78 | 52.3\% | 71 | 47.7\% | 116 | 78.4\% | 32 | 21.6\% | 68 | 46.3\% | 79 | 53.7\% |
| All Campuses | 658 | 36.9\% | 1,126 | 63.1\% | 463 | 26.0\% | 1,316 | 74.0\% | 355 | 19.9\% | 1,426 | 80.1\% |

Table C.9. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following College and Career Awareness Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Received assistance at school completing college, financial aid, and scholarship applications |  |  |  | Taken a career inventory/test about career interests at your school |  |  |  | Learned about careers at your school (available careers, applying for careers, creating resumes, educational and training requirements) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 13 | 8.6\% | 139 | 91.4\% | 42 | 27.5\% | 111 | 72.5\% | 56 | 36.6\% | 97 | 63.4\% |
| Adams Middle School | 55 | 10.2\% | 485 | 89.8\% | 192 | 36.4\% | 336 | 63.6\% | 275 | 51.0\% | 264 | 49.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 64 | 14.8\% | 369 | 85.2\% | 141 | 32.8\% | 289 | 67.2\% | 236 | 54.4\% | 198 | 45.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 48 | 14.9\% | 274 | 85.1\% | 127 | 40.2\% | 189 | 59.8\% | 183 | 57.0\% | 138 | 43.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 28 | 15.6\% | 152 | 84.4\% | 110 | 61.5\% | 69 | 38.5\% | 102 | 56.0\% | 80 | 44.0\% |
| Odem Junior High | 25 | 16.8\% | 124 | 83.2\% | 92 | 63.4\% | 53 | 36.6\% | 116 | 78.9\% | 31 | 21.1\% |
| All Campuses | 233 | 13.1\% | 1,543 | 86.9\% | 704 | 40.2\% | 1,047 | 59.8\% | 968 | 54.5\% | 808 | 45.5\% |

Table C.9. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following College and Career Awareness Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Visited local employers |  |  |  | Interned or shadowed someone at a job |  |  |  | Had a school administrator or teacher visit your home |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 6 | 3.9\% | 147 | 96.1\% | 5 | 3.3\% | 148 | 96.7\% | 11 | 7.2\% | 142 | 92.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 43 | 8.0\% | 495 | 92.0\% | 51 | 9.5\% | 488 | 90.5\% | 18 | 3.3\% | 522 | 96.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 57 | 13.1\% | 379 | 86.9\% | 66 | 15.1\% | 370 | 84.9\% | 31 | 7.1\% | 406 | 92.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 44 | 13.7\% | 278 | 86.3\% | 43 | 13.5\% | 276 | 86.5\% | 24 | 7.5\% | 298 | 92.5\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 12 | 6.6\% | 169 | 93.4\% | 20 | 11.0\% | 161 | 89.0\% | 7 | 3.8\% | 175 | 96.2\% |
| Odem Junior High | 45 | 30.2\% | 104 | 69.8\% | 59 | 39.6\% | 90 | 60.4\% | 15 | 10.1\% | 134 | 89.9\% |
| All Campuses | 207 | 11.6\% | 1,572 | 88.4\% | 244 | 13.7\% | 1,533 | 86.3\% | 106 | 5.9\% | 1,677 | 94.1\% |

Table C.10. Please Indicate How Familiar You Are with Each Type of College and University

| Campus | Community or junior colleges (two-year programs) |  |  |  |  |  | Four-year colleges and universities |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  | Not familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 69 | 45.1\% | 77 | 50.3\% | 7 | 4.6\% | 44 | 28.9\% | 60 | 39.5\% | 48 | 31.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 242 | 45.5\% | 229 | 43.0\% | 61 | 11.5\% | 175 | 32.5\% | 200 | 37.2\% | 163 | 30.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 182 | 41.7\% | 196 | 45.0\% | 58 | 13.3\% | 120 | 27.5\% | 141 | 32.3\% | 175 | 40.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 123 | 39.2\% | 125 | 39.8\% | 66 | 21.0\% | 95 | 30.0\% | 114 | 36.0\% | 108 | 34.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 77 | 42.5\% | 75 | 41.4\% | 29 | 16.0\% | 44 | 24.3\% | 72 | 39.8\% | 65 | 35.9\% |
| Odem Junior High | 41 | 27.7\% | 75 | 50.7\% | 32 | 21.6\% | 24 | 16.4\% | 60 | 41.1\% | 62 | 42.5\% |
| All Campuses | 734 | 41.6\% | 777 | 44.0\% | 253 | 14.3\% | 502 | 28.4\% | 647 | 36.6\% | 621 | 35.1\% |

Table C.10. Please Indicate How Familiar You Are with Each Type of College and University (Continued)

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities

| Campus | Visited a college or university |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 19 | 12.5\% | 16 | 10.5\% | 32 | 21.1\% | 38 | 25.0\% | 47 | 30.9\% |
| Adams Middle School | 84 | 15.7\% | 56 | 10.5\% | 124 | 23.2\% | 88 | 16.4\% | 183 | 34.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 64 | 14.7\% | 61 | 14.0\% | 120 | 27.6\% | 81 | 18.6\% | 109 | 25.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 43 | 13.5\% | 31 | 9.7\% | 68 | 21.3\% | 60 | 18.8\% | 117 | 36.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 15 | 8.4\% | 10 | 5.6\% | 54 | 30.2\% | 26 | 14.5\% | 74 | 41.3\% |
| Odem Junior High | 12 | 8.2\% | 9 | 6.1\% | 29 | 19.7\% | 34 | 23.1\% | 63 | 42.9\% |
| All Campuses | 237 | 13.4\% | 183 | 10.4\% | 427 | 24.2\% | 327 | 18.5\% | 593 | 33.6\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with a school counselor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 26 | 17.0\% | 28 | 18.3\% | 42 | 27.5\% | 28 | 18.3\% | 29 | 19.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 129 | 24.1\% | 80 | 15.0\% | 105 | 19.6\% | 87 | 16.3\% | 134 | 25.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 110 | 25.4\% | 77 | 17.8\% | 89 | 20.6\% | 72 | 16.6\% | 85 | 19.6\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 43 | 13.4\% | 37 | 11.5\% | 69 | 21.5\% | 65 | 20.2\% | 107 | 33.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 28 | 15.6\% | 32 | 17.9\% | 46 | 25.7\% | 29 | 16.2\% | 44 | 24.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 20 | 13.5\% | 16 | 10.8\% | 35 | 23.6\% | 35 | 23.6\% | 42 | 28.4\% |
| All Campuses | 356 | 20.1\% | 270 | 15.3\% | 386 | 21.8\% | 316 | 17.9\% | 441 | 24.9\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with your teacher |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 19 | 12.6\% | 21 | 13.9\% | 42 | 27.8\% | 33 | 21.9\% | 36 | 23.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 127 | 23.8\% | 82 | 15.4\% | 113 | 21.2\% | 90 | 16.9\% | 122 | 22.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 86 | 20.0\% | 73 | 16.9\% | 106 | 24.6\% | 76 | 17.6\% | 90 | 20.9\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 43 | 13.5\% | 46 | 14.4\% | 79 | 24.8\% | 54 | 16.9\% | 97 | 30.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 16 | 8.9\% | 28 | 15.6\% | 39 | 21.8\% | 51 | 28.5\% | 45 | 25.1\% |
| Odem Junior High | 19 | 13.2\% | 13 | 9.0\% | 33 | 22.9\% | 44 | 30.6\% | 35 | 24.3\% |
| All Campuses | 310 | 17.6\% | 263 | 15.0\% | 412 | 23.4\% | 348 | 19.8\% | 425 | 24.2\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with your parent(s) or guardian(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 14 | 9.2\% | 16 | 10.5\% | 23 | 15.1\% | 34 | 22.4\% | 65 | 42.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 67 | 12.6\% | 43 | 8.1\% | 61 | 11.4\% | 111 | 20.8\% | 251 | 47.1\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 63 | 14.8\% | 32 | 7.5\% | 53 | 12.4\% | 85 | 19.9\% | 194 | 45.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 36 | 11.3\% | 22 | 6.9\% | 53 | 16.6\% | 62 | 19.4\% | 146 | 45.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 19 | 10.7\% | 17 | 9.6\% | 31 | 17.5\% | 37 | 20.9\% | 73 | 41.2\% |
| Odem Junior High | 12 | 8.2\% | 10 | 6.8\% | 21 | 14.4\% | 33 | 22.6\% | 70 | 47.9\% |
| All Campuses | 211 | 12.0\% | 140 | 8.0\% | 242 | 13.8\% | 362 | 20.6\% | 799 | 45.6\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with a brother or sister |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 34 | 22.4\% | 26 | 17.1\% | 37 | 24.3\% | 27 | 17.8\% | 28 | 18.4\% |
| Adams Middle School | 166 | 31.5\% | 72 | 13.7\% | 89 | 16.9\% | 75 | 14.2\% | 125 | 23.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 121 | 28.3\% | 60 | 14.1\% | 75 | 17.6\% | 74 | 17.3\% | 97 | 22.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 91 | 28.8\% | 49 | 15.5\% | 55 | 17.4\% | 49 | 15.5\% | 72 | 22.8\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 50 | 28.2\% | 35 | 19.8\% | 36 | 20.3\% | 23 | 13.0\% | 33 | 18.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 34 | 24.1\% | 29 | 20.6\% | 29 | 20.6\% | 30 | 21.3\% | 19 | 13.5\% |
| All Campuses | 496 | 28.5\% | 271 | 15.6\% | 321 | 18.4\% | 278 | 16.0\% | 374 | 21.5\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, or cousin) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 26 | 17.2\% | 26 | 17.2\% | 36 | 23.8\% | 24 | 15.9\% | 39 | 25.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 110 | 20.7\% | 70 | 13.2\% | 103 | 19.4\% | 101 | 19.0\% | 148 | 27.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 97 | 22.3\% | 69 | 15.9\% | 81 | 18.6\% | 85 | 19.5\% | 103 | 23.7\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 67 | 20.9\% | 46 | 14.4\% | 63 | 19.7\% | 57 | 17.8\% | 87 | 27.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 42 | 23.3\% | 33 | 18.3\% | 42 | 23.3\% | 24 | 13.3\% | 39 | 21.7\% |
| Odem Junior High | 23 | 15.6\% | 19 | 12.9\% | 31 | 21.1\% | 39 | 26.5\% | 35 | 23.8\% |
| All Campuses | 365 | 20.7\% | 263 | 14.9\% | 356 | 20.2\% | 330 | 18.7\% | 451 | 25.6\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | e continu |


| Campus | Looked at a guide to colleges and universities (e.g., Barron's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 28 | 18.4\% | 17 | 11.2\% | 33 | 21.7\% | 23 | 15.1\% | 51 | 33.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 111 | 21.0\% | 63 | 11.9\% | 108 | 20.4\% | 105 | 19.8\% | 142 | 26.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 84 | 19.4\% | 81 | 18.8\% | 80 | 18.5\% | 87 | 20.1\% | 100 | 23.1\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 59 | 19.0\% | 45 | 14.5\% | 71 | 22.8\% | 60 | 19.3\% | 76 | 24.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 37 | 20.7\% | 21 | 11.7\% | 38 | 21.2\% | 39 | 21.8\% | 44 | 24.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 14 | 9.7\% | 17 | 11.7\% | 31 | 21.4\% | 28 | 19.3\% | 55 | 37.9\% |
| All Campuses | 333 | 19.1\% | 244 | 14.0\% | 361 | 20.7\% | 342 | 19.6\% | 468 | 26.8\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Commercials or advertisements (TV, online) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 39 | 26.0\% | 35 | 23.3\% | 30 | 20.0\% | 23 | 15.3\% | 23 | 15.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 139 | 26.8\% | 95 | 18.3\% | 130 | 25.1\% | 79 | 15.3\% | 75 | 14.5\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 132 | 30.6\% | 89 | 20.6\% | 109 | 25.2\% | 53 | 12.3\% | 49 | 11.3\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 80 | 25.4\% | 70 | 22.2\% | 64 | 20.3\% | 47 | 14.9\% | 54 | 17.1\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 37 | 21.1\% | 37 | 21.1\% | 44 | 25.1\% | 25 | 14.3\% | 32 | 18.3\% |
| Odem Junior High | 13 | 9.0\% | 38 | 26.4\% | 36 | 25.0\% | 21 | 14.6\% | 36 | 25.0\% |
| All Campuses | 440 | 25.4\% | 364 | 21.0\% | 413 | 23.8\% | 248 | 14.3\% | 269 | 15.5\% |

Table C.11. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important or not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 42 | 38.9\% | 16 | 14.8\% | 20 | 18.5\% | 14 | 13.0\% | 16 | 14.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 165 | 55.0\% | 32 | 10.7\% | 39 | 13.0\% | 19 | 6.3\% | 45 | 15.0\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 159 | 54.8\% | 28 | 9.7\% | 40 | 13.8\% | 21 | 7.2\% | 42 | 14.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 115 | 55.3\% | 19 | 9.1\% | 34 | 16.3\% | 13 | 6.2\% | 27 | 13.0\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 76 | 69.7\% | 8 | 7.3\% | 9 | 8.3\% | 8 | 7.3\% | 8 | 7.3\% |
| Odem Junior High | 27 | 40.3\% | 8 | 11.9\% | 15 | 22.4\% | 4 | 6.0\% | 13 | 19.4\% |
| All Campuses | 584 | 54.0\% | 111 | 10.3\% | 157 | 14.5\% | 79 | 7.3\% | 151 | 14.0\% |

Table C.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements?

| Campus | A GEAR UP, STAR representative |  |  |  | My parent(s) or guardian |  |  |  | My school counselor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 113 | 73.9\% | 40 | 26.1\% | 43 | 28.1\% | 110 | 71.9\% | 115 | 75.2\% | 38 | 24.8\% |
| Adams Middle School | 477 | 86.1\% | 77 | 13.9\% | 153 | 27.6\% | 401 | 72.4\% | 458 | 82.7\% | 96 | 17.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 364 | 83.1\% | 74 | 16.9\% | 126 | 28.8\% | 312 | 71.2\% | 345 | 78.8\% | 93 | 21.2\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 274 | 84.6\% | 50 | 15.4\% | 110 | 34.0\% | 214 | 66.0\% | 106 | 32.7\% | 218 | 67.3\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 131 | 72.0\% | 51 | 28.0\% | 65 | 35.7\% | 117 | 64.3\% | 132 | 72.5\% | 50 | 27.5\% |
| Odem Junior High | 77 | 51.3\% | 73 | 48.7\% | 44 | 29.3\% | 106 | 70.7\% | 95 | 63.3\% | 55 | 36.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,436 | 79.7\% | 365 | 20.3\% | 541 | 30.0\% | 1,260 | 70.0\% | 1,251 | 69.5\% | 550 | 30.5\% |

Table C.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements? (Continued)

| Campus | My teachers |  |  |  | My principal or assistant principal |  |  |  | My brother or sister |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 78 | 51.0\% | 75 | 49.0\% | 132 | 86.3\% | 21 | 13.7\% | 100 | 65.4\% | 53 | 34.6\% |
| Adams Middle School | 337 | 60.8\% | 217 | 39.2\% | 477 | 86.1\% | 77 | 13.9\% | 359 | 64.8\% | 195 | 35.2\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 196 | 44.7\% | 242 | 55.3\% | 361 | 82.4\% | 77 | 17.6\% | 278 | 63.5\% | 160 | 36.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 92 | 28.4\% | 232 | 71.6\% | 204 | 63.0\% | 120 | 37.0\% | 231 | 71.3\% | 93 | 28.7\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 71 | 39.0\% | 111 | 61.0\% | 132 | 72.5\% | 50 | 27.5\% | 126 | 69.2\% | 56 | 30.8\% |
| Odem Junior High | 59 | 39.3\% | 91 | 60.7\% | 103 | 68.7\% | 47 | 31.3\% | 103 | 68.7\% | 47 | 31.3\% |
| All Campuses | 833 | 46.3\% | 968 | 53.7\% | 1,409 | 78.2\% | 392 | 21.8\% | 1,197 | 66.5\% | 604 | 33.5\% |

Table C.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements? (Continued)

| Campus | Another family member |  |  |  | No one |  |  |  | Other |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 83 | 54.2\% | 70 | 45.8\% | 132 | 86.3\% | 21 | 13.7\% | 148 | 96.7\% | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 307 | 55.4\% | 247 | 44.6\% | 466 | 84.1\% | 88 | 15.9\% | 541 | 97.7\% | 13 | 2.3\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 239 | 54.6\% | 199 | 45.4\% | 382 | 87.2\% | 56 | 12.8\% | 410 | 93.6\% | 28 | 6.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 178 | 54.9\% | 146 | 45.1\% | 295 | 91.0\% | 29 | 9.0\% | 308 | 95.1\% | 16 | 4.9\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 104 | 57.1\% | 78 | 42.9\% | 154 | 84.6\% | 28 | 15.4\% | 173 | 95.1\% | 9 | 4.9\% |
| Odem Junior High | 78 | 52.0\% | 72 | 48.0\% | 137 | 91.3\% | 13 | 8.7\% | 145 | 96.7\% | 5 | 3.3\% |
| All Campuses | 989 | 54.9\% | 812 | 45.1\% | 1,566 | 87.0\% | 235 | 13.0\% | 1,725 | 95.8\% | 76 | 4.2\% |

Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table C.13. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition

| Campus | A GEAR UP, STAR representative |  |  |  | My parent(s) or guardian |  |  |  | My school counselor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 140 | 91.5\% | 13 | 8.5\% | 82 | 53.6\% | 71 | 46.4\% | 132 | 86.3\% | 21 | 13.7\% |
| Adams Middle School | 513 | 92.6\% | 41 | 7.4\% | 272 | 49.1\% | 282 | 50.9\% | 506 | 91.3\% | 48 | 8.7\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 391 | 89.3\% | 47 | 10.7\% | 203 | 46.3\% | 235 | 53.7\% | 369 | 84.2\% | 69 | 15.8\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 297 | 91.7\% | 27 | 8.3\% | 165 | 50.9\% | 159 | 49.1\% | 197 | 60.8\% | 127 | 39.2\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 149 | 81.9\% | 33 | 18.1\% | 104 | 57.1\% | 78 | 42.9\% | 167 | 91.8\% | 15 | 8.2\% |
| Odem Junior High | 113 | 75.3\% | 37 | 24.7\% | 74 | 49.3\% | 76 | 50.7\% | 121 | 80.7\% | 29 | 19.3\% |
| All Campuses | 1,603 | 89.0\% | 198 | 11.0\% | 900 | 50.0\% | 901 | 50.0\% | 1,492 | 82.8\% | 309 | 17.2\% |

Table C.13. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition Expenses? (Continued)

| Campus | My teacher(s) |  |  |  | My principal or assistant principal |  |  |  | My brother or sister |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 120 | 78.4\% | 33 | 21.6\% | 145 | 94.8\% | 8 | 5.2\% | 127 | 83.0\% | 26 | 17.0\% |
| Adams Middle School | 445 | 80.3\% | 109 | 19.7\% | 524 | 94.6\% | 30 | 5.4\% | 450 | 81.2\% | 104 | 18.8\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 306 | 69.9\% | 132 | $30.1 \%$ | 389 | 88.8\% | 49 | 11.2\% | 344 | 78.5\% | 94 | 21.5\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 182 | 56.2\% | 142 | 43.8\% | 252 | 77.8\% | 72 | 22.2\% | 271 | 83.6\% | 53 | 16.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 134 | 73.6\% | 48 | 26.4\% | 163 | 89.6\% | 19 | 10.4\% | 159 | 87.4\% | 23 | 12.6\% |
| Odem Junior High | 111 | 74.0\% | 39 | 26.0\% | 130 | 86.7\% | 20 | 13.3\% | 117 | 78.0\% | 33 | 22.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,298 | 72.1\% | 503 | 27.9\% | 1,603 | 89.0\% | 198 | 11.0\% | 1,468 | 81.5\% | 333 | 18.5\% |

Table C.13. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition

Table C.14. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources?

Table C.14. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources? (Continued)

| Campus | A community or junior college (two-year program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Definitely |  | Probably |  | Not sure |  | Probably not |  | Definitely not |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias Junior High | 59 | 39.3\% | 58 | 38.7\% | 24 | 16.0\% | 4 | 2.7\% | 5 | 3.3\% |
| Adams Middle School | 203 | 39.3\% | 170 | 32.9\% | 93 | 18.0\% | 27 | 5.2\% | 24 | 4.6\% |
| Memorial Middle School | 131 | 30.3\% | 166 | 38.4\% | 99 | 22.9\% | 17 | 3.9\% | 19 | 4.4\% |
| Driscoll Middle School | 87 | 27.8\% | 104 | 33.2\% | 94 | 30.0\% | 11 | 3.5\% | 17 | 5.4\% |
| Mathis Middle School | 66 | 36.9\% | 71 | 39.7\% | 31 | 17.3\% | 7 | 3.9\% | 4 | 2.2\% |
| Odem Junior High | 59 | 41.0\% | 47 | 32.6\% | 31 | 21.5\% | 2 | 1.4\% | 5 | 3.5\% |
| All Campuses | 605 | 34.9\% | 616 | 35.5\% | 372 | 21.4\% | 68 | 3.9\% | 74 | 4.3\% |

Table C.14. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources? (Continued)


Table C.15. What Is the Highest Level of Education That You Plan to Earn?

| Education Level | Falfurrias Junior High |  | Adams Middle School |  | Memorial Middle School |  | Driscoll <br> Middle <br> School |  | Mathis <br> Middle <br> School |  | Odem Junior High |  | All <br> Campuses |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Less than high school | 3 | 2.1\% | 4 | 0.8\% | 4 | 1.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 3 | 2.2\% | 14 | 0.8\% |
| High school | 5 | 3.5\% | 16 | 3.1\% | 12 | 2.9\% | 17 | 5.6\% | 6 | 3.4\% | 5 | 3.6\% | 61 | 3.6\% |
| High school plus vocational school | 3 | 2.1\% | 14 | 2.7\% | 7 | 1.7\% | 6 | 2.0\% | 4 | 2.3\% | 3 | 2.2\% | 37 | 2.2\% |
| Some college but less than a four-year degree (not an associate's degree) | 12 | 8.4\% | 21 | 4.1\% | 23 | 5.6\% | 6 | 2.0\% | 9 | 5.1\% | 9 | 6.6\% | 80 | 4.8\% |
| Associate's degree (two-year community college) | 8 | 5.6\% | 16 | 3.1\% | 22 | 5.4\% | 28 | 9.3\% | 6 | 3.4\% | 7 | 5.1\% | 87 | 5.2\% |
| Bachelor's degree (four-year college or university degree) | 43 | 30.1\% | 152 | 29.4\% | 114 | 27.9\% | 73 | 24.3\% | 50 | 28.4\% | 41 | 29.9\% | 473 | 28.1\% |
| Graduate or professional degree (master's, Ph.D., law degree, M.D., etc.) | 51 | 35.7\% | 224 | 43.3\% | 156 | 38.1\% | 112 | 37.2\% | 69 | 39.2\% | 49 | 35.8\% | 661 | 39.3\% |
| Don't know | 18 | 12.6\% | 70 | 13.5\% | 71 | 17.4\% | 59 | 19.6\% | 32 | 18.2\% | 20 | 14.6\% | 270 | 16.0\% |

## Results From the Spring 2011 High School Student Survey

Table D.1. Number of High School Students Responding by District and School

| Campus | Number of Students | Surveys Received | Response Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brooks County ISD |  |  |  |
| Falfurrias High School | 422 | 221 | 52\% |
| Alice ISD |  |  |  |
| Alice High School | 1,354 | 633 | 47\% |
| Kingsville ISD |  |  |  |
| H. M. King High School | 1,084 | 425 | 39\% |
| Corpus Christi ISD |  |  |  |
| Miller High School | 914 | 549 | 60\% |
| Mathis ISD |  |  |  |
| Mathis High School | 479 | 335 | 70\% |
| Odem-Edroy ISD |  |  |  |
| Odem High School | 303 | 209 | 69\% |
| All Campuses | 4,556 | 2,372 | 52\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Note. Number of students based on AEIS 2009-10 counts.
Table D.2. Prior Year Enrollment Status of Students Responding to the High School Survey

| Campus | Yes |  | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias High School | 146 | $67.3 \%$ | 71 | $32.7 \%$ |
| Alice High School | 442 | $70.3 \%$ | 187 | $29.7 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | 255 | $60.0 \%$ | 170 | $40.0 \%$ |
| Miller High School | 399 | $72.9 \%$ | 148 | $27.1 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | 240 | $71.9 \%$ | 94 | $28.1 \%$ |
| Odem High School | 163 | $78.4 \%$ | 45 | $21.6 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{1 , 6 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 3 \%}$ |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.3. Grade Levels of Students Responding to the High School Survey

| Campus | 9 |  | 10 |  | 11 |  | 12 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 65 | 29.7\% | 61 | 27.9\% | 49 | 22.4\% | 44 | 20.1\% |
| Alice High School | 167 | 26.4\% | 259 | 41.0\% | 97 | 15.3\% | 109 | 17.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 195 | 45.9\% | 98 | 23.1\% | 93 | 21.9\% | 39 | 9.2\% |
| Miller High School | 153 | 27.9\% | 145 | 26.4\% | 102 | 18.6\% | 149 | 27.1\% |
| Mathis High School | 76 | 22.8\% | 100 | 29.9\% | 95 | 28.4\% | 63 | 18.9\% |
| Odem High School | 61 | 29.3\% | 73 | 35.1\% | 40 | 19.2\% | 34 | 16.3\% |
| All Campuses | 717 | 30.3\% | 736 | 31.1\% | 476 | 20.1\% | 438 | 18.5\% |

[^17]Table D.4. Gender of Students Responding to the High School Survey

| Campus | Male |  | Female |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias High School | 96 | $44.2 \%$ | 121 | $55.8 \%$ |
| Alice High School | 316 | $50.2 \%$ | 314 | $49.8 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | 219 | $51.7 \%$ | 205 | $48.3 \%$ |
| Miller High School | 281 | $51.7 \%$ | 263 | $48.3 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | 171 | $51.4 \%$ | 162 | $48.6 \%$ |
| Odem High School | 113 | $54.9 \%$ | 93 | $45.1 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{1 , 1 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 . 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 . 2 \%}$ |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.5. Ethnicity of Students Responding to the High School Survey

| Campus | Hispanic, Latino |  | African American |  | White |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 206 | 94.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10 | 4.6\% | 3 | 1.4\% |
| Alice High School | 565 | 89.5\% | 7 | 1.1\% | 51 | 8.1\% | 8 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 344 | 81.1\% | 14 | 3.3\% | 49 | 11.6\% | 17 | 4.0\% |
| Miller High School | 463 | 85.0\% | 40 | 7.3\% | 23 | 4.2\% | 19 | 3.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 288 | 86.0\% | 3 | 0.9\% | 32 | 9.6\% | 12 | 3.6\% |
| Odem High School | 165 | 79.3\% | 1 | 0.5\% | 31 | 14.9\% | 11 | 5.3\% |
| All Campuses | 2,031 | 86.0\% | 65 | 2.8\% | 196 | 8.3\% | 70 | 3.0\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.6. How Much Time Do You Usually Spend on Homework Each Day?

| Campus | Less than 30 minutes |  | 30 to 59 minutes |  | 1 to 2 hours |  | More than 2 hours |  | My teacher does not assign homework. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 99 | 46.7\% | 69 | 32.5\% | 28 | 13.2\% | 6 | 2.8\% | 10 | 4.7\% |
| Alice High School | 275 | 44.4\% | 169 | 27.3\% | 49 | 7.9\% | 12 | 1.9\% | 114 | 18.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 186 | 44.4\% | 149 | 35.6\% | 35 | 8.4\% | 10 | 2.4\% | 39 | 9.3\% |
| Miller High School | 217 | 40.4\% | 150 | 27.9\% | 44 | 8.2\% | 16 | 3.0\% | 110 | 20.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 165 | 50.9\% | 85 | 26.2\% | 34 | 10.5\% | 4 | 1.2\% | 36 | 11.1\% |
| Odem High School | 75 | 36.6\% | 93 | 45.4\% | 12 | 5.9\% | 4 | 2.0\% | 21 | 10.2\% |
| All Campuses | 1,017 | 43.9\% | 715 | 30.9\% | 202 | 8.7\% | 52 | 2.2\% | 330 | 14.2\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year

| Campus | Tutoring for an academic subject |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 47 | 21.9\% | 78 | 36.3\% | 67 | 31.2\% | 19 | 8.8\% | 4 | 1.9\% |
| Alice High School | 162 | 25.6\% | 186 | 29.4\% | 222 | 35.1\% | 54 | 8.5\% | 8 | 1.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 96 | 22.7\% | 138 | 32.6\% | 151 | 35.7\% | 34 | 8.0\% | 4 | 0.9\% |
| Miller High School | 136 | 24.8\% | 148 | 27.0\% | 205 | 37.3\% | 51 | 9.3\% | 9 | 1.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 139 | 41.6\% | 119 | 35.6\% | 68 | 20.4\% | 7 | 2.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 56 | 26.9\% | 79 | 38.0\% | 54 | 26.0\% | 17 | 8.2\% | 2 | 1.0\% |
| All Campuses | 636 | 26.9\% | 748 | 31.7\% | 767 | 32.5\% | 182 | 7.7\% | 28 | 1.2\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Mentoring by an adult who is not your parent, guardian, or a teacher |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 109 | 51.7\% | 54 | 25.6\% | 35 | 16.6\% | 11 | 5.2\% | 2 | 0.9\% |
| Alice High School | 298 | 47.5\% | 151 | 24.0\% | 125 | 19.9\% | 41 | 6.5\% | 13 | 2.1\% |
| H. M. King High School | 170 | 41.0\% | 102 | 24.6\% | 94 | 22.7\% | 42 | 10.1\% | 7 | 1.7\% |
| Miller High School | 242 | 44.6\% | 134 | 24.7\% | 118 | 21.8\% | 33 | 6.1\% | 15 | 2.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 177 | 53.3\% | 84 | 25.3\% | 47 | 14.2\% | 21 | 6.3\% | 3 | 0.9\% |
| Odem High School | 97 | 46.4\% | 57 | 27.3\% | 38 | 18.2\% | 11 | 5.3\% | 6 | 2.9\% |
| All Campuses | 1,093 | 46.8\% | 582 | 24.9\% | 457 | 19.6\% | 159 | 6.8\% | 46 | 2.0\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Counseling about your grades |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 81 | 38.8\% | 67 | 32.1\% | 44 | 21.1\% | 12 | 5.7\% | 5 | 2.4\% |
| Alice High School | 177 | 28.5\% | 193 | 31.1\% | 183 | 29.5\% | 57 | 9.2\% | 11 | 1.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 138 | 33.9\% | 125 | 30.7\% | 109 | 26.8\% | 32 | 7.9\% | 3 | 0.7\% |
| Miller High School | 153 | 28.9\% | 148 | 27.9\% | 152 | 28.7\% | 62 | 11.7\% | 15 | 2.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 145 | 44.3\% | 97 | 29.7\% | 63 | 19.3\% | 21 | 6.4\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 96 | 48.0\% | 50 | 25.0\% | 30 | 15.0\% | 19 | 9.5\% | 5 | 2.5\% |
| All Campuses | 790 | 34.4\% | 680 | 29.6\% | 581 | 25.3\% | 203 | 8.8\% | 40 | 1.7\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Workshop on study skills |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 115 | 55.0\% | 56 | 26.8\% | 35 | 16.7\% | 2 | 1.0\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
| Alice High School | 358 | 57.5\% | 162 | 26.0\% | 89 | 14.3\% | 12 | 1.9\% | 2 | 0.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 250 | 60.1\% | 96 | 23.1\% | 56 | 13.5\% | 13 | 3.1\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Miller High School | 232 | 43.7\% | 134 | 25.2\% | 114 | 21.5\% | 36 | 6.8\% | 15 | 2.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 162 | 49.2\% | 114 | 34.7\% | 46 | 14.0\% | 6 | 1.8\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 118 | 58.4\% | 59 | 29.2\% | 20 | 9.9\% | 5 | 2.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,235 | 53.5\% | 621 | 26.9\% | 360 | 15.6\% | 74 | 3.2\% | 20 | 0.9\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Workshop to learn about the ACT, SAT, or other college entrance exam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 113 | 53.6\% | 63 | 29.9\% | 27 | 12.8\% | 7 | 3.3\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
| Alice High School | 311 | 49.4\% | 207 | 32.9\% | 93 | 14.8\% | 18 | 2.9\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 210 | 50.4\% | 114 | 27.3\% | 82 | 19.7\% | 8 | 1.9\% | 3 | 0.7\% |
| Miller High School | 232 | 43.4\% | 139 | 26.0\% | 104 | 19.5\% | 44 | 8.2\% | 15 | 2.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 130 | 39.3\% | 125 | 37.8\% | 62 | 18.7\% | 12 | 3.6\% | 2 | 0.6\% |
| Odem High School | 101 | 49.3\% | 75 | 36.6\% | 23 | 11.2\% | 5 | 2.4\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
| All Campuses | 1,097 | 47.1\% | 723 | 31.1\% | 391 | 16.8\% | 94 | 4.0\% | 23 | 1.0\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Class field trip to learn more about a subject discussed in class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 126 | 59.4\% | 63 | 29.7\% | 16 | 7.5\% | 7 | 3.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 475 | 76.0\% | 80 | 12.8\% | 60 | 9.6\% | 9 | 1.4\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 274 | 65.7\% | 94 | 22.5\% | 43 | 10.3\% | 5 | 1.2\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Miller High School | 282 | 52.0\% | 143 | 26.4\% | 83 | 15.3\% | 29 | 5.4\% | 5 | 0.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 156 | 47.6\% | 119 | 36.3\% | 45 | 13.7\% | 7 | 2.1\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 98 | 47.8\% | 83 | 40.5\% | 21 | 10.2\% | 3 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,411 | 60.6\% | 582 | 25.0\% | 268 | 11.5\% | 60 | 2.6\% | 8 | 0.3\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Attending a family activity at school with a parent or guardian (including events with FACE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 125 | 58.7\% | 58 | 27.2\% | 24 | 11.3\% | 6 | 2.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 397 | 62.9\% | 132 | 20.9\% | 81 | 12.8\% | 19 | 3.0\% | 2 | 0.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 268 | 64.3\% | 98 | 23.5\% | 44 | 10.6\% | 7 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School | 325 | 59.5\% | 130 | 23.8\% | 70 | 12.8\% | 17 | 3.1\% | 4 | 0.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 200 | 59.9\% | 95 | 28.4\% | 31 | 9.3\% | 6 | 1.8\% | 2 | 0.6\% |
| Odem High School | 121 | 58.2\% | 56 | 26.9\% | 27 | 13.0\% | 4 | 1.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,436 | 61.1\% | 569 | 24.2\% | 277 | 11.8\% | 59 | 2.5\% | 8 | 0.3\% |

Table continues
Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)
Attending a presentation by a business person or a Junior Achievement activity

| Campus | Attending a presentation by a business person or a Junior Achievement activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 107 | 51.2\% | 74 | 35.4\% | 23 | 11.0\% | 5 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 386 | 61.1\% | 183 | 29.0\% | 56 | 8.9\% | 6 | 0.9\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 194 | 46.3\% | 108 | 25.8\% | 93 | 22.2\% | 23 | 5.5\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| Miller High School | 237 | 43.5\% | 152 | 27.9\% | 115 | 21.1\% | 36 | 6.6\% | 5 | 0.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 180 | 54.1\% | 106 | 31.8\% | 45 | 13.5\% | 1 | 0.3\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 89 | 43.0\% | 92 | 44.4\% | 23 | 11.1\% | 3 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,193 | 50.9\% | 715 | 30.5\% | 355 | 15.1\% | 74 | 3.2\% | 8 | 0.3\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | University professor visits to your class |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 57 | 26.8\% | 84 | 39.4\% | 65 | 30.5\% | 7 | 3.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 474 | 75.5\% | 97 | 15.4\% | 52 | 8.3\% | 4 | 0.6\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
| H. M. King High School | 247 | 59.1\% | 103 | 24.6\% | 63 | 15.1\% | 5 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Miller High School | 264 | 48.4\% | 157 | 28.8\% | 92 | 16.9\% | 22 | 4.0\% | 10 | 1.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 144 | 43.2\% | 106 | 31.8\% | 72 | 21.6\% | 9 | 2.7\% | 2 | 0.6\% |
| Odem High School | 101 | 48.6\% | 62 | 29.8\% | 34 | 16.3\% | 11 | 5.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,287 | 54.9\% | 609 | 26.0\% | 378 | 16.1\% | 58 | 2.5\% | 13 | 0.6\% |

Table D.7. Please Mark How Often You Have Participated in Each of the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Used the Go Center for college or career information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Never |  | Rarely |  | Sometimes |  | Often |  | Almost Every Day |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 136 | 63.6\% | 53 | 24.8\% | 18 | 8.4\% | 7 | 3.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Alice High School | 270 | 43.1\% | 187 | 29.8\% | 128 | 20.4\% | 42 | 6.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 217 | 52.3\% | 104 | 25.1\% | 67 | 16.1\% | 21 | 5.1\% | 6 | 1.4\% |
| Miller High School | 208 | 38.1\% | 123 | 22.5\% | 133 | 24.4\% | 62 | 11.4\% | 20 | 3.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 203 | 61.3\% | 79 | 23.9\% | 40 | 12.1\% | 7 | 2.1\% | 2 | 0.6\% |
| Odem High School | 148 | 71.2\% | 44 | 21.2\% | 13 | 6.2\% | 3 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| All Campuses | 1,182 | 50.5\% | 590 | 25.2\% | 399 | 17.0\% | 142 | 6.1\% | 28 | 1.2\% |

Table D.8. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following Activities During This School Year

| Campus | Visited a college campus with your school |  |  |  | Attended a college or career fair at your school |  |  |  | Attended a college planning workshop at your school (learning about college entrance exams and entrance requirements) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 93 | 43.7\% | 120 | 56.3\% | 155 | 72.8\% | 58 | 27.2\% | 86 | 40.8\% | 125 | 59.2\% |
| Alice High School | 124 | 19.7\% | 506 | 80.3\% | 332 | 52.8\% | 297 | 47.2\% | 159 | 25.3\% | 470 | 74.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 116 | 27.6\% | 304 | 72.4\% | 266 | 63.5\% | 153 | 36.5\% | 144 | 34.4\% | 274 | 65.6\% |
| Miller High School | 177 | 32.3\% | 371 | 67.7\% | 208 | 38.2\% | 337 | 61.8\% | 219 | 40.0\% | 328 | 60.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 175 | 52.6\% | 158 | 47.4\% | 99 | 29.8\% | 233 | 70.2\% | 102 | 31.1\% | 226 | 68.9\% |
| Odem High School | 114 | 55.1\% | 93 | 44.9\% | 125 | 60.4\% | 82 | 39.6\% | 57 | 27.5\% | 150 | 72.5\% |
| All Campuses | 799 | 34.0\% | 1,552 | 66.0\% | 1,185 | 50.5\% | 1,160 | 49.5\% | 767 | 32.8\% | 1,573 | 67.2\% |

Table D.8. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Received assistance at school completing college, financial aid, and scholarship applications |  |  |  | Taken a career inventory/test about career interests at your school |  |  |  | Learned about careers at your school and/or career requirements |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 67 | 31.5\% | 146 | 68.5\% | 110 | 52.1\% | 101 | 47.9\% | 167 | 78.4\% | 46 | 21.6\% |
| Alice High School | 196 | 31.2\% | 433 | 68.8\% | 244 | 38.7\% | 386 | 61.3\% | 381 | 60.5\% | 249 | 39.5\% |
| H. M. King High School | 134 | 32.2\% | 282 | 67.8\% | 176 | 42.3\% | 240 | 57.7\% | 259 | 62.6\% | 155 | 37.4\% |
| Miller High School | 206 | 37.7\% | 340 | 62.3\% | 195 | 35.8\% | 350 | 64.2\% | 346 | 63.4\% | 200 | 36.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 128 | 38.7\% | 203 | 61.3\% | 171 | 52.0\% | 158 | 48.0\% | 193 | 58.1\% | 139 | 41.9\% |
| Odem High School | 64 | 31.1\% | 142 | 68.9\% | 151 | 72.9\% | 56 | 27.1\% | 139 | 67.5\% | 67 | 32.5\% |
| All Campuses | 795 | 34.0\% | 1,546 | 66.0\% | 1,047 | 44.8\% | 1,291 | 55.2\% | 1,485 | 63.4\% | 856 | 36.6\% |

Table D.8. Please Mark if You Have Ever Participated in the Following Activities During This School Year (Continued)

| Campus | Visited local employers |  |  |  | Interned or shadowed someone at a job |  |  |  | Had a school administrator or teacher visit your home |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 38 | 17.9\% | 174 | 82.1\% | 18 | 8.5\% | 194 | 91.5\% | 16 | 7.5\% | 196 | 92.5\% |
| Alice High School | 75 | 11.9\% | 554 | 88.1\% | 80 | 12.7\% | 550 | 87.3\% | 40 | 6.4\% | 588 | 93.6\% |
| H. M. King High School | 80 | 19.2\% | 336 | 80.8\% | 78 | 18.8\% | 337 | 81.2\% | 52 | 12.6\% | 362 | 87.4\% |
| Miller High School | 100 | 18.3\% | 446 | 81.7\% | 77 | 14.1\% | 468 | 85.9\% | 65 | 12.0\% | 478 | 88.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 53 | 15.9\% | 280 | 84.1\% | 61 | 18.3\% | 272 | 81.7\% | 29 | 8.7\% | 304 | 91.3\% |
| Odem High School | 23 | 11.2\% | 183 | 88.8\% | 33 | 15.9\% | 175 | 84.1\% | 10 | 4.8\% | 197 | 95.2\% |
| All Campuses | 369 | 15.8\% | 1,973 | 84.2\% | 347 | 14.8\% | 1,996 | 85.2\% | 212 | 9.1\% | 2,125 | 90.9\% |

Table D.9. Please Indicate How Familiar You Are With Each Type of College and University

| Campus | Community or junior or junior colleges (two-year programs) |  |  |  |  |  | Four-year colleges or universities |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  | Not familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 46 | 21.9\% | 109 | 51.9\% | 55 | 26.2\% | 33 | 15.7\% | 73 | 34.8\% | 104 | 49.5\% |
| Alice High School | 140 | 22.4\% | 315 | 50.5\% | 169 | 27.1\% | 123 | 19.6\% | 245 | 39.0\% | 260 | 41.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 107 | 26.0\% | 209 | 50.9\% | 95 | 23.1\% | 64 | 15.5\% | 168 | 40.7\% | 181 | 43.8\% |
| Miller High School | 154 | 28.5\% | 254 | 47.0\% | 132 | 24.4\% | 129 | 23.9\% | 228 | 42.2\% | 183 | 33.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 56 | 16.9\% | 183 | 55.3\% | 92 | 27.8\% | 45 | 13.5\% | 141 | 42.3\% | 147 | 44.1\% |
| Odem High School | 22 | 10.7\% | 113 | 54.9\% | 71 | 34.5\% | 15 | 7.3\% | 90 | 43.7\% | 101 | 49.0\% |
| All Campuses | 525 | 22.6\% | 1,183 | 50.9\% | 614 | 26.4\% | 409 | 17.6\% | 945 | 40.6\% | 976 | 41.9\% |

Table D.9. Please Indicate How Familiar You Are With Each Type of College and University (Continued)

|  | Vocational or technical schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not familiar |  | Somewhat familiar |  | Very familiar |  |
| Campus | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| Falfurrias High School | 86 | $41.1 \%$ | 95 | $45.5 \%$ | 28 | $13.4 \%$ |
| Alice High School | 298 | $47.7 \%$ | 237 | $37.9 \%$ | 90 | $14.4 \%$ |
| H. M. King High School | 172 | $42.2 \%$ | 172 | $42.2 \%$ | 64 | $15.7 \%$ |
| Miller High School | 247 | $45.9 \%$ | 208 | $38.7 \%$ | 83 | $15.4 \%$ |
| Mathis High School | 158 | $47.6 \%$ | 133 | $40.1 \%$ | 41 | $12.3 \%$ |
| Odem High School | 95 | $46.1 \%$ | 75 | $36.4 \%$ | 36 | $17.5 \%$ |
| All Campuses | $\mathbf{1 , 0 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 8 \%}$ |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities

| Campus | Visited a college or university |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 12 | 5.7\% | 11 | 5.3\% | 38 | 18.2\% | 67 | 32.1\% | 81 | 38.8\% |
| Alice High School | 45 | 7.2\% | 54 | 8.6\% | 158 | 25.3\% | 126 | 20.2\% | 242 | 38.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 36 | 8.7\% | 36 | 8.7\% | 123 | 29.8\% | 80 | 19.4\% | 138 | 33.4\% |
| Miller High School | 71 | 13.2\% | 47 | 8.8\% | 148 | 27.6\% | 81 | 15.1\% | 190 | 35.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 19 | 5.7\% | 16 | 4.8\% | 81 | 24.3\% | 78 | 23.4\% | 139 | 41.7\% |
| Odem High School | 10 | 4.9\% | 14 | 6.8\% | 36 | 17.6\% | 51 | 24.9\% | 94 | 45.9\% |
| All Campuses | 193 | 8.3\% | 178 | 7.7\% | 584 | 25.2\% | 483 | 20.8\% | 884 | 38.1\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with a school counselor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 14 | 6.7\% | 12 | 5.7\% | 57 | 27.3\% | 60 | 28.7\% | 66 | 31.6\% |
| Alice High School | 54 | 8.6\% | 58 | 9.2\% | 155 | 24.6\% | 138 | 21.9\% | 225 | 35.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 39 | 9.5\% | 58 | 14.1\% | 115 | 27.9\% | 80 | 19.4\% | 120 | 29.1\% |
| Miller High School | 53 | 9.9\% | 56 | 10.4\% | 125 | 23.2\% | 108 | 20.1\% | 196 | 36.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 27 | 8.2\% | 31 | 9.4\% | 98 | 29.6\% | 75 | 22.7\% | 100 | 30.2\% |
| Odem High School | 13 | 6.3\% | 16 | 7.7\% | 40 | 19.3\% | 66 | 31.9\% | 72 | 34.8\% |
| All Campuses | 200 | 8.6\% | 231 | 9.9\% | 590 | 25.4\% | 527 | 22.6\% | 779 | 33.5\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with your teacher |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 19 | 9.0\% | 18 | 8.6\% | 67 | 31.9\% | 51 | 24.3\% | 55 | 26.2\% |
| Alice High School | 69 | 11.0\% | 72 | 11.5\% | 186 | 29.6\% | 135 | 21.5\% | 166 | 26.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 36 | 8.7\% | 70 | 16.9\% | 116 | 28.0\% | 95 | 22.9\% | 97 | 23.4\% |
| Miller High School | 62 | 11.5\% | 57 | 10.5\% | 161 | 29.8\% | 115 | 21.3\% | 146 | 27.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 28 | 8.5\% | 34 | 10.3\% | 97 | 29.3\% | 89 | 26.9\% | 83 | 25.1\% |
| Odem High School | 10 | 4.9\% | 20 | 9.8\% | 64 | 31.4\% | 56 | 27.5\% | 54 | 26.5\% |
| All Campuses | 224 | 9.6\% | 271 | 11.6\% | 691 | 29.7\% | 541 | 23.2\% | 601 | 25.8\% |

Table continues
Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with your parent(s) or guardian(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 11 | 5.3\% | 8 | 3.8\% | 39 | 18.7\% | 60 | 28.7\% | 91 | 43.5\% |
| Alice High School | 37 | 5.9\% | 43 | 6.8\% | 118 | 18.8\% | 122 | 19.4\% | 308 | 49.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 29 | 7.0\% | 31 | 7.5\% | 73 | 17.6\% | 107 | 25.8\% | 174 | 42.0\% |
| Miller High School | 47 | 8.7\% | 42 | 7.8\% | 111 | 20.6\% | 107 | 19.9\% | 231 | 42.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 25 | 7.5\% | 20 | 6.0\% | 67 | 20.1\% | 71 | 21.3\% | 150 | 45.0\% |
| Odem High School | 7 | 3.4\% | 8 | 3.9\% | 31 | 15.0\% | 49 | 23.7\% | 112 | 54.1\% |
| All Campuses | 156 | 6.7\% | 152 | 6.5\% | 439 | 18.8\% | 516 | 22.2\% | 1,066 | 45.8\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with a brother or sister |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 35 | 17.1\% | 23 | 11.2\% | 50 | 24.4\% | 54 | 26.3\% | 43 | 21.0\% |
| Alice High School | 101 | 16.1\% | 87 | 13.9\% | 163 | 26.0\% | 123 | 19.6\% | 152 | 24.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 69 | 16.7\% | 73 | 17.6\% | 116 | 28.0\% | 62 | 15.0\% | 94 | 22.7\% |
| Miller High School | 94 | 17.5\% | 82 | 15.2\% | 139 | 25.8\% | 97 | 18.0\% | 126 | 23.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 57 | 17.2\% | 48 | 14.5\% | 88 | 26.6\% | 67 | 20.2\% | 71 | 21.5\% |
| Odem High School | 25 | 12.3\% | 29 | 14.2\% | 54 | 26.5\% | 40 | 19.6\% | 56 | 27.5\% |
| All Campuses | 381 | 16.4\% | 342 | 14.8\% | 610 | 26.3\% | 443 | 19.1\% | 542 | 23.4\% |

Table continues
Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Discussed college opportunities with another family member |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 20 | 9.6\% | 26 | 12.5\% | 62 | 29.8\% | 45 | 21.6\% | 55 | 26.4\% |
| Alice High School | 68 | 10.8\% | 75 | 11.9\% | 176 | 28.0\% | 144 | 22.9\% | 165 | 26.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 47 | 11.4\% | 65 | 15.7\% | 101 | 24.5\% | 96 | 23.2\% | 104 | 25.2\% |
| Miller High School | 73 | 13.5\% | 63 | 11.7\% | 151 | 28.0\% | 107 | 19.9\% | 145 | 26.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 38 | 11.4\% | 52 | 15.7\% | 87 | 26.2\% | 76 | 22.9\% | 79 | 23.8\% |
| Odem High School | 13 | 6.3\% | 25 | 12.1\% | 60 | 29.1\% | 54 | 26.2\% | 54 | 26.2\% |
| All Campuses | 259 | 11.1\% | 306 | 13.2\% | 637 | 27.4\% | 522 | 22.4\% | 602 | 25.9\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Looked at a guide to colleges and universities (e.g., Barron's) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 11 | 5.3\% | 15 | 7.2\% | 52 | 24.9\% | 58 | 27.8\% | 73 | 34.9\% |
| Alice High School | 62 | 10.0\% | 59 | 9.5\% | 153 | 24.6\% | 141 | 22.6\% | 208 | 33.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 34 | 8.3\% | 56 | 13.6\% | 98 | 23.8\% | 101 | 24.6\% | 122 | 29.7\% |
| Miller High School | 67 | 12.5\% | 65 | 12.1\% | 140 | 26.1\% | 120 | 22.3\% | 145 | 27.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 29 | 8.7\% | 29 | 8.7\% | 87 | 26.2\% | 86 | 25.9\% | 101 | 30.4\% |
| Odem High School | 7 | 3.4\% | 24 | 11.7\% | 49 | 23.8\% | 61 | 29.6\% | 65 | 31.6\% |
| All Campuses | 210 | 9.1\% | 248 | 10.7\% | 579 | 25.0\% | 567 | 24.5\% | 714 | 30.8\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Commercials or advertisements (TV, online) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 35 | 16.8\% | 38 | 18.3\% | 58 | 27.9\% | 41 | 19.7\% | 36 | 17.3\% |
| Alice High School | 106 | 16.9\% | 119 | 18.9\% | 189 | 30.0\% | 103 | 16.4\% | 112 | 17.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 79 | 19.2\% | 86 | 20.9\% | 114 | 27.7\% | 62 | 15.0\% | 71 | 17.2\% |
| Miller High School | 92 | 17.0\% | 108 | 20.0\% | 163 | 30.1\% | 87 | 16.1\% | 91 | 16.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 57 | 17.5\% | 51 | 15.6\% | 114 | 35.0\% | 54 | 16.6\% | 50 | 15.3\% |
| Odem High School | 20 | 9.7\% | 44 | 21.3\% | 67 | 32.4\% | 50 | 24.2\% | 26 | 12.6\% |
| All Campuses | 389 | 16.7\% | 446 | 19.2\% | 705 | 30.3\% | 397 | 17.1\% | 386 | 16.6\% |

Table D.10. Please Indicate How Important Each of the Following Sources Was in Helping You Learn About Colleges and Universities (Continued)

| Campus | Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not at all important |  | Not important |  | Neither important nor not important |  | Important |  | Very important |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 51 | 45.5\% | 7 | 6.2\% | 24 | 21.4\% | 15 | 13.4\% | 15 | 13.4\% |
| Alice High School | 106 | 34.0\% | 36 | 11.5\% | 78 | 25.0\% | 36 | 11.5\% | 56 | 17.9\% |
| H. M. King High School | 92 | 37.4\% | 38 | 15.4\% | 45 | 18.3\% | 31 | 12.6\% | 40 | 16.3\% |
| Miller High School | 141 | 38.0\% | 42 | 11.3\% | 90 | 24.3\% | 32 | 8.6\% | 66 | 17.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 71 | 40.8\% | 17 | 9.8\% | 48 | 27.6\% | 15 | 8.6\% | 23 | 13.2\% |
| Odem High School | 29 | 36.2\% | 9 | 11.2\% | 17 | 21.2\% | 9 | 11.2\% | 16 | 20.0\% |
| All Campuses | 490 | 37.8\% | 149 | 11.5\% | 302 | 23.3\% | 138 | 10.7\% | 216 | 16.7\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.11. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements?

| Campus | A GEAR UP, STAR representative |  |  |  | My parent(s) or guardian |  |  |  | My school counselor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 128 | 57.9\% | 93 | 42.1\% | 84 | 38.0\% | 137 | 62.0\% | 77 | 34.8\% | 144 | 65.2\% |
| Alice High School | 390 | 61.6\% | 243 | 38.4\% | 216 | 34.1\% | 417 | 65.9\% | 268 | 42.3\% | 365 | 57.7\% |
| H. M. King High School | 301 | 70.8\% | 124 | 29.2\% | 157 | 36.9\% | 268 | 63.1\% | 246 | 57.9\% | 179 | 42.1\% |
| Miller High School | 382 | 69.6\% | 167 | 30.4\% | 245 | 44.6\% | 304 | 55.4\% | 239 | 43.5\% | 310 | 56.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 221 | 66.0\% | 114 | 34.0\% | 137 | 40.9\% | 198 | 59.1\% | 140 | 41.8\% | 195 | 58.2\% |
| Odem High School | 110 | 52.6\% | 99 | 47.4\% | 60 | 28.7\% | 149 | 71.3\% | 108 | 51.7\% | 101 | 48.3\% |
| All Campuses | 1,532 | 64.6\% | 840 | 35.4\% | 899 | 37.9\% | 1,473 | 62.1\% | 1,078 | 45.4\% | 1,294 | 54.6\% |

Table D.11. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements? (Continued)

| Campus | My teacher(s) |  |  |  | My principal or assistant principal |  |  |  | My brother or sister |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 86 | 38.9\% | 135 | 61.1\% | 179 | 81.0\% | 42 | 19.0\% | 163 | 73.8\% | 58 | 26.2\% |
| Alice High School | 320 | 50.6\% | 313 | 49.4\% | 543 | 85.8\% | 90 | 14.2\% | 443 | 70.0\% | 190 | 30.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 191 | 44.9\% | 234 | 55.1\% | 368 | 86.6\% | 57 | 13.4\% | 295 | 69.4\% | 130 | 30.6\% |
| Miller High School | 229 | 41.7\% | 320 | 58.3\% | 411 | 74.9\% | 138 | 25.1\% | 379 | 69.0\% | 170 | 31.0\% |
| Mathis High School | 114 | 34.0\% | 221 | 66.0\% | 237 | 70.7\% | 98 | 29.3\% | 245 | 73.1\% | 90 | 26.9\% |
| Odem High School | 98 | 46.9\% | 111 | 53.1\% | 197 | 94.3\% | 12 | 5.7\% | 134 | 64.1\% | 75 | 35.9\% |
| All Campuses | 1,038 | 43.8\% | 1,334 | 56.2\% | 1,935 | 81.6\% | 437 | 18.4\% | 1,659 | 69.9\% | 713 | 30.1\% |

Table D.11. Has Anyone Talked to You About College Entrance Requirements? (Continued)

| Campus | Another family member |  |  |  | No one has spoken to me about college entrance requirements. |  |  |  | Other |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 137 | 62.0\% | 84 | 38.0\% | 199 | 90.0\% | 22 | 10.0\% | 214 | 96.8\% | 7 | 3.2\% |
| Alice High School | 372 | 58.8\% | 261 | 41.2\% | 568 | 89.7\% | 65 | 10.3\% | 609 | 96.2\% | 24 | 3.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 255 | 60.0\% | 170 | 40.0\% | 381 | 89.6\% | 44 | 10.4\% | 396 | 93.2\% | 29 | 6.8\% |
| Miller High School | 336 | 61.2\% | 213 | 38.8\% | 494 | 90.0\% | 55 | 10.0\% | 517 | 94.2\% | 32 | 5.8\% |
| Mathis High School | 236 | 70.4\% | 99 | 29.6\% | 304 | 90.7\% | 31 | 9.3\% | 323 | 96.4\% | 12 | 3.6\% |
| Odem High School | 112 | 53.6\% | 97 | 46.4\% | 199 | 95.2\% | 10 | 4.8\% | 197 | 94.3\% | 12 | 5.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,448 | 61.0\% | 924 | 39.0\% | 2,145 | 90.4\% | 227 | 9.6\% | 2,256 | 95.1\% | 116 | 4.9\% |

Table D.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition

| Campus | A GEAR UP, STAR representative |  |  |  | My parent(s) or guardian |  |  |  | My school counselor |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 155 | 70.1\% | 66 | 29.9\% | 121 | 54.8\% | 100 | 45.2\% | 113 | 51.1\% | 108 | 48.9\% |
| Alice High School | 473 | 74.7\% | 160 | 25.3\% | 350 | 55.3\% | 283 | 44.7\% | 395 | 62.4\% | 238 | 37.6\% |
| H. M. King High School | 350 | 82.4\% | 75 | 17.6\% | 232 | 54.6\% | 193 | 45.4\% | 315 | 74.1\% | 110 | 25.9\% |
| Miller High School | 403 | 73.4\% | 146 | 26.6\% | 336 | 61.2\% | 213 | 38.8\% | 300 | 54.6\% | 249 | 45.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 263 | 78.5\% | 72 | 21.5\% | 185 | 55.2\% | 150 | 44.8\% | 181 | 54.0\% | 154 | 46.0\% |
| Odem High School | 133 | 63.6\% | 76 | 36.4\% | 98 | 46.9\% | 111 | 53.1\% | 124 | 59.3\% | 85 | 40.7\% |
| All Campuses | 1,777 | 74.9\% | 595 | 25.1\% | 1,322 | 55.7\% | 1,050 | 44.3\% | 1,428 | 60.2\% | 944 | 39.8\% |

Table D.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition Expenses? (Continued)

| Campus | My teacher(s) |  |  |  | My principal or assistant principal |  |  |  | My brother or sister |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 140 | 63.3\% | 81 | 36.7\% | 203 | 91.9\% | 18 | 8.1\% | 177 | 80.1\% | 44 | 19.9\% |
| Alice High School | 463 | 73.1\% | 170 | 26.9\% | 576 | 91.0\% | 57 | 9.0\% | 535 | 84.5\% | 98 | 15.5\% |
| H. M. King High School | 296 | 69.6\% | 129 | 30.4\% | 388 | 91.3\% | 37 | 8.7\% | 352 | 82.8\% | 73 | 17.2\% |
| Miller High School | 325 | 59.2\% | 224 | 40.8\% | 447 | 81.4\% | 102 | 18.6\% | 452 | 82.3\% | 97 | 17.7\% |
| Mathis High School | 187 | 55.8\% | 148 | 44.2\% | 284 | 84.8\% | 51 | 15.2\% | 275 | 82.1\% | 60 | 17.9\% |
| Odem High School | 140 | 67.0\% | 69 | 33.0\% | 202 | 96.7\% | 7 | 3.3\% | 164 | 78.5\% | 45 | 21.5\% |
| All Campuses | 1,551 | 65.4\% | 821 | 34.6\% | 2,100 | 88.5\% | 272 | 11.5\% | 1,955 | 82.4\% | 417 | 17.6\% |

Table continues
Table D.12. Has Anyone Talked to You About About Financial Aid Opportunities That Will Help Pay College or University Tuition Expenses? (Continued)
Table D.13. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources?

| Campus | A four-year college or university |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Definitely |  | Probably |  | Not sure |  | Probably not |  | Definitely not |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 46 | 22.7\% | 83 | 40.9\% | 56 | 27.6\% | 10 | 4.9\% | 8 | 3.9\% |
| Alice High School | 147 | 23.4\% | 224 | 35.7\% | 186 | 29.6\% | 44 | 7.0\% | 27 | 4.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 110 | 27.0\% | 157 | 38.5\% | 100 | 24.5\% | 26 | 6.4\% | 15 | 3.7\% |
| Miller High School | 97 | 18.3\% | 173 | 32.6\% | 160 | 30.2\% | 57 | 10.8\% | 43 | 8.1\% |
| Mathis High School | 56 | 17.0\% | 131 | 39.8\% | 98 | 29.8\% | 27 | 8.2\% | 17 | 5.2\% |
| Odem High School | 41 | 20.3\% | 77 | 38.1\% | 62 | 30.7\% | 14 | 6.9\% | 8 | 4.0\% |
| All Campuses | 497 | 21.6\% | 845 | 36.7\% | 662 | 28.8\% | 178 | 7.7\% | 118 | 5.1\% |

Table D.13. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources? (Continued)

| Campus | A community or junior college (two-year program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Definitely |  | Probably |  | Not sure |  | Probably not |  | Definitely not |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 72 | 35.0\% | 89 | 43.2\% | 33 | 16.0\% | 7 | 3.4\% | 5 | 2.4\% |
| Alice High School | 220 | 35.9\% | 235 | 38.3\% | 127 | 20.7\% | 12 | 2.0\% | 19 | 3.1\% |
| H. M. King High School | 131 | 33.0\% | 139 | 35.0\% | 92 | 23.2\% | 18 | 4.5\% | 17 | 4.3\% |
| Miller High School | 122 | 23.4\% | 192 | 36.8\% | 144 | 27.6\% | 33 | 6.3\% | 31 | 5.9\% |
| Mathis High School | 114 | 35.0\% | 120 | 36.8\% | 72 | 22.1\% | 12 | 3.7\% | 8 | 2.5\% |
| Odem High School | 77 | 38.7\% | 81 | 40.7\% | 34 | 17.1\% | 3 | 1.5\% | 4 | 2.0\% |
| All Campuses | 736 | 32.5\% | 856 | 37.8\% | 502 | 22.2\% | 85 | 3.8\% | 84 | 3.7\% |

Table D.13. Do You Think That You Could Afford to Attend Each of the Following Using Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Your Family's Resources? (Continued)

| Campus | A vocational or technical school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Definitely |  | Probably |  | Not sure |  | Probably not |  | Definitely not |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 56 | 28.0\% | 63 | 31.5\% | 59 | 29.5\% | 9 | 4.5\% | 13 | 6.5\% |
| Alice High School | 146 | 24.0\% | 161 | 26.5\% | 231 | 38.0\% | 35 | 5.8\% | 35 | 5.8\% |
| H. M. King High School | 95 | 24.1\% | 104 | 26.3\% | 144 | 36.5\% | 29 | 7.3\% | 23 | 5.8\% |
| Miller High School | 80 | 15.3\% | 140 | 26.8\% | 194 | 37.1\% | 59 | 11.3\% | 50 | 9.6\% |
| Mathis High School | 73 | 22.6\% | 90 | 27.9\% | 119 | 36.8\% | 26 | 8.0\% | 15 | 4.6\% |
| Odem High School | 67 | 33.7\% | 49 | 24.6\% | 60 | 30.2\% | 14 | 7.0\% | 9 | 4.5\% |
| All Campuses | 517 | 23.0\% | 607 | 27.0\% | 807 | 35.9\% | 172 | 7.7\% | 145 | 6.5\% |

Table D.14. Indicate Whether You Have Taken, Plan to Take, or Will Not Take Each of the Following College Entrance Examinations

| Campus | PSAT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Have taken |  | Plan to take |  | Will not take |  | Unsure |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 80 | 39.2\% | 41 | 20.1\% | 23 | 11.3\% | 60 | 29.4\% |
| Alice High School | 262 | 43.4\% | 103 | 17.1\% | 43 | 7.1\% | 196 | 32.5\% |
| H. M. King High School | 202 | 50.5\% | 75 | 18.8\% | 10 | 2.5\% | 113 | 28.2\% |
| Miller High School | 168 | 32.6\% | 132 | 25.6\% | 33 | 6.4\% | 183 | 35.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 208 | 64.8\% | 40 | 12.5\% | 10 | 3.1\% | 63 | 19.6\% |
| Odem High School | 90 | 45.9\% | 36 | 18.4\% | 16 | 8.2\% | 54 | 27.6\% |
| All Campuses | 1,010 | 45.1\% | 427 | 19.1\% | 135 | 6.0\% | 669 | 29.9\% |

Table D.14. Indicate Whether You Have Taken, Plan to Take, or Will Not Take Each of the Following College Entrance

Examinations (Continued)

Table D.14. Indicate Whether You Have Taken, Plan to Take, or Will Not Take Each of the Following College Entrance Examinations (Continued)

| Campus | SAT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Have taken |  | Plan to take |  | Will not take |  | Unsure |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 19 | 9.3\% | 109 | 53.4\% | 25 | 12.3\% | 51 | 25.0\% |
| Alice High School | 43 | 7.3\% | 315 | 53.3\% | 48 | 8.1\% | 185 | 31.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 67 | 16.8\% | 202 | 50.6\% | 14 | 3.5\% | 116 | 29.1\% |
| Miller High School | 127 | 24.1\% | 240 | 45.6\% | 26 | 4.9\% | 133 | 25.3\% |
| Mathis High School | 73 | 23.4\% | 153 | 49.0\% | 9 | 2.9\% | 77 | 24.7\% |
| Odem High School | 24 | 12.4\% | 109 | 56.5\% | 17 | 8.8\% | 43 | 22.3\% |
| All Campuses | 353 | 15.9\% | 1,128 | 50.7\% | 139 | 6.2\% | 605 | 27.2\% |

Table D.14. Indicate Whether You Have Taken, Plan to Take, or Will Not Take Each of the Following College Entrance Examinations (Continued)

Table D.14. Indicate Whether You Have Taken, Plan to Take, or Will Not Take Each of the Following College Entrance Examinations (Continued)

Table D.15. Which Graduation Plan Are You Currently Pursuing?

| Campus | Distinguished Achievement Program |  | Recommended High School Program |  | Minimum Graduation Plan |  | Unsure |  | Other |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 78 | 37.0\% | 99 | 46.9\% | 13 | 6.2\% | 17 | 8.1\% | 4 | 1.9\% |
| Alice High School | 170 | 27.6\% | 280 | 45.4\% | 39 | 6.3\% | 125 | 20.3\% | 3 | 0.5\% |
| H. M. King High School | 126 | 31.3\% | 154 | 38.3\% | 13 | 3.2\% | 105 | 26.1\% | 4 | 1.0\% |
| Miller High School | 118 | 22.5\% | 168 | 32.1\% | 37 | 7.1\% | 188 | 35.9\% | 13 | 2.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 137 | 42.0\% | 82 | 25.2\% | 18 | 5.5\% | 88 | 27.0\% | 1 | 0.3\% |
| Odem High School | 47 | 23.6\% | 92 | 46.2\% | 6 | 3.0\% | 52 | 26.1\% | 2 | 1.0\% |
| All Campuses | 676 | 29.7\% | 875 | 38.4\% | 126 | 5.5\% | 575 | 25.2\% | 27 | 1.2\% |

Table D.16. What Is the Highest Level of Education That You Plan to Earn?

| Education Level | Falfurrias High School |  | Alice High School |  | H. M. King High School |  | Miller High School |  | Mathis High School |  | Odem High School |  | All Campuses |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Less than high school | 1 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.5\% | 3 | 0.7\% | 2 | 0.4\% | 1 | 0.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10 | 0.4\% |
| High school | 10 | 4.9\% | 36 | 5.9\% | 27 | 6.7\% | 51 | 9.9\% | 18 | 5.5\% | 6 | 3.0\% | 148 | 6.5\% |
| High school plus vocational school | 7 | 3.4\% | 10 | 1.6\% | 7 | 1.7\% | 11 | 2.1\% | 8 | 2.4\% | 5 | 2.5\% | 48 | 2.1\% |
| Associate's degree (two-year community college) | 23 | 11.2\% | 55 | 9.0\% | 21 | 5.2\% | 64 | 12.5\% | 45 | 13.8\% | 15 | 7.5\% | 223 | 9.8\% |
| Some college but less than a four-year degree (not an associate's degree) | 16 | 7.8\% | 46 | 7.5\% | 24 | 5.9\% | 35 | 6.8\% | 18 | 5.5\% | 12 | 6.0\% | 151 | 6.7\% |
| Bachelor's degree (four-year college or university degree) | 66 | 32.0\% | 204 | 33.3\% | 142 | 35.1\% | 132 | 25.7\% | 126 | 38.5\% | 74 | 37.0\% | 744 | 32.9\% |
| Graduate or professional degree (master's, Ph.D., law degree. M.D., etc.) | 59 | 28.6\% | 178 | 29.1\% | 135 | 33.3\% | 146 | 28.4\% | 86 | 26.3\% | 63 | 31.5\% | 667 | 29.5\% |
| Don't know | 24 | 11.7\% | 80 | 13.1\% | 46 | 11.4\% | 73 | 14.2\% | 25 | 7.6\% | 25 | 12.5\% | 273 | 12.1\% |

Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.
Table D.17. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Please Mark Whether You Will Not Apply, Plan to Apply, Have Applied, or Have Been Accepted to Each Type of Post-Secondary Program

Table D.17. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Please Mark Whether You Will Not Apply, Plan to Apply, Have Applied, or Have Been Accepted to Each Type of Post-Secondary Program (Continued)

Table D.17. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Please Mark Whether You Will Not Apply, Plan to Apply, Have Applied, or Have Been Accepted to Each Type of Post-Secondary Program (Continued)

| Campus | A vocational or technical school |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Will not apply |  | Plan to apply |  | Have applied |  | Have been accepted |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 34 | 85.0\% | 1 | 2.5\% | 1 | 2.5\% | 4 | 10.0\% |
| Alice High School | 58 | 58.0\% | 33 | 33.0\% | 7 | 7.0\% | 2 | 2.0\% |
| H. M. King High School | 24 | 72.7\% | 6 | 18.2\% | 2 | 6.1\% | 1 | 3.0\% |
| Miller High School | 82 | 61.7\% | 43 | 32.3\% | 6 | 4.5\% | 2 | 1.5\% |
| Mathis High School | 35 | 63.6\% | 9 | 16.4\% | 6 | 10.9\% | 5 | 9.1\% |
| Odem High School | 21 | 72.4\% | 6 | 20.7\% | 1 | 3.4\% | 1 | 3.4\% |
| All Campuses | 254 | 65.1\% | 98 | 25.1\% | 23 | 5.9\% | 15 | 3.8\% |

Table D.18. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Which of the Items Listed Below Are Most Likely to Prevent You From Attending a College or University After You Have Completed High School?

| Campus | Nothing is likely to prevent me from attending a college or university. |  |  |  | It costs too much/can't afford it. |  |  |  | I need/want to work. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 11 | 25.0\% | 33 | 75.0\% | 36 | 81.8\% | 8 | 18.2\% | 36 | 81.8\% | 8 | 18.2\% |
| Alice High School | 62 | 56.9\% | 47 | 43.1\% | 67 | 61.5\% | 42 | 38.5\% | 66 | 60.6\% | 43 | 39.4\% |
| H. M. King High School | 17 | 43.6\% | 22 | 56.4\% | 27 | 69.2\% | 12 | 30.8\% | 28 | 71.8\% | 11 | 28.2\% |
| Miller High School | 97 | 65.1\% | 52 | 34.9\% | 92 | 61.7\% | 57 | 38.3\% | 89 | 59.7\% | 60 | 40.3\% |
| Mathis High School | 34 | 54.0\% | 29 | 46.0\% | 38 | 60.3\% | 25 | 39.7\% | 42 | 66.7\% | 21 | 33.3\% |
| Odem High School | 16 | 47.1\% | 18 | 52.9\% | 22 | 64.7\% | 12 | 35.3\% | 30 | 88.2\% | 4 | 11.8\% |
| All Campuses | 237 | 54.1\% | 201 | 45.9\% | 282 | 64.4\% | 156 | 35.6\% | 291 | 66.4\% | 147 | 33.6\% |

Table D.18. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Which of the Items Listed Below Are Most Likely to Prevent You From Attending a College or University After You Have Completed High School? (Continued)

| Campus | I am not interested in college. |  |  |  | I want to go into the military. |  |  |  | I have responsibilities to family. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  | No |  | Yes |  |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| Falfurrias High School | 42 | 95.5\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 42 | 95.5\% | 2 | 4.5\% | 39 | 88.6\% | 5 | 11.4\% |
| Alice High School | 104 | 95.4\% | 5 | 4.6\% | 101 | 92.7\% | 8 | 7.3\% | 100 | 91.7\% | 9 | 8.3\% |
| H. M. King High School | 39 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 37 | 94.9\% | 2 | 5.1\% | 34 | 87.2\% | 5 | 12.8\% |
| Miller High School | 141 | 94.6\% | 8 | 5.4\% | 131 | 87.9\% | 18 | 12.1\% | 129 | 86.6\% | 20 | 13.4\% |
| Mathis High School | 60 | 95.2\% | 3 | 4.8\% | 60 | 95.2\% | 3 | 4.8\% | 54 | 85.7\% | 9 | 14.3\% |
| Odem High School | 34 | 100.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 33 | 97.1\% | 1 | 2.9\% | 33 | 97.1\% | 1 | 2.9\% |
| All Campuses | 420 | 95.9\% | 18 | 4.1\% | 404 | 92.2\% | 34 | 7.8\% | 389 | 88.8\% | 49 | 11.2\% |

Table D.18. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Which of the Items Listed Below Are Most Likely to Prevent You From Attending a College or University After You Have Completed High School? (Continued)

Table D.18. If You Are in Your Senior Year of High School, Which of the Items Listed Below Are Most Likely to Prevent You From Attending a College or University After You Have Completed High School? (Continued)


## Appendix E

Instruments and Protocols

SURVEYS
Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey
High School Student Survey
Middle School Student Survey
Parent Telephone Survey
PROTOCOLS
District Coordinator Interview
Campus Administrator Interview
Counselor Interview
Teacher Focus Group-Moderator's Guide
Partner Organization Interview
Classroom Observation Form

## This survey is secure socket layer (SSL) protected. All data are encrypted for transmission.

## GEAR UP - Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey-2011

The Texas Center for Educational Research (TCER) is conducting an evaluation of the GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) project, also known as STAR (Students Training for Academic Readiness) under contract with the Texas Education Agency (TEA). As part of the evaluation, TCER is asking teachers, counselors, and librarians to participate in an on-line survey. The purpose of this survey is to collect information about the experiences of staff working in GEAR UP/STAR schools. The survey is completely voluntary and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All information collected through the survey will remain confidential. TCER will not share your individual answers with anyone in your school or at TEA. All survey information will be reported in aggregate and will not be linked to an individual respondent. If you have any questions about this survey or the evaluation, please contact Catherine Maloney at TCER (512-467-3596 or catherine.maloney@tcer.org).

By clicking here, then NEXT, you are agreeing to complete this survey.

## GEAR UP - Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey-2011

If you require a paper and pencil version of the survey, please contact Dana Beebe at 800-580-8237.
Please complete the online survey by April 29, 2011. Thank you for your participation!

| GENERAL INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Last Name |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| School Name: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What grades do you currently work with at this school? (Mark all that apply.) | 6 | $\begin{gathered} 7 \\ \square \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $8$ | $\begin{gathered} 9 \\ \square \end{gathered}$ | $10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & \square \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \square \end{aligned}$ |

2. Including this school year, how many years have you been employed in your current position
(e.g., as a counselor)?
3. Including this school year, how many years have you been working in your current position at this school?
4. What is your gender?

O Male
O Female
5. Which of the following best describes your race or ethnicity?

O WhiteAfrican American
O Hispanic/LatinoOther
If other, please specify:
6. What is your highest educational attainment?Bachelor's degreeEnrolled in master's courseworkMaster's degreeEnrolled in doctoral courseworkDoctorate
O Other
If other, please specify:
7. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with each of the following statements.

| Teachers in this school share an understanding about how Advanced Placement (AP) strategies may be used to enhance learning. | Strongly Disagree | Disagree $\bigcirc$ | Unsure $\bigcirc$ | Agree $\bigcirc$ | Strongly Agree $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The principal consults with staff before making decisions that may affect our ability to work in vertical teams. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| In this school, there are clear expectations that all students will be prepared for postsecondary educational opportunities. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I incorporate information about college readiness into my content-area lessons. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| The principal in my school actively encourages teachers to pursue professional development geared towards AP strategies and vertical teaming. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teachers are not afraid to learn about new educational approaches and use them with their class(es). | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in my classes. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Parents support our school's emphasis on college readiness. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| The principal is an effective leader for vertical teams in this school. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Overall, considering the uses of vertical teams in my school today, I am confident that this use is leading to increased student achievement. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| The principal encourages teachers to be innovative and try new methods. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to parents and the community. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| The principal is willing to support--through funding or manpower--teachers' efforts at vertical teaming. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teachers receive adequate administrative support to incorporate vertical teams. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teachers and administrators rely on research-proven teaching and learning principles in making decisions about instruction. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| When our school has professional development focused on vertical teams, the principal often participates. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| The surrounding community actively supports our emphasis on college readiness. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teachers in this school are generally supportive of vertical teaming efforts. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| This school provides a variety of opportunities for parent involvement. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to staff. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I am aware of an advisory committee that assists with GEAR UP implementation. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I have received sufficient training to use student test scores and achievement/accountability data in planning individual academic programs. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

PREPARATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
8. How often do you provide students with counseling or advice about the following:

Rarely $=1$ or 2 times a YEAR, Sometimes $=1$ or 2 times a MONTH, Often $=1$ or 2 times a WEEK

|  | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recommended High School Program or |  |
| Distinguished Achievement Program |  |$\quad$| Rarely |
| :---: |
| O |$\quad$| Sometimes |
| :---: |
| O |

9. How often do you provide parents with counseling or advice about the following:

Rarely $=1$ or 2 times a YEAR, Sometimes $=1$ or 2 times a MONTH, Often $=1$ or 2 times a WEEK

|  | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | | Rarely |
| :---: |
| Recommended High School Program or |
| Distinguished Achievement Program |$\quad$| Sometimes |
| :---: |
| O |

## VERTICAL TEAMS

GEAR UP/STAR supports vertical teams of middle and high school teachers in the core content areas to develop an aligned middle-to-high school curriculum. GEAR UPISTAR also supports vertical teams of counselors.
10. Please respond to each of the following items with respect to vertical teams in your school this year (August 2010 July 2011).

| I have attended or will attend a vertical teaming training this year. | Yes No <br> $\bigcirc$ $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| My school requires that I participate in vertical team training. | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ |
| My school provides release time or paid time to participate in vertical team training. | $\bigcirc$ |
| My school provides release time or paid time to participate in vertical team planning. | $\bigcirc \bigcirc$ |
| My school provides release time or paid time for team curriculum writing. | $\bigcirc$ |
| 11. How frequently during did your vertical team meet this year? |  |
| At least once a week |  |
| At least once a month |  |
| 1-2 times a semester |  |
| 1-2 times a year |  |
| $\bigcirc$ We have never had a meeting. |  |

12. To what extent have each of the following issues been a challenge in implementing vertical teams in your school?

|  | Large Extent | Moderate Extent | Small Extent | Not at All |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time/scheduling constraints | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Inadequate leadership or guidance | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Insufficient teacher participation | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Poor communication between teachers | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Teacher turnover | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Vertical teaming is not a priority | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

13. What needs to be in place in your school to make vertical teaming effective?
14. Please indicate the position in which you currently work. (Mark only one.)

Counselor $\bigcirc$

## Librarian <br> ○

[^18]
## Counselors are

 routed to the next section.Librarians are routed to the end of the survey.

## This Section is for Counselors Only

15. Consider each of the following counseling tasks. Please rank the level of importance for each.

|  | Least <br> Important |  | Neutral |  | Most <br> Important |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assisting students with grades and achievement issues | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Providing support for students' career goals | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Helping students plan and prepare for postsecondary education | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Assisting students with matters related to personal growth | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Coordinating GEAR UP activities | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Providing parents with college planning information | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| Providing parents with support and services | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

16. Consider each of the following counseling tasks. Please indicate the percentage of your time spent on each of these activities at your current school this year. Note. The total of all percentages must sum to $100 \%$.
__ Scheduling courses
___ Assisting students in course selections
__ Counseling for postsecondary admissions
__ Testing
__ Career counseling
__ Counseling related to students' personal issues and concerns
__ Other counseling tasks
__ Coordinating GEAR UP activities
__ Providing parents with college planning information
__ Providing parents/families with non-academic support and services
$\qquad$
TOTAL (out of 100 )
Click to continue, then hit NEXT button

## Questions for Teachers

17. What is your primary teaching assignment? (Mark only one.)

O Mathematics
O science
O English language arts/readingSocial studies/social scienceSelf-contained (i.e., teach multiple subjects to the same group of students)
O Other
If other, please specify:
18. About how often do you interact with colleagues in each of the following ways? (Select only one response for each statement.)

Rarely $=$ a few times a YEAR, Sometimes $=$ once or twice a MONTH, Often $=$ one or twice a WEEK

| As a teacher I... have informal discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for vertical teams. | Never $\bigcirc$ | Rarely ○ | Sometimes $\bigcirc$ | Often $\bigcirc$ | Almost Daily ○ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| receive feedback from other teachers based on their observations of my teaching. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| provide feedback to other teachers based on my observations of their teaching. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| consult with other teachers about students' academic performance. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| work with a subject-area peer(s) on my campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| work with a subject-area peer(s) from a feeder pattern campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| work with a colleague(s) in a different subject area to develop a lesson plan or class activity. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| act as a vertical team coach or mentor to other teachers or staff at my school. (May include teaching in-service workshop in your school.) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| receive vertical team coaching or mentoring from an external (non-school) source such as a professional curriculum developer, or university faculty fellow. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |


|  | Yes |
| :--- | :---: |
| 19. I have attended an AP summer institute offered by the College Board. | No |
| 20. I am teaching one or more AP courses this school year. | No |

Respondents who answered "yes" are routed to the next set of questions. Respondents who answered "no" are routed to the University Faculty Fellows Section.
21. Including the current school year, how many years have you been teaching AP or pre-AP courses? $\qquad$
22. Are your AP students required to take the AP exam?
23. Describe one instructional strategy learned in AP training that you have used successfully in your classroom(s).
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
24. What changes would make the AP program at your school more effective?

## UNIVERSITY FACULTY FELLOWS

| 25. Did you attend a university Faculty Fellows orientation meeting? | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 26. Have you been assigned a university faculty member through the Faculty Fellows program at | $\bigcirc$ | O | Texas A\&M University-Kingsville or Texas A\&M Corpus Christi University?

## Respondents who answered "yes" are routed to the next set of questions.

Respondents who answered "no" are routed to the end of the survey.
27. How frequently do you communicate with your university Faculty Fellow?

OAt least once a week
OAt least once a month
1-2 times a semester
O Other
If other, please specify:
28. How useful were any lectures, presentations, or demonstrations given by a university Faculty Fellow in your class?

OVery useful
Somewhat useful
Onot very useful
OMy Faculty Fellow did not give a lecture/presentation/demonstration
29. What were the most useful or effective activities involving your university Faculty Fellow mentor?
30. How could the university Faculty Fellows program be improved?

To complete the survey, please hit the submit button.
Thank you for your participation!
2) TCER

Texas Center for Educational Research
P.O. Box 679002, Austin, TX 78767-9002
www.tcer.org

# Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) <br> High School Student Survey--Spring 2011 

| MARKING INSTRUCTIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| - Use a No. 2 pencil only. | •Make solid marks that fill the response | • Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change. |  |  |
| - Do not use ink, ball point, or felt tip pens. | completely. | Make no stray marks on this form. |  |  |

Please answer each of the following questions about the GEAR UP program at your school. Your individual responses are confidential. You will not be identified by name in any reports. Thank you for completing this survey.

## General Information

First Name


Last Name
$\square$

School Name



1. Were you enrolled in this school last year?YesNo
2. What grade are you in this school year?
$\bigcirc 9$
$\bigcirc 10$
○ 11
○ 12
3. What is your gender?MaleFemale
4. Which of the following best describes you? (Mark only one.)Hispanic/Latino
(including Mexican American)
$\bigcirc$
African American

- White

Other (describe)
5. How much time do you usually spend on homework each day?
(Mark only one.)
Less than 30 minutes

- 30 to 60 minutes
- 1 to 2 hours

More than 2 hours
My teacher does not assign homework.


| O A GEAR UP/STAR representative | $\bigcirc$ My principal/assistant principal |
| :--- | :--- |
| M My parent(s) or guardian | $\bigcirc$ My brother or sister |
| My school counselor | $O$ Another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, cousin, or grandparent) |
| My teacher(s) | $O$ No one has spoken to me about college entrance requirements |
| Other (please explain): |  |

11. Has anyone talked to you about financial aid opportunities that will help pay college or university tuition expenses? (Mark all that apply.)

| A GEAR UP/STAR representative | $\bigcirc$ My principal/assistant principal |
| :--- | :--- |
| O My parent(s) or guardian | $\bigcirc$ My brother or sister |
| My school counselor | $\bigcirc$ Another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, cousin, or grandparent) |
| O My teacher(s) | $\bigcirc$ No one has spoken to me about financial aid opportunities |
| Other (please explain): |  |

12. Do you think that you could afford to attend each of the following using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources? (Mark only one response for each item.)

|  |  |  | Not | Probably | Definitely |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Definitely | Probably | Sure | Not | Not |
| a. A four-year college or university | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b. A community or junior college (two-year program) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. A vocational or technical school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## College Planning

13. In the next section, please indicate whether you "Have Taken," "Plan to Take," or "Will not Take" each of the following college entrance exams. If you are unsure of you plans, mark the oval in the column with the heading "Unsure." (Mark only one response for each item.)

|  | Have <br> Taken | Plan to Take | Will Not Take | Unsure |  | Have Taken | Plan to Take | Will Not Take | Unsure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. PSAT | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | d. ACT | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| b. PLAN | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | e. THEA | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | O |
| c. SAT | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## 14. Which graduation plan are you currently pursuing?(Mark only one.)

Distinguished Achievement Program
O Unsure
Recommended High School Program
Minimum Graduation Plan

## Post High School Plans

15. What is the highest level of education that you plan to earn? (Mark only one.)

O Less than high school

- High school

O High school plus vocational school
O Associate's degree (two-year community college)
O Some college but less than a four-year degree (not an associate's degree)
Bachelor's degree (four-year college or university degree)
Graduate or professional degree (master's, Ph.D., law degree, M.D., etc.)

- Don't know



## Thank you for taking the survey.

# Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Middle School Student Survey--Spring 2011 

| MARKING INSTRUCTIONS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| - Use a No. 2 pencil only. |
| - Do not use ink, ball point, or felt tip pens. |$\quad$| •Make solid marks that fill the response |
| :--- |
| completely. |$\quad$| • Erase cleanly any marks you wish to change. |
| :--- |
| •Make no stray marks on this form. |

Please answer each of the following questions about the GEAR UP program at your school. Your individual responses are confidential. You will not be identified by name in any reports. Thank you for completing this survey.

## General Information

## First Name



Last Name
$\square$
School Name
$\square$

(1) (0) (1) (0) (0) (0) (0) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)
(2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)
(3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3) (3)
(4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)
(5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5) (5)
(6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6) (6)
(7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7) (7)
(8) (8) (8) (8) (8) (8) (8) (8) (8)
(9) (9) (9) (8) (2) (9) (9) (9) (2)

9. Please indicate how familiar you are with each type of college and university. (Select only one response for each item.)

|  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Not }\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Somewhat }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Familiar | Familiar |  |
| Familiar |  |  |  |$]$

10. Please indicate how important each of the following sources was in helping you learn about colleges and universities. (Select only one level of agreement for each item.) If an item is NOT AT ALL important, then choose "1". If an item is VERY important, then choose " 5 ".

|  | Not At All Important |  |  | Very Important |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| a. Visited a college or university | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| b. Discussed college opportunities with a school counselor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| c. Discussed college opportunities with your teacher | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| d. Discussed college opportunities with your parent(s) or guardian(s) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| e. Discussed college opportunities with a brother or sister | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| f. Discussed college opportunities with another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, or cousin) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| g. Looked at a guide to colleges and universities (e.g., Barron's) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| h. Commercials or advertisements (TV, online) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| i. Other (describe): | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |

11. Has anyone talked to you about college entrance requirements? (Mark all that apply.)

| $\bigcirc$ A GEAR UP/STAR representative | $\bigcirc$ My principal/assistant principal |
| :--- | :--- |
| My parent(s) or guardian | $\bigcirc$ My brother or sister |
| My school counselor | $\bigcirc$ Another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, cousin, or grandparent) |
| My teacher(s) | $\bigcirc$ No one has spoken to me about college entrance requirements |
| Other (please explain): |  |

12. Has anyone talked to you about financial aid opportunities that will help pay college or university tuition expenses?
(Mark all that apply.)

- A GEAR UPISTAR representative

O My principal/assistant principal

- My parent(s) or guardian
- My brother or sister
- My school counselor

Another family member (e.g., an aunt, uncle, cousin, or grandparent)

- My teacher(s)

O No one has spoken to me about financial aid opportunities
Other (please explain):
13. Do you think that you could afford to attend each of the following using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources? (Mark only one response for each item.)

|  | Probably Definitely |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Definitely Probably Not Sure Not Not |  |  |


| a. A four-year college or university | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b. A community or junior college (two-year program) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. A vocational or technical school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

14. What is the highest level of education that you plan to earn? (Mark only one.)
$\bigcirc$ Less than high school

High school
High school plus vocational school
Some college but less than a four-year degree (not an associate's degree)
Associate's degree (two-year community college)
Bachelor's degree (four-year college or university degree)
Graduate or professional degree (master's, Ph.D., law degree, M.D., etc.)

- Don't know


## Thank you for taking the survey.

## Students Training for Academic Readiness (GEAR UPISTAR) Parent Telephone Survey - Spring 2011

## Introduction

Hello! My name is [interviewer's name]. I am calling on behalf of the Texas Center for Educational Research.

We are conducting a survey with parents of students who are attending [school name] to obtain parents' experiences with the school and with activities to help students get ready for college.

May I speak with the parent or guardian of [child's name] or the adult in your household who is most involved in decisions about the education of this child?

We would like to talk with you about [child's name]'s and your experiences at school.
Your name has been randomly selected to participate in this survey. All answers will be kept completely confidential. Your participation is voluntary, and if there is a question you don't wish to answer, please let us know and we will go on to the next question.

## Survey

Are you at least 18 years old? \{If "no", end survey.\}
\{Please note gender of respondent: Female, Male.\}

## Parent Involvement/Familiarity with School

1. How many times have you visited [child's name] school in the past year? [Record number of times.]
2. Which of the following school activities have you participated in over the course of the past school year?

| Activity | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a. PTA/PTO meeting | 1 | 2 |
| b. Volunteer activities for your child's school | 1 | 2 |
| c. Parent-teacher conferences | 1 | 2 |
| d. Observed/visited your child's classroom | 1 | 2 |
| e. Talked with a teacher or administrator about your child's education | 1 | 2 |
| f.Received college planning information or other counseling services <br> from the school counselor | 1 | 2 |
| g. Received a home visit from a teacher, counselor, or administrator at |  |  |
| your child's school |  |  |

3. Which of the following college and career awareness activities have you participated in at your child's school over the course of the past school year?

| Activity | Yes | No |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| a. Visited a college campus with your child's school | 1 | 2 |
| b. Attended a college or career fair at your child's school | 1 | 2 |
| c. Attended a workshop on preparing for college (learning about |  |  |
| applications, financial aid, entrance exams) |  |  |$\quad 1$| 2 |
| :---: |
| d.Received assistance in completing financial aid, scholarships, and <br> college applications |
| e. Attended a workshop on careers with your child (available careers, |
| applying for careers, creating resumes, educational and training <br> requirements for specific careers) |
| f. Attend a FACE activity with your child |

If yes (Other), please specify:
4. How familiar are you with the GEAR UP/STAR Program at [child's name] school?

1. Very familiar
2. Somewhat familiar
3. Not very familiar
4. Not familiar at all

## Involvement in Child's Schooling

5. Over the past school year, how often did you do each of the following activities?

| Activity |  | Several <br> Times a <br> Month | Several <br> Times a <br> Week | Every <br> Day |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a.Assist with or monitor your child's homework <br> at home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b.Tutor your child at home using materials and <br> instructions provided by the teacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Read with your child at home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d.Discuss school with your child | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e.Talk to other parents about your child's <br> school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

## Educational Expectations/Aspirations

6. Has [child's name] expressed an interest in going to college?
7. Yes
8. No
9. Don't know
10. What is the highest level of education that you think [child's name] will achieve?
11. Less than high school
12. High school
13. Some college but less than a four-year degree
14. 4-year degree or higher
15. Don't know
16. How often do you do each of the following with [child's name]?

| Activity | Never | Not Very <br> Often | Sometimes | Very <br> Often |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Talk about attending college | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b.Help select classes that support [CHILD'S] <br> college plans | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c.Talk about taking one or more of the college <br> entrance exams (SAT, ACT, PSAT, PLAN) <br> d. <br> Talk about financial aid opportunities, <br> scholarships, and other resources that might <br> provide the money to attend a college 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |

9. If in the future [child's name] were not to be able to continue his/her education after high school for some reason or other, what would be the most likely or most important obstacle?
10. It costs too much/can't afford it
11. $\mathrm{He} /$ she needs/wants to work
12. His/her grades are not good enough
13. $\mathrm{He} /$ she is not interested in college
14. $\mathrm{He} /$ she has a disability (physical, learning, emotional)
15. $\mathrm{He} /$ she wants to go into the military
16. $\mathrm{He} /$ she wants to get married
17. $\mathrm{He} /$ she has responsibilities to parents, brothers and sisters
18. $\mathrm{He} /$ she has children
19. Other/don't know
20. Child not likely to have an obstacle preventing him/her from continuing beyond high school
21. In the past year, has any one from [child's name] school or the GEAR UP program ever spoken with you about...

|  |  | Yes | No | Don't <br> Know |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. | College entrance requirements. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| b. | The availability of financial aid for college. | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| c. | The courses your child should take to prepare for college. | 1 | 2 | 3 |

## Financial Resources for Post-secondary Education

11. Do you think that [child's name] could afford to attend a public 4-year college using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources?
12. Definitely
13. Probably
14. Not sure
15. Probably not
16. Definitely not
17. Do you think that [child's name] could afford to attend a public community college (two-year) using financial aid, scholarships, and your family's resources?
18. Definitely
19. Probably
20. Not sure
21. Probably not
22. Definitely not
[If child is in high school (i.e., grades 9, 10, 11, or 12), go to question 13.]
[If child is not in high school, skip to question 18.]

## Parents of High School Students

13. Have you received any information from [child's name] school about the graduation plan called the Recommended High School Program in Texas?
14. Yes
15. No
16. Don't know/refused
17. Do you know which of the following graduation plans [child's name] is enrolled in? Is it
18. The Minimum Graduation Program?
19. The Recommended High School Program?
20. The Distinguished Achievement Program?
21. Don't know
22. How familiar are you with the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) form that a high school student must complete to qualify for federal financial aid for college?
23. Very familiar
24. Somewhat familiar
25. Not very familiar
26. Not familiar at all
27. Do you know if [child's name] has completed the FAFSA form and is eligible for federal financial aid for college?
28. Yes, my child has completed the FAFSA form
29. No, my child has not completed the FAFSA from
30. Have you begun saving for [child's name] education after high school?
31. Yes
32. No
33. Don't know/refused

## Personal/Demographic Information

18. Which of the following languages are primarily spoken in your home?
19. English
20. Spanish
21. Vietnamese
22. Japanese
23. Chinese
24. Other [Record the language.]
25. Which best describes your household?
26. Two parents or guardians
27. Single parent or guardian
28. Other \{specify\}
29. How many years have you lived at your current address? [Record the number of years.]
30. How do you think of yourself?
31. Black, non-Hispanic
32. Asian/Asian-American
33. Latino/Hispanic
34. White, non-Hispanic
35. Native American/American Indian
36. Other $\qquad$
37. Refused/don't know
38. How many years of formal schooling have you completed? [Formal schooling includes elementary and secondary education. Record the number of years.]
39. Have you attended college?
40. Yes
41. No
42. Refused/don't know
43. If yes, how many years of college have you completed? [College includes postsecondary education. Record the number of years.]
44. What is your current yearly household income?
45. Less than $\$ 15,000 /$ year
46. $\$ 15,000-24,999 /$ year
47. $\$ 25,000-34,999 /$ year
48. $\$ 35,0000-49,999 /$ year
49. $\$ 50,000-74,999 /$ year
50. More than $\$ 75,000 /$ year
51. Refused/don't know

Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) District GEAR UPISTAR Coordinator Interview Spring 2011

| Administrator Name: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | District: |
| New Administrator (to this district) $2010-11: \quad$ Interviewer: |  |
| 1. Role in GEAR UPISTAR |  |
| a) Overall, how would you say implementation of GEAR UP/STAR has gone this year? (Deliberately broad |  |
| to allow for a wide range of responses.) |  |
| b) Describe your role in implementing the GEAR UP/STAR grant this year. |  |
| c) Does this differ from your role in previous years? Please explain. |  |
| d) What, if any, challenges have you experienced in fulfilling this role? (Probe for issues related to time, |  |
| conflicting priorities, lack of clearly defined project responsibilities.) |  |
| e) Describe the role of campus counselors in implementing the project. |  |
| f) Describe the role of campus teachers in implementing the project. |  |
| g) Describe your relationship with principals on GEAR UP/STAR campuses. |  |

## 2. Fifth Year Implementation of GEAR UPISTAR Activities

What are the key components of your district's plan for implementing GEAR UPISTAR? (Probe which individuals are responsible for implementing components.)
a) Does your district emphasize certain program components more than others? (Program components include (1) raising academic standards and improving instruction, (2) engaging teachers through professional development and students through targeted services, (3) increasing student and parent access to postsecondary planning information, and (4) building parent and community support.)

If yes, please explain the reasons behind this emphasis.
b) Please describe the GEAR UP/STAR activities that have been implemented in your district during the 2010-11 school year. (Probe for information about participants.)
c) How do these activities differ from those offered in previous years to support students' college readiness?
d) Please describe how your district allocates STAR funding between the middle school and the high school. Have allocation patterns changed across implementation years?

## 3. Vertical Teams

a) Which faculty and staff comprise your vertical teams under the GEAR UPISTAR project?
b) What goals or expectations do you have for vertical teaming in your school district? (Probe how often vertical teams are expected to meet.)
c) What, if anything, has limited the implementation of vertical teams this year? (Probe for issues related to lack of common planning periods, lack of coordination between high school and middle school, and staff resistance.)

## 4. Successes and Challenges of Fifth Year GEAR UPISTAR Implementation

Please think about the successes and challenges you encountered in implementing the GEAR UP/STAR project this school year.
a) What were the primary successes your district experienced in implementing GEAR UP/STAR during this school year?
b) What were the primary barriers or challenges to implementing GEAR UP/STAR this school year?
c) How did your district resolve or overcome these challenges?
5. Communication of GEAR UPISTAR Activities to Staff, Students, Parents, and Community Members
a) How have GEAR UP/STAR activities been communicated? (Probe for communication with teachers, students, parents, and community members.)
b) What measures have been taken to encourage participation in GEAR UP/STAR activities? (Probe for measures addressing with teachers, students, parents, and community members.)
6. Role of GEAR UPISTAR Partner Organizations
a) Please describe how GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations have participated in the implementation of GEAR UPISTAR activities during the 2010-11 school year.
b) Which partner organizations played the greatest role in implementing GEAR UP/STAR activities?
c) Overall, are you satisfied with the participation of partner organizations?
d) How could the participation of GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations be improved?

## 7. Continuation of GEAR UPISTAR in the 2011-12 School Year

a) What specific activities are you planning for next year's implementation of GEAR UP/STAR? Do these activities differ from those of the 2010-11 school year?

## 8. STAR Sustainability

a) Please describe any plans your district may have for sustaining STAR after grant funds expire in 2012. (Probe for challenges and supports to sustainability, differences in the types of services offered, other.)
9. Other
a) Is there anything that I have not asked that you think is important to understanding GEAR UP/STAR implementation on your campus this year?

> Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Campus Administrator Interview Spring 2011

| Administrator Name: | Campus/District: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date: | Interviewer: |
| Years as an administrator | Years as an administrator on this campus |
| 1. Role in GEAR UPISTAR |  |
| a) Overall, how would you say GEAR UP/STAR has gone this year? (Deliberately broad to allow for a |  |
| wide range of responses.) |  |
| b) Describe your role in implementing the GEAR UP/STAR grant this year. |  |
| c) Does this differ from your role in previous years? Please explain. |  |
| d) What, if any, challenges have you experienced in fulfilling this role? (Probe for issues related to time, |  |
| conflicting priorities, lack of clearly defined project responsibilities.) |  |

## 2. Fifth Year Implementation of GEAR UPISTAR Activities

a) What are the key components of your campus's plan for implementing GEAR UP/STAR? (Probe for individuals who are responsible for implementing components.)
b) Does your district emphasize certain program components more than others? (Program components include (1) raising academic standards and improving instruction, (2) engaging teachers through professional development and students through targeted services, (3) increasing student and parent access to postsecondary planning information, and (4) building parent and community support.)

If yes, please explain the reasons behind this emphasis.
c) Please describe the GEAR UP/STAR activities that have been implemented on your campus during the 2010-11 school year. (Probe for participants.)
d) Do these activities differ from those offered in previous years to support students' college readiness? If so, how?
e) Describe the STAR teacher professional development activities offered this school year. (Probe for information about vertical team training, faculty fellows mentoring.)
f) Have you observed any changes in instruction or classroom practice that is a result of STAR professional development?

If yes, please describe these changes.
g) Please describe how your district allocates STAR funding between the middle school and the high school. Have allocation patterns changed across implementation years?
h) MIDDLE SCHOOL ONLY: Has STAR implementation changed since the initial student cohort (seventh graders in 2006-07) is now in high school? (Probe for changes in the types of services offered, levels of implementation, numbers of students served, other.)

If yes, please describe why changes may have occurred. (Probe for changes in funding, administrative support, etc.)

## 3. Successes and Challenges of Fifth Year GEAR UPISTAR Implementation

Please think about the successes and challenges you encountered in implementing the GEAR UPISTAR project this school year.
a) What were the primary successes your campus experienced in implementing GEAR UP/STAR during this school year?
b) What were the primary barriers or challenges to implementing GEAR UP/STAR this school year?
c) How did your campus resolve or overcome these challenges?
4. Communication of GEAR UPISTAR Activities to Staff, Students, Parents, and Community Members
a) How have GEAR UP/STAR activities been communicated this school year? (Probe for communication to teachers, students, parents and community members.)
b) What measures have been taken to encourage participation in GEAR UP/STAR activities? (Probe for measures related to teachers, students, parents and community members.)

## 5. Role of GEAR UPISTAR Partner Organizations

a) Please describe how GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations have participated in the implementation of GEAR UP/STAR activities during the 2010-11 school year.
b) Which partner organizations played the greatest role in implementing GEAR UP/STAR activities?
c) Overall, are you satisfied with the participation of partner organizations?
d) How could the participation of GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations be improved?

## 6. Continuation of GEAR UPISTAR in the 2011-12 School Year

a) What specific activities are you planning for next year's implementation of GEAR UP/STAR?
b) Do these activities differ from those of the 2010-11 school year? If so, how?

## 7. STAR Sustainability

a) Please describe any plans your district may have for sustaining STAR after grant funds expire in 2012. (Probe for challenges and supports to sustainability, differences in the types of services offered, other.)

## 8. Other

a) Is there anything that I have not asked that you think is important to understanding GEAR UP/STAR implementation on your campus this year?

# Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Counselor Interview Spring 2011 

Counselor Name/Title: Campus/District:

Date: Interviewer:
Years as a counselor
Years as counselor at this school

## 1 Role in Implementing GEAR UPISTAR

a) Overall, how would you say implementation of GEAR UP/STAR has gone this year? (Deliberately broad to allow for a wide range of responses.)
b) Please describe your role in implementing GEAR/UP STAR during this school year. (Probe for activities addressing college awareness, college readiness, and college planning.)
c) Does this differ from your role in previous years? Please explain.
d) What, if any, challenges have you experienced in fulfilling this role? (Probe for issues related to time, conflicting priorities, lack of clearly defined project responsibilities.)

## 2. Fifth Year Implementation of GEAR UPISTAR Activities

a) What are the key components of your campus's plan for implementing GEAR UP/STAR? (Probe for information on components related to academic support, informational resources, parent activities, and community support, and the individuals involved in implementing components.)
b) Please describe the GEAR UP/STAR activities that have been implemented on your campus during the 2010-11 school year. (Probe for information on activities related to academic support, informational resources, parent activities, and community support, and the activity participants.)
c) How do these activities differ from those offered in previous years to support students' college readiness?
d) Have you observed any effects of STAR activities? (Probe for changes in parent, student, and/or teacher behavior.)

## 3. Successes and Challenges of Fifth Year GEAR UPISTAR Implementation

Please think about the successes and challenges you encountered in implementing the GEAR UP/STAR project this school year.
a) What were the primary successes your campus experienced in implementing GEAR UP/STAR during this school year?
b) What were the primary barriers or challenges to implementing GEAR UP/STAR this school year?
c) How did your campus resolve or overcome these challenges?
d) What resources or assistance are still needed to improve STAR implementation?

## 4. Vertical Team Training for Counselors

a) Please describe professional development activities that you have received this school year. (Probe for trainings related to vertical teams.)
b) What effect has training had on counseling services in this school or district?

## 5. Parental Involvement

a) Were there any counseling services or activities that you offered to parents?
b) If yes, how did you encourage parents to participate?
c) How would you describe the level of parent participation?
6. Role of GEAR UPISTAR Partner Organizations
a) Please describe how GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations have participated in the implementation of GEAR UPISTAR activities during the 2010-11 school year.
b) Which partner organizations played the greatest role in implementing GEAR UP/STAR activities?
c) Overall, are you satisfied with the participation of partner organizations?
d) How could the participation of GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations be improved?

## 7. Continuation of GEAR UPISTAR in the 2011-12 School Year

a) What specific activities are you planning for next year's implementation of GEAR UP/STAR? Do these activities differ from those of the 2010-11 school year?

## 8. Other

a) Is there anything that I have not asked that you think is important to understanding GEAR UP/STAR implementation on your campus this year?

## Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Teacher Focus Group - Moderator's Guide <br> Spring 2011

| Participants: | Campus: <br> District: <br> Date: $\qquad$ <br> Moderato |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Introduction |  |
| [Distribute index cards to participants. Ask participants to write their name, teaching assignment. Collect cards at the end as a record of teacher participation.] |  |
| Purpose of Teacher Focus Group: |  |
| Your school has received funding under the federal Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) to support the Students Training for Academic Readiness Program (STAR). The Texas Education Agency has contracted with the Texas Center for Educational Research conduct a research study of the STAR program. This focus group is part of that research. |  |
| Here are some Ground Rules: |  |
| 1. Recording the session-responses confidential; individuals not identified |  |
| 2. One person speak at a time |  |
| 3. Speak loudly enough to be picked up on tape |  |
| 4. All views are important-need open, candid responses |  |
| 5. Everyone participates |  |
| 6. We need to stay on schedule (40-45 minutes). I may interrupt you to get back on task |  |
| Participant Introductions |  |
| [Begin taping. Give the name of the school. Ask participants to give their names and teaching assignments, grades taught, and number of years teaching] |  |

## 1. Teachers' Role in GEAR UPISTAR Implementation

a) Overall, how would you say GEAR UPISTAR has gone this year? (Deliberately broad to allow for a wide range of responses.)
b) Describe teachers' role in implementing GEAR UPISTAR this school year. (Probe for college awareness, college readiness, and college planning activities after initial response.)
c) Did this differ from teachers' role in previous years? Please explain.
d) What, if any, challenges did teachers' experience in fulfilling this role? (Probe for issues related to time, conflicting priorities, lack of clearly defined project responsibilities, time.)
e) From where or whom do you receive support and assistance with GEAR UP implementation?

## 2. Vertical Teaming

a) Please describe how verticals teams are implemented on this campus. (Probe for membership of teams, differences among subject areas, and the goals of vertical teams.)
b) Are there any district or campus expectations about teachers' participation in vertical teams?
c) What, if anything, has limited the implementation of vertical teams this year? (Probe for issues related to lack of common planning periods, lack of coordination between high school and middle school, and staff resistance)
d) Have you noticed any effects from the vertical teaming implementation?

## 3. Professional Development for Vertical Teaming

a) Describe the professional development provided this school year to support vertical teaming. (Probe who participated in vertical teams.)
b) What aspects of this training were most useful to you? And least useful?
c) Are there any district or campus expectations with respect to teachers' participation in vertical team training?
d) Were there any efforts to align the curriculum on your campus that included collaboration with university faculty fellows and/or university personnel? If so, please describe.
e) Have you attended any other training or professional development other than vertical teaming and AP strategies? (Continue with: Were they helpful? Effective? Are you implementing these strategies?)

## 4. Faculty Fellows Mentoring Program

a) Did you participate in the Faculty Fellows Program this year?
b) If yes, please describe the kinds of activities that are offered through the program.
c) Were these activities helpful? Why or why not?

## 5. Informational Resources

a) What informational resources are available to you to share with students to assist them with college preparation and planning? (Probe for the most and least useful resources.)
b) Have you used these resources with students? If yes, explain how.

## 6. Parent Support

a) Please describe any activities offered by your school this year that are designed to increase parent involvement in students' education.
b) Have you participated in these activities?
c) Have you observed any effects of these activities? If yes, please explain/describe. (Probe for the level of parental involvement and participation, and effects, such as student achievement.)

## 7. Other

a) Is there anything that I have not asked that you think is important to understanding GEAR UP/STAR implementation on your campus this year?

## Students Training for Academic Readiness (STAR) Partner Organization Interview -Summer 2011

## Partner Organization Name:

Organization Representative Name:
Job Title:
Date: Interviewer:

Representative's years employed with partner organization:

## 1. Involvement in Grant Planning

a) Did you or your organization participate in developing any grant applications GEAR UPISTAR districts submitted to TEA for 2010-11 (year 5) funding? If yes, please describe your role in the process. (Probe for key contacts at each district.)
b) Did you or anyone in your organization assist in the development of districts' implementation plans for 2010-11? This document is the implementation plan listing activities and timetables for year 5, and is based on the district's grant application as approved by the TEA. If yes, please describe which districts, and how you assisted them. (Probe for key contacts at each district.)

## 2. Year 5 Implementation

a) What were your organization's goals, key activities, and services offered for year 5 of the project? (Probe for brief summary of goals.)
b) What evidence do you have that these activities and services support college readiness, indirectly or directly? (Probe for research as well as anecdotal evidence.)
c) Do you vary or modify your services and activities across districts? Why?
d) What do you feel were your greatest successes in implementing your organization's activities and services in year 5?
e) What do you feel were your greatest challenges in implementing activities and services in year 5 ?
f) How will/have these challenges and successes inform your organization's approach to year 6 of the project?
g) What are your goals for year 6 of the project? Do you have specific goals for any of the GEAR UP/STAR districts? (Probe for details where necessary.)
h) Are you coordinating activities or services with other GEAR UP/STAR partner organizations? Why or why not? (Probe for key contacts at the coordinating partner organizations, and extent of any collaboration.)

## 3. Other Issues

Is there anything I haven't asked that you think is important in researchers' understanding of the GEAR UP/STAR project?

# STARIGEAR UP Classroom Observation Form 

RECORD DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) (0) |  | O | (0) | (0) | (0) |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) (1) |  | 1 | (1) | (1) | 1 |  |  |  | (1) | (1) |
| (2) (2) |  | (2) 2 | (2) (2) | (2) | (2) |  |  |  |  | (2) |
| (3) (3) |  | 3 | 3 (3) | (3) | (3) |  |  |  | ${ }^{3}$ | (3) |
| (4) (4) |  | 4 (4) | (4) (4) | (4) | (4) |  |  |  | (4) | (4) |
| (5) (5) |  | 5 | (5) | (5) | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | (5) |
| (6) (6) |  | (6) | (6) | (6) | (6) |  |  |  | (6) | (6) |
| (7) (7) |  | 7 | 77 | 7 | (1) |  |  |  | (7) | (7) |
| (8) 88 |  | 3) 8 | 8 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  |  | 8 | 8 8 |
| (9) (9) |  | (9) | (9) | (9) | (9) | ( | 9 | (9) | (9) | (9) |



14. Organization of the classroom (Mark only one.)


Traditional rows
Desks arranged so that students face each other
Small clusters of 3-5 student desks
Desks in circles or semi-circles
Tables
Lab
3. OBSERVATION DATE


## 8. SUBJECT

$\bigcirc$ Reading
Language Arts
Science
Mathematics
Other
11. Technology availability:

## classroom

15. Rate and give examples of the adequacy of the physical environment:

|  | Sparsely equipped |  |  | Rich in resources |  | Inhibited interactions |  |  | tated ctions |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. Classroom resources: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | c. Room arrangement: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| (examples) |  |  |  |  | (examples) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Crowded Adequate |  |  |  | Not at all |  |  | To a great extent |  |
| b. Classroom space: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | d. Student work displayed: | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| (examples) |  |  |  |  | (examples) |  |  |  |  |

16. Comments on classroom environment (e.g., visuals, resources, student work, arrangement, management).

Record your first observation during the first 5 minutes, then record every 10 minutes

| SEGMENT |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. Class organization |  | Mark one |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | dividual students working alone | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | airs of students | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | mall groups (3+ students) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | Whole class | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ombination of any of the above | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 18. Teacher is... |  | Mark one |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | irecting whole group (teacher telling, lecturing, questioning, controlling topic and pace). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | uiding interactive discussion with whole group (primarily students contributing). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | modeling for whole group (demonstrates a strategy aligned with lesson objective). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | acilitating/coaching (students work collaboratively on project/problem, teacher assists). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | monitoring student work (supervising independent work, may interact briefly). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | oviding one-on-one instruction (individualized instruction lasting 3 minutes or more). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | iving a test. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | howing a video/CD-ROM. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | anaging behavior or materials. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ting at desk. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | hecking/grading student work. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | her (write in) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 19. Students are... |  | Mark all that apply |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | stening to a teacher presentation or discussion (majority of students). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | stening to a student presentation (majority of students). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | iving a presentation. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ngaged in interactive discussion (majority of students contributing). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | sing graphic organizers/linking maps (circle, bubble, tree, brace, flow, bridge,etc.). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | king notes (two-column, main idea, opinion, hypothisis-proof, problem-solution). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | rriting communication related to lesson (reflection, composition, notebook, journal). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ngaged in problem solving/investigation (manipulatives, experiment, game, exploration). | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | gaged in individual reading/reflection. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | mpleting an exercise or short answer worksheet. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ewing a video/CD-ROM. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | king a test. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | using technology/audio-visual resources. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ther (write in) | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 20. Teacher's technology use: |  | Mark all that apply |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ot used | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | resentation | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | acilitating student use | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | mart Board | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | Vrite pads | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | ther | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 21. Students' technology use |  | Mark all that apply |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ot used | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | Computer Lab | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | class computer | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|  | aptop carts | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 22. Student engagement |  | Mark one |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Low engagement: Several students are not focused on the learning tasks. Students engage in inappropriate behaviors (talk to peers about non-class matters, make noise). Most students invest minimal effort in learning or understanding the lesson content. Students exhibit minimal or no interest in or enthusiasm for the assigned tasks. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 2 | A few students are not focused on the learning tasks and engage in inappropriate behaviors. Although most students comply with teacher directives, they invest modest effort in learning or understanding the lesson content. Students exhibit little interest in or enthusiasm for the assigned tasks. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 3 | Moderate engagement: Nearly all students are obedient and attend to the teachers' content delivery and directions. Students comply with expectations by answering questions and carrying out assignments. Students exhibit limited or moderate interest in or excitement about the content they are learning. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 4 | Nearly all students are on task. Activity in the classroom is relevant to assigned tasks. Most students exhibit a sustained commitment to and involvement in their academic tasks. Students are interested in their assignments. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 5 | High engagement: Nearly all students are substantively engaged. Students are focused on meaningful and intellectually challenging tasks. The lesson allows for substantial student-to-student and /or student-to-teacher interaction. Nearly all students are interested in and enthusiastic about their assigned tasks. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |

## Evidence:

## RECORD DESCRIPTIVE NOTES DURING OBSERVATION:

23. Describe the instructional goals/objectives for student learning.
24. Describe the teacher's instructional activities and questioning strategies: (Lower order questions = " 1 " and higher order questions $=$ " + ") and the students' learning experiences (extent of intellectual challenge and understanding).

|  |  | $\mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathbf{Q}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Complete the following sections after the observation.

## 25. Student collaboration:

${ }^{(1)}$ Almost no student-to-student interaction. Students generally work as a whole group or do independent work the entire class period.
(2) Minimal student-to-student interaction. Students work as a whole group or independently most of the period. Less than a third of class time is allocated for students to work as pairs or in small groups. Only a few students participate and share ideas during group work.
(3) Most students (more than half) work cooperatively in pairs or groups for a substantial part of the class period (about a third). In groups, some students contribute information and share ideas; other students are not active contributors.
${ }^{4}$ N Nearly all of students (all but a few) work in pairs or groups through most of the class period. Most students share ideas about subject matter.
${ }^{5}$ (5early all students work cooperatively in pairs or groups through most of the class period. Nearly all students contribute ideas about subject matter. Students reach goals as a group, with most making significant contributions.
Evidence:

## HIGHER ORDER THINKING INDICATORS

| 26. The teacher... | Not at All | Small Extent | Moderate Extent | Large Extent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. asks open-ended questions with multiple answers or interpretations. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| b. asks questions that require reasoning (if/then, what if, or suppose that). | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| c. asks students to justify ideas and explain their thoughts (Why do you think so?). | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| d. asks students to explain key concepts, definitions, and attributes in their own words. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| e. has students think about and relate examples from their own experience. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| f. relates subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| g. Class activity does not involve questioning. (specify): | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

## SUBJECT-SPECIFIC INDICATORS

## 27. In the English/language arts classroom, students are...

a. applying knowledge of literary elements to understand written texts.
b. acquiring vocabulary through reading and systematic word study.
c. producing compositions for a specific purpose (content, organization, mechanics).
d. recognizing appropriate organization of ideas in written text (using models, examples).
e. using critical thinking/problem solving skills to analyze/evaluate written texts.
f. using graphic organizers, summarizing, note taking/outlining, identifying main ideas.
g. linking ELA concepts to their own experiences or other subject areas.

## 28. In the mathematics classroom, students are...

| Not at | Small <br> Moderate | Large <br> Extent | Extent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Extent |  |  |  |


| a. using active manipulation as a model for the mathematical situation in the lesson. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b. using calculators to explore the mathematical situation. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| c. discussing the problem solving process they are using. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| d. are asking mathematical questions of the teacher and each other. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| e. using writing to describe their solution strategies or mathematical thinking. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| f. using graphic data representation, concept mapping, graphic organizers, creating models. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| g. linking mathematics in this lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| h. summarizing mathematical ideas from this lesson. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |


| 29. In the science classroom, students are... | Not at All | Small Extent | Moderate Extent | Large Extent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a. using calculators/computers to explore a scientific situation. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| b. using scientific tools to model the scientific situation in the lesson. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| c. participating in experiments/investigations. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| d. discussing the scientific situation, problem, or discoveries they are making. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| e. asking scientific questions of the teacher and each other. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| f. using written communication to describe their solution strategies or scientific thinking. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| g. using graphic organizers, summarizing, note taking/outlining, identifying main ideas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| h. linking science in this lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| i. summarizing scientific ideas from this lesson. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| 30. In the social studies classroom, students are... | Not at All | Small Extent | Moderate Extent | Large Extent |
| a. using maps, charts, globe to interpret events. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| b. using written communication to analyze, make judgements, draw conclusions. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| c. evaluating the validity of various types of evidence. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| d. examining trends, themes, and interactions (e.g.. graphs, charts). | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| e. exploring cause and effect relationships. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| f. conducting research (gather, analyze, interpret, synthesize). | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| g. making connections between past and present events. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| h. using graphic organizers, summarizing, note taking/outlining, identifying main ideas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| i. linking the social studies lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

## STAR Goals and Objectives for the Statewide and District Programs

GOAL 1: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF UNDERREPRESENTED (LOW-INCOME AND MINORITY) STUDENTS WHO ARE PREPARED TO GO TO COLLEGE.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's first year, information, workshops, and student internship opportunities aimed at linking college attendance to career success will be available to $100 \%$ of the cohort students and their parents.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's second year, at least $50 \%$ of the parents will have attended at least five college awareness activities.

Objective 3: By the end of the project's third year, 50\% of the middle school students in participating schools will be enrolled in pre-AP curriculum, including Algebra 1 and/or Spanish.
Objective 4: By the end of the project's fourth year, at least $25 \%$ of the cohort will take an AP course as reflected on the Academic Excellence Indicator System.
Objective 5: By the end of the project's fifth year, the number of students taking and passing AP examinations will meet or exceed the state average as reflected in the Academic Excellence Indicator System.

GOAL 2: INCREASE THE NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY (LEP) HISPANIC STUDENTS WHO SUCCESSFULLY GRADUATE AND ATTEND COLLEGE.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's first year, at least $50 \%$ of the parents of LEP students will be involved in college awareness activities.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's third year, 30\% of the LEP students will participate in pre-AP and AP courses; by the end of the fifth year, the number of LEP students in pre-AP and AP courses will meet or exceed the state average.
Objective 3: By the end of the project's third year, $25 \%$ of LEP students will take AP Spanish in middle and high school to earn college credit before graduating.

## GOAL 3: STRENGTHEN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND STUDENT SERVICES AT PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's first year, teams of teachers at the middle and high school will have participated in AP vertical/horizontal team training.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's second year, at least $75 \%$ of the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students will be involved in a comprehensive mentoring, counseling, and/or tutoring program based on results of teacher/counselor input and diagnostic data.

Objective 3: By the end of the project's fourth year, $50 \%$ of the students participating high schools will complete AP or concurrent enrollment credit.

GOAL 4: BUILD AN ACADEMIC PIPELINE DESIGNED FROM SCHOOL TO COLLEGE.
Objective 1: Increase state commitment to building an academic pipeline designed to allow all students the opportunity to attend college.

Objective 2: By the end of the project's second year, at least $30 \%$ of the students will be involved in summer programs and institutes designed to help them with at or above grade level and to increase college awareness.
Objective 3: By the end of the project's second year, all students and parents will have access to information about college, financial aid, and career requirements.

GOAL 5: DEVELOP EFFECTIVE AND ENDURING ALLIANCES AMONG SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, STUDENTS, PARENTS, GOVERNMENT, AND COMMUNITY GROUPS.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's first year, existing school/college programs will be expanded by $25 \%$ and new programs will be created.
Objective2: By the end of the project's second year, counseling to parents and students will be available at Project STAR sites.
Objective 3: By the end of the project's second year, all communities will have business alliances formed that support higher student achievement.
Objective 4: By the end of the project's second year, participating campuses will have formed alliances with governmental entities and community groups enhance the information available on scholarships, financial aid, and college awareness.

## GOAL 6: IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's first year, teams of teachers at the middle and high school will have participated in AP vertical/horizontal team training.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's second year, middle and high school teachers and counselors will be trained in effective data usage in planning individual student programs.
Objective 3: By the end of the project's second year, all teachers will have the opportunity to participate in the University Fellows Program.

## GOAL 7: PROVIDE STUDENTS WITH INTENSIVE, INDIVIDUALIZED AND COORDINATED SUPPORT.

Objective 1: By the end of the project's second year, $75 \%$ of the students will have the opportunity to receive mentoring and/or tutoring services.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's second year, $75 \%$ of the students will have the opportunity to receive counseling services as needed.

GOAL 8: RAISE STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT FOR ALL STUDENTS.
Objective 1: By the end of the project's third year, at least $50 \%$ of the cohort will take pre-AP or AP courses.
Objective 2: By the end of the project's fifth year, $50 \%$ of the students will score at or about the state average on the ACT/SAT.
Objective 3: By the end of the project's fifth year, the number of students meeting criterion on the THEA will meet or exceed the state average.
APPENDIX G
Table G.1. Data Sources and Methodology for Implementation Analysis, 2010-11

| Indicator | Source | Item Description | Methodology | Standards-Based Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Raising Academic Standards |  |  | 5-point scale: [(Mean: Academic Rigor + Mean: Curricular Alignment + Advanced Academics)/3] |  |
| Academic Rigor | Classroom Observations | Higher Order Thinking <br> The teacher... <br> a) Asks open-ended questions with multiple answers or interpretations. <br> b) Asks questions that require reasoning. <br> c) Asks students to justify ideas and explain their thoughts. <br> d) Asks students to explain key concepts, definitions, and attributes in their own words. <br> e) Has students think about and relate examples from their own experience. <br> f) Relates subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life. | - Find mean score per classroom. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Not at all } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Small extent } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Moderate extent } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Large extent } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Classroom Observations | Subject-Specific Indicators <br> In the ELA classroom, students are... <br> a) Applying knowledge of literary elements to understand written texts. <br> b) Acquiring vocabulary through reading and systematic word student. <br> c) Producing compositions for a specific purpose. <br> d) Recognizing appropriate organization of ideas in written text. <br> e) Using critical thinking/problem solving skills to analyze/evaluate written texts. <br> f) Using graphic organizers, summarizing, note-taking/outlining, identifying main ideas. <br> g) Linking ELA concepts to their own experiences or other subject areas. | - Find mean score per classroom. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Not at all } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Small extent } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Moderate extent } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Large extent } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Classroom Observations | In the mathematics classroom, students are... <br> a) Using active manipulation as a model for the mathematical situation in the lesson. <br> b) Using calculators to explore the mathematical situation. <br> c) Discussing the problem solving process they are using. <br> d) Are asking mathematical questions of the teacher and each other. <br> e) Using writing to describe their solution strategies or mathematical thinking. <br> f) Using graphic data representation, concept mapping, graphic organizers, creating models. <br> g) Linking mathematics in this lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. <br> h) Summarizing mathematical ideas from this lesson. | - Find mean score per classroom. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Not at all } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Small extent } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Moderate extent } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Large extent } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Classroom Observations | In the science classroom, students are... <br> a) Using calculators/computers to explore a scientific situation. <br> b) Using scientific tools to model the scientific situation in the lesson. <br> c) Participating in experiments/investigations. <br> d) Discussing the scientific situation, problem, or discoveries they are making. <br> e) Asking scientific questions of the teacher and each other. <br> f) Using written communication to describe their solution strategies or scientific thinking. <br> g) Using graphic organizers, summarizing, note-taking/outlining, identifying main ideas. <br> h) Linking science in this lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. <br> i) Summarizing scientific ideas from this lesson. | - Find mean score per classroom. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Not at all } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Small extent } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Moderate extent } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Large extent } \end{aligned}$ |


|  | Classroom Observations | In the social studies classroom, students are... <br> a) Using maps, charts, globe to interpret events. <br> b) Using written communication to analyze, make judgments, draw conclusions. <br> c) Evaluating the validity of various types of evidence. <br> d) Examining trends, themes, and interactions. <br> e) Exploring cause and effect relationships. <br> f) Conducting research. <br> g) Making connections between past and present events. <br> h) Using graphic organizers, summarizing, note-taking, identifying main ideas. <br> i) Linking the social studies lesson to real world experiences or other subject areas. | - Find mean score per classroom. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Not at all } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Small extent } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Moderate extent } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Large extent } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Classroom Observations | Student Engagement | - Create hierarchy by multiplying each level of engagement by increasing increments (level $1 * 1$; level $2 * 2 \ldots$ level $5 * 5$ ). <br> - Find sum of each level of engagement across all time points per classroom. <br> - Find mean level of engagement per classroom by dividing by number of time points. <br> - Find mean per campus. | $1.00=$ Several students are not focused on the learning tasks. Students engage in inappropriate behaviors. Most students invest minimal effort in learning or understanding the lesson content. Students exhibit minimal or no interest or enthusiasm in assigned tasks. <br> $2.00=$ A few students are not focused on the learning tasks and engage in inappropriate behaviors. Although most students comply with teacher directives, they invest modest effort in learning or understanding the lesson content. Students exhibit little interest in or enthusiasm for the assigned tasks. <br> $3.00=$ Nearly all students are obedient and attend to the teacher's content delivery and directions. Students comply with expectations by answering questions and carrying out assignments. Students exhibit limited or moderate interest in or excitement about the content they are learning. $4.00=$ Nearly all students are on task. Activity in the classroom is relevant to assigned tasks. Most students exhibit a sustained commitment to and involvement in their academic tasks. Students are interested in their assignments. <br> $5.00=$ Nearly all students are substantively engaged. Students are focused on meaningful and intellectually challenging tasks. The lesson allows for substantial student-to-student and/or student-to-teacher interaction. Nearly all students are interested in and enthusiastic about their assigned tasks. |


| Mean: Academic Rigor |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curricular <br> Alignment: <br> Vertical <br> Teaming <br> Strategies | Teacher Survey | As a teacher, I... <br> a) Have informal discussions with colleagues regarding strategies for vertical teams. <br> b) Receive feedback from other teachers based on their observations of my teaching. <br> c) Provide feedback to other teachers based on my observations of their teaching. <br> d) Consult with other teachers about students' academic performance. <br> e) Work with a subject-area per on my campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity. <br> f) Work with a subject-area peer from a feeder pattern campus to develop a lesson plan or class activity. <br> g) Work with a colleague in a different subject area to develop a lesson plan or class activity. <br> h) Act as a vertical team coach or mentor to other teachers or staff at my school. <br> i) Receive vertical team coaching or mentoring from an external source such as a professional curriculum developer, or university faculty fellow. | - Mean score per teacher. <br> - Mean score per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { Never } \\ & 2.00=\text { Rarely } \\ & 3.00=\text { Sometimes } \\ & 4.00=\text { Often } \\ & 5.00=\text { Almost daily } \end{aligned}$ |
| Curricular <br> Alignment: <br> Frequency of <br> Vertical Team <br> Meetings | Teacher Survey | How frequently did your vertical team meet this year? | - Recode to reverse negative coding $(1=5,2=4 \ldots 5=1)$ <br> - Mean per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { We have never had a meeting } \\ & 2.00=1-2 \text { times a year } \\ & 3.00=1-2 \text { times a semester } \\ & 4.00=\text { At least once a month } \\ & 5.00=\text { At least once a week } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mean: Curricular Alignment |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |
| Advanced Academics: Advanced Course Completion | TEA Course Completion Records | What percentage of high school students received AP course credit in at least one course as compared to the STAR goal (50\%)? | - Using student course completion data, find percentage of students earning course credit per high school campus. <br> - To compare campus results to the STAR goal (50\%), multiply percentage by 2 . <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=10 \%$ of students or $20 \%$ of STAR Goal $2.00=20 \%$ of students or $40 \%$ of STAR Goal $3.00=30 \%$ of students or $60 \%$ of STAR Goal $4.00=40 \%$ of students or $80 \%$ of STAR Goal $5.00=50 \%$ of students or $100 \%$ of STAR Goal |
| Advanced <br> Academics: <br> AP Exam <br> Participation | College <br> Board <br> Advanced <br> Placement <br> Examination <br> Participation Data | What percentage of STAR high school students took at least one AP test as compared to the state average (state average varies by year)? | - Find percentage of high school students taking at least one AP exam per high school campus <br> - (state average varies by year)Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of state average <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of state average <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of state average <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of state average <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of state average |
| Advanced Academics: AP Exam Scores | College Board Advanced Placement Performance Data | What percentage of high school students taking AP Exams scored a Grade 3 or better, as compared to state average (state average varies by year)? | - Using student test data, find percentage of students receiving a 3 or better per high school campus. <br> - (state average varies by year) <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of state average <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of state average <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of state average <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of state average <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of state average |
| Mean: Advanced Academics |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |


| Engaging Teachers and Students |  |  | 5-point scale: [(Teacher Engagement in Professional Development + Mean: Student Engagement in School) / 2] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Teacher <br> Engagement in Professional Development: | Teacher Survey | Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements. <br> e) Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas. <br> g) Teachers are not afraid to learn about new educational approaches and use them with their class(es). <br> h) I have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in my classes. <br> w) I have received sufficient training to use student test scores and achievement/accountability data in planning individual academic programs. | - Mean score per teacher. <br> - Mean score per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { Strongly disagree } \\ & 2.00=\text { Disagree } \\ & 3.00=\text { Unsure } \\ & 4.00=\text { Agree } \\ & 5.00=\text { Strongly agree } \end{aligned}$ |
| Teacher Engagement in Professional Development |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |
| Student <br> Engagement in Schooling: Systems of Support | Middle <br> School <br> Student <br> Survey | Please mark how often you have participated in each of the following activities during this school year. <br> a) Tutoring for an academic subject. <br> b) Mentoring by an adult who is not your parent, guardian, or a teacher. <br> c) Counseling about your grades. <br> d) Workshop on study skills. <br> e) Workshop to learn about the ACT, SAT, or other college entrance exam. <br> g) Attending a family activity at school with a parent or guardian (FACE). <br> h) Attending a presentation by a business person or attended a Junior Achievement activity. <br> i) University professor visits your class. | - Recode to $1=$ participated in activity at least once (responded Rarely, Sometimes, Often, or Almost every day) and $0=$ did not participate in activity (responded Never) <br> - Add across items to find total number of activities each student participated in <br> - Mean score per campus. | $1.00=$ participated in 1.40 types of activities <br> $2.00=$ participated in 2.80 types of activities <br> $3.00=$ participated in 4.20 types of activities <br> $4.00=$ participated in 5.60 types of activities <br> $5.00=$ participated in 7.00 types of activities |
|  | High School Student Survey | Please mark how often you have participated in each of the following activities during this school year. <br> a) Tutoring for an academic subject. <br> b) Mentoring by an adult who is not your parent, guardian, or a teacher. <br> c) Counseling about your grades. <br> d) Workshop on study skills. <br> e) Workshop to learn about the ACT, SAT, or other college entrance exam. <br> g) Attending a family activity at school with a parent or guardian (FACE). <br> h) Attending a presentation by a business person or attended a Junior Achievement activity. <br> i) University professor visits your class. | - Mean score per campus. | $1.00=$ participated in 1.60 types of activities <br> $2.00=$ participated in 3.20 types of activities <br> $3.00=$ participated in 4.80 types of activities <br> $4.00=$ participated in 6.40 types of activities <br> $5.00=$ participated in 8.00 types of activities |
| Student <br> Engagement in Schooling: Student Attendance Rates | TEA | 2009-10 student attendance rates from TEA to determine if schools encourage attendance, identify truant students, and provide truant students with supports to increase attendance. | - Select data for students who remain enrolled on same STAR campus across the year. <br> - Mean attendance rate per campus. <br> - Divide mean rate by 95.5 and multiply by 100 to convert to percentage of the state average. <br> - Subtract 80 to only show range of 80\%-100\%. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=76.4 \%$ student attendance rate or $80 \%$ of the state average <br> $2.00=81.2 \%$ student attendance rate or $85 \%$ of the state average <br> $3.00=86.0 \%$ student attendance rate or $90 \%$ of the state average <br> $4.00=90.7 \%$ student attendance rate or $95 \%$ of the state average <br> $5.00=95.5 \%$ student attendance rate or $100 \%$ of the state average |
| Mean: Student Engagement in School |  |  | 5-point score: mean |  |


| Student and Parent Access to Information |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5-point scale: [(Mean: Student Access to } \\ & \text { Information + Mean: Parent Access to } \\ & \text { Information)/2] } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Student <br> Access to Information: Student Informational Activities | Middle School Student Survey | Have you ever participated in the following awareness activities this year? <br> a) Visited a college campus with your school. <br> b) Attended a college or career fair at your school. <br> c) Attended a college planning workshop at your school. <br> d) Received assistance at school completing college, financial aid, and scholarship applications. <br> e) Taken a career inventory about career interests at your school. |  | - Recode: yes $=1$ and no=0. <br> - Add across items to get total per student. <br> - Find mean score per campus. | $1.00=$ participated in 1.00 type of activity <br> $2.00=$ participated in 2.00 types of activities <br> $3.00=$ participated in 3.00 types of activities <br> $4.00=$ participated in 4.00 types of activities <br> $5.00=$ participated in 5.00 types of activities |
|  | High School Student Survey | Have you ever participated in the following awareness activities this year? <br> a) Visited a college campus with your school. <br> b) Attended a college or career fair at your school. <br> c) Attended a college planning workshop at your school. <br> d) Received assistance at school completing college, financial aid, and scholarship applications. <br> e) Taken a career inventory about career interests at your school. | - Recode: yes $=1$ and no=0. <br> - Add across items to get total per student. <br> - Find mean score per campus. | $1.00=$ participated in 1.00 type of activity <br> $2.00=$ participated in 2.00 types of activities <br> $3.00=$ participated in 3.00 types of activities <br> $4.00=$ participated in 4.00 types of activities <br> $5.00=$ participated in 5.00 types of activities |
| Student <br> Access to Information: Students' Participation in Summer Programs | Data From TAMUCC: POC | How many students from each district participated in the POC Summer Bridge activities as compared to TEA's expectation ( 30 students)? | - Receive participation numbers from POC. <br> - Divide the number of participants per district by 30 (the target number of students). <br> - Multiply by 100 to get percentage. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of goal or 6 students <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of goal or 12 students <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of goal or 18 students <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of goal or 24 students <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of goal or 30 students |
| Student <br> Access to Information: <br> Awareness of Postsecondary Opportunities | Middle <br> School <br> Student <br> Survey | How familiar are you with: <br> a) Community or junior colleges <br> b) Four-year colleges or universities <br> c) Vocational or technical schools | - Recode: "Not at all familiar=0, "Somewhat familiar=1, Very familiar=1." <br> - Find sum by adding across postsecondary opportunities per student. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $0.00-1.67=$ Familiar with one type of postsecondary opportunity $1.68-3.34=$ Familiar with two types of postsecondary opportunities $3.35-5.00=$ Familiar with three types of postsecondary opportunities |
|  | High School Student Survey | How familiar are you with: <br> a) Community or junior colleges <br> b) Four-year colleges or universities <br> c) Vocational or technical schools | - Recode: "Not at all familiar=0, "Somewhat familiar=1, Very familiar=1." <br> - Find sum by adding across postsecondary opportunities per student. <br> - Find mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $0.00-1.67=$ Familiar with one type of postsecondary opportunity $1.68-3.34=$ Familiar with two types of postsecondary opportunities $3.35-5.00=$ Familiar with three types of postsecondary opportunities |


| Student <br> Access to Information: <br> Awareness of College <br> Entrance Requirements | Middle <br> School <br> Student <br> Survey | Has anyone talked to you about college entrance requirements? <br> a) A GEAR UP/STAR representative <br> c) My school counselor <br> d) My teachers <br> e) My principal/assistant principal | - Recode: yes=1 and no=0. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 1 . <br> - Find percentage of students receiving information from at least one of the school/GEAR UP sources per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High School Student Survey | Has anyone talked to you about college entrance requirements? <br> a) A GEAR UP/STAR representative <br> c My school counselor <br> d) My teachers <br> e) My principal/assistant principal | - Recode: yes=1 and no=0. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 1 . <br> - Find percentage of students receiving information from at least one of the school/GEAR UP sources per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source $3.00=60 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source $5.00=100 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source |
| Student <br> Access to Information: <br> Awareness of <br> Financial <br> Assistance | Middle <br> School <br> Student <br> Survey | Has anyone talked to you about financial aid opportunities? <br> a) A GEAR UP/STAR representative <br> c) My school counselor <br> d) My teachers <br> e) My principal/assistant principal | - Recode: yes $=1$ and $n o=0$. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 1 . <br> - Find percentage of students receiving information from at least one of the school/GEAR UP sources per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source $5.00=100 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source |
|  | High School Student Survey | Has anyone talked to you about financial aid opportunities? <br> a) A GEAR UP/STAR representative <br> c) My school counselor <br> d) My teachers <br> e) My principal/assistant principal | - Recode: yes $=1$ and no=0. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 1 . <br> - Find percentage of students receiving information from at least one of the school/GEAR UP sources per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point. | $1.00=20 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source $5.00=100 \%$ of students receive information from at least one source |
| Mean: Student Access to Information |  |  | 5-point scale. mean |  |


| Parent Access to <br> Information: <br> Parent Access to Partial Information | Parent Survey | In the past year, has anyone spoken with you about: <br> a) College entrance requirements <br> b) The availability of financial aid <br> c) The courses your child should take to prepare for college | - Recode: yes $=1$ and no=0. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 1. <br> - Find the percentage of parents receiving information regarding at least one college planning topic per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of parents receive information about at least one planning process <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of parents receive information about at least one planning process <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of parents receive information about at least one planning process <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of parents receive information about at least one planning process <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of parents receive information about at least one planning process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parent Access to <br> Information: <br> Parent Access <br> to Full <br> Information | Parent Survey | In the past year, has anyone spoken with you about: <br> a) College entrance requirements <br> b) The availability of financial aid <br> c) The courses your child should take to prepare for college | - Recode: yes $=1$ and no $=0$. <br> - Sum across items. <br> - Select data: If the sum equals 3 . <br> - Find the percentage of parents receiving information regarding all three college planning topics per campus per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00=20 \%$ of parents receive information about all three planning processes <br> $2.00=40 \%$ of parents receive information about all three planning processes <br> $3.00=60 \%$ of parents receive information about all three planning processes <br> $4.00=80 \%$ of parents receive information about all three planning processes <br> $5.00=100 \%$ of parents receive information about all three planning processes |
| Parent Access to <br> Information: <br> Parent <br> Awareness of GEAR <br> UP/STAR | Parent Survey | How familiar are you with the GEAR UP/STAR program? | - Mean score per parent. <br> - Mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $1.00-1.25=$ Not familiar at all $1.26-2.50=$ Not very familiar $2.51-3.75=$ Somewhat familiar $3.76-5.00=$ Very familiar |
| Mean: Parent Access to Information |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |


| Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement |  |  | 5-point scale: [(Mean: School <br> Environment + Mean: Parent and Community Support)/2] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Environment: Leadership and Staff Buyin | Teacher Survey | Please indicate your agreement with the following statements: <br> a) Teachers in this school share an understanding about how AP strategies may be used to enhance learning. <br> b) The principal consults with staff before making decisions that may affect our ability to work in vertical teams. <br> c) In this school, there are clear expectations that all students will be prepared for postsecondary educational opportunities. <br> d) I incorporate college information into my content-area lessons. <br> j) The principal is an effective leader for vertical teams in this school. <br> k) Overall, considering the uses of vertical teams in my school today, I am confident that this use is leading to increased student achievement. <br> n) The principal is willing to support teachers' efforts at vertical teaming. <br> o) Teachers receive adequate administrative support to incorporate vertical teams. <br> q) When our school has professional development focused on vertical teams, the principal often participates. <br> s) Teachers in this school are generally supportive of vertical teaming efforts. <br> u) GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to staff. | - Mean score per teacher. <br> - Mean score per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { Strongly disagree } \\ & 2.00=\text { Disagree } \\ & 3.00=\text { Unsure } \\ & 4.00=\text { Agree } \\ & 5.00=\text { Strongly agree } \end{aligned}$ |
| School <br> Environment: <br> Innovative <br> Environment | Teacher Survey | Please indicate your agreement with the following statements: <br> a) Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas. <br> b) The principal in my school actively encourages teachers to pursue professional development geared towards AP strategies and vertical teaming. <br> c) Teachers are not afraid to learn about new educational approaches and use them with their classes. <br> 1) The principal encourages teachers to be innovative and try new methods. <br> p) Teachers and administrators rely on research-proven teaching and learning principles in making decisions about instruction. | - Mean score per teacher. <br> - Mean score per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { Strongly disagree } \\ & 2.00=\text { Disagree } \\ & 3.00=\text { Unsure } \\ & 4.00=\text { Agree } \\ & 5.00=\text { Strongly agree } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mean: School Environment |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |
| Parent and <br> Community <br> Support: <br> Parent and <br> Community <br> Engagement in <br> School <br> Activities | Teacher Survey | Please indicate your agreement with the following statements: <br> i) Parents support our school's emphasis on college readiness. <br> m ) GEAR UP goals are clearly communicated to parents and the community. <br> r) The surrounding community actively supports our emphasis on college readiness. <br> t) This school provides a variety of opportunities for parental involvement. | - Mean score per teacher. <br> - Mean score per campus. | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00=\text { Strongly disagree } \\ & 2.00=\text { Disagree } \\ & 3.00=\text { Unsure } \\ & 4.00=\text { Agree } \\ & 5.00=\text { Strongly agree } \end{aligned}$ |
| Parent and Community Support: Parents' Support of Goals at Home | Parent Survey | Over the past year, how often did you: <br> a) Assist with or monitor your child's homework at home. <br> b) Tutor your child at home using materials and instructions provided by the teacher. <br> c) Read with your child at home. <br> d) Discuss school with your child. <br> How often did you do each of the following: <br> a) Talk about attending college. <br> b) Help select classes that support your child's college plans. <br> c) Talk about taking a college entrance exam.. <br> d) Talk about financial aid opportunities or scholarships. | - Mean score per parent [(Q5 + Q8)/number of items]. <br> - Mean score per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00-1.25=\text { Never } \\ & 1.26-2.50=\text { Several times a month } \\ & 2.51-3.75=\text { Several times a week } \\ & 3.76-5.00=\text { Every day } \end{aligned}$ |


| Parent and Community Support: Parents' Participation in School and STAR Activities | Parent Survey | How many times have you visited your child's school in the past year? <br> Which of the following activities have you participated in over the course of the past school year? <br> a) PTA meeting. <br> b) Volunteer activities. <br> c) Parent-teacher conferences. <br> d) Observed/visited your child's classroom. <br> e) Talked with a teacher or administrator about your child's education. <br> f) Received college planning information or other counseling services from the counselor. <br> g) Received a home visit from a teacher, counselor, or administrator. <br> Which of the following college and career awareness activities have you participated in over the past year? <br> a) Visited a college campus with your child's school. <br> b) Attended a college or career fair at your child's school. <br> c) Attended a workshop on preparing for college. <br> d) Received assistance in completing financial aid, scholarships, and applications. <br> e) Attended a workshop on careers with your child. <br> f) Attended a FACE activity with your child. <br> g) Other. | - $\quad$ Recode Q1: If X is greater than or equal to 1 , recode as 1 . <br> - Recode Q2 and Q3: yes=1 and no=0. <br> - Add across all items across all three questions. <br> - Select data: If the sum is greater than or equal to 5 . <br> - Find percentage of parents attending 5 or more activities per campus. <br> - Convert to 5-point scale | $1.00=10 \%$ of parents attended 5 or more activities <br> $2.00=20 \%$ of parents attended 5 or more activities <br> $3.00=30 \%$ of parents attended 5 or more activities <br> $4.00=40 \%$ of parents attended 5 or more activities <br> $5.00=50 \%$ of parents attended 5 or more activities |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean: Parent and Community Support |  |  | 5-point scale: mean |  |
| Implementation Index |  |  | 5-point scale: [(Mean: Raising Academic Standards + Mean: Engaging Teachers and Students + Mean: Student and Parent Access to Information + Mean: Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement)/4] | 5-point scale |

[^19] Survey, spring 2011.
APPENDIX H
Implementation Analysis Scoring Rubric
Table H. 1 describes the criteria used to identify schools' level of implementation for each of the core components of STAR implementation.

## Table H.1. Scoring Rubrics for the Implementation Evaluation of GEAR UP/STAR in 2010-11

| Component | Minimal Implementation (0.00-1.50) | Partial Implementation (1.51-3.00) | Substantial Implementation (3.01-4.50) | Full Implementation (4.51-5.00) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Raising Academic Standards |  |  |  |  |
| Academic Rigor | Teachers ask open-ended questions or questions that require reasoning to a very small extent. Teachers relate subject matter or ask students to relate subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life to a very small extent. Teachers use subjectspecific Advanced Placement academic strategies to a very small extent. Several students are not focused on the learning tasks and engage in inappropriate behaviors. Most students invest minimal effort in learning or understanding the lesson content and exhibit minimal or no interest for the assigned tasks. | Teachers ask open-ended questions or questions that require reasoning to a small or moderate extent. Teachers relate subject matter or ask students to relate subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life to a small or moderate extent. Teachers use subject-specific Advanced Placement academic strategies to a small or moderate extent. A few students are obedient and attend to the teacher's content delivery and directions. Most students comply with expectations. Students exhibit limited or moderate interest in about the content they are learning. | Teachers ask open-ended questions or questions that require reasoning to a large extent. Teachers relate subject matter or ask students to relate subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life to $a$ large extent. Teachers use subject-specific Advanced Placement academic strategies to a large extent. Nearly all students are on task. Activity in the classroom is relevant to assigned tasks. Most students exhibit a sustained commitment to and involvement in their academic tasks. Students are interested in their assignments. | Teachers ask open-ended questions or questions that require reasoning to a very large extent. Teachers relate subject matter or ask students to relate subject matter to other contexts or to everyday life to a very large extent. Teachers use subject-specific Advanced Placement academic strategies to a very large extent. Nearly all students are focused on meaningful and intellectually challenging tasks. The lesson allows for substantial student-tostudent and/or student-to-teacher interaction. Nearly all students are interested in and enthusiastic about their assigned tasks. |
| Curricular Alignment | Teachers very rarely communicate or work collaboratively with colleagues and peers. Teachers meet with their vertical teams $\underline{1-2 \text { times } a}$ year or less. | Teachers sometimes communicate or work collaboratively with colleagues and peers. Teachers meet with their vertical teams $\underline{1-}$ $\underline{2}$ times a semester. | Teachers often communicate or work collaboratively with colleagues and peers. Teachers meet with their vertical teams $\underline{a t}$ least once a month. | Teachers communicate or work collaboratively with colleagues and peers almost daily. Teachers meet with their vertical teams $\underline{a t}$ least once a week. |


| Component | Minimal Implementation (0.00-1.50) | Partial Implementation (1.51-3.00) | Substantial Implementation (3.01-4.50) | Full Implementation (4.51-5.00) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Advanced Academics(High School Only) | The district provided students minimal access to advanced courses and $0.0 \%-15.0 \%$ of students enrolled in an advanced course and $0.0 \%-3.4 \%$ of students participated in an AP exam. The district emphasized rigor to a small extent and $0.0 \%$ $13.9 \%$ of AP exams earned a Grade 3 or better (or $0.0 \%-30 \%$ of state average). | The district provided students access to advanced courses and $15.1 \%-30.0 \%$ of students enrolled in an advanced course and $3.5 \%-6.8 \%$ of students participated in an AP exam. The district_emphasized rigor and $14.0 \%-27.8 \%$ of AP exams earned a Grade 3 or better (or $30.1 \%-60.0 \%$ of state average). | The district provided students access to advanced courses and $30.1 \%-45.0 \%$ of students enrolled in an advanced course and <br> $6.9 \%-10.2 \%$ of students participated in an AP exam. The district emphasized rigor to a large extent and $27.9 \%-41.8 \%$ of AP exams earned a Grade 3 or better (or $60.1 \%-89.9 \%$ of state average). | The district provided students extensive access to advanced courses and $45.1 \%-50.0 \%$ of students enrolled in an advanced course and $10.3 \%-11.4 \%$ of students participated in an AP exam. The district emphasized rigor to a great extent and $41.9 \%$ $46.4 \%$ of AP exams earned a Grade 3 or better (or $90.0 \%$ $100.0 \%$ of state average). |
| Engaging Teachers and Students |  |  |  |  |
| Teacher Engagement in Professional Development | Teachers disagree that teachers in their school are continually learning and are not afraid to learn about new strategies and use them. Teachers disagree that they have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in their classroom or use student test scores in planning academic programs. In the district, $\underline{0.0 \%-}$ $30.0 \%$ of teachers attended STAR training. | Teachers are unsure if teachers in their school are continually learning and are not afraid to learn about new strategies and use them. Teachers are unsure if they have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in their classroom or use student test scores in planning academic programs. In the district, $31.1 \%$ $60.0 \%$ of teachers attended STAR training. | Teachers agree that teachers in their school are continually learning and are not afraid to learn about new strategies and use them. Teachers agree that they have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in their classroom or use student test scores in planning academic programs. In the district, $61.1 \%$ 90.0\% of teachers attended STAR training. | Teachers strongly agree that teachers in their school are continually learning and are not afraid to learn about new strategies and use them. Teachers strongly agree that they have received sufficient training to incorporate AP strategies in their classroom or use student test scores in planning academic programs. In the district, $90.1 \%$ $100.0 \%$ of teachers attended STAR training. |
| Student Engagement in School | Students attend $0.0-2.2$ types of activities, such as tutoring, mentoring, or counseling activities provided by their school. The campus attendance rate is less than or equal to $82.5 \%$ of the state average ( $95.5 \%$ ). | Students attend 2.3-4.4 types of activities, such as tutoring, mentoring, or counseling activities provided by their school. The campus attendance rate is between $82.6 \%$ and $90.0 \%$ of the state average ( $95.5 \%$ ). | Students attend 4.5-6.7 types of activities, such as tutoring, mentoring, or counseling activities provided by their school. The campus attendance rate is between $90.1 \%$ and $97.5 \%$ of the state average ( $95.5 \%$ ). | Students attend 6.8-7.5 types of activities, such as tutoring, mentoring, or counseling activities provided by their school. The campus attendance rate is between $97.6 \%$ and $100.0 \%$ of the state average (95.5\%). |


| Component | Minimal Implementation (0.00-1.50) | Partial Implementation (1.51-3.00) | Substantial Implementation (3.01-4.50) | Full Implementation (4.51-5.00) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Student and Parent Access to Information |  |  |  |  |
| Student Access to Information | Students have attended less than 1.50 different kinds of awareness activities, on average. Less than $\underline{9}$ students attended summer STAR activities. Students are familiar with one of the postsecondary educational opportunities. Less than $30.0 \%$ of students have received information about college entrance requirements and financial aid from at least one school source. | Students have attended between 1.51 and 3.00 different kinds of awareness activities, on average. Between 9 and 18 students attended summer STAR activities. Students are familiar with two of the postsecondary educational opportunities. Between $30.1 \%$ and $60.0 \%$ of students have received information about college entrance requirements and financial aid from at least one school source. | Students have attended between 3.01 and 4.50 awareness activities, on average. Between 19 and 27 students attended summer STAR activities. Students are familiar with all three of the postsecondary educational opportunities. Between $60.1 \%$ and $90.0 \%$ of students have received information about college entrance requirements and financial aid from at least one school source. | Students have attended between 4.51 and 5.00 awareness activities, on average. Between 27 and 30 students attended summer STAR activities. Students are familiar with all three of the postsecondary educational opportunities. Between $90.1 \%$ and $100.0 \%$ of students have received information about college entrance requirements and financial aid from at least one school source. |
| Parent Access to Information | Less than 30.0\% of parents have received information about at least one college planning topic. Less than $30.0 \%$ of parents have received information about all three college planning topics. Parents are not very familiar with the STAR program on their child's campus, on average. | Between $30.1 \%$ and $60.0 \%$ of parents have received information about at least one college planning topic. Between $30.1 \%$ and $60.0 \%$ of parents have received information about all three college planning topics. Parents are somewhat familiar with the STAR program on their child's campus, on average. | Between $60.1 \%$ and $90.0 \%$ of parents have received information about at least one college planning topic. Between $60.1 \%$ and $90.0 \%$ of parents have received information about all three college planning topics. Parents are very familiar with the STAR program on their child's campus, on average. | Between $90.1 \%$ and $100.0 \%$ of parents have received information about at least one college planning topic. Between 90.1\% and $100.0 \%$ of parents have received information about all three college planning topics. Parents are very familiar with the STAR program on their child's campus, on average. |
| Building School and Community Cultures that Support Academic Achievement |  |  |  |  |
| School Environment | Teachers disagree that their administrators provide effective leadership and support to implement STAR. Teachers disagree that other teachers support the goals of STAR. Teachers disagree that school staff members are innovative and seek to learn new strategies. | Teachers are unsure if their administrators provide effective leadership and support to implement STAR. Teachers are unsure if other teachers support the goals of STAR. Teachers are unsure if school staff members are innovative and seek to learn new strategies. | Teachers strongly agree that their administrators provide effective leadership and support to implement STAR. Teachers strongly agree that other teachers support the goals of STAR. Teachers strongly agree that school staff members are innovative and seek to learn new strategies. | Teachers strongly agree that their administrators provide effective leadership and support to implement STAR. Teachers strongly agree that other teachers support the goals of STAR. Teachers strongly agree that school staff members are innovative and seek to learn new strategies. |

Camponem

| Component | Minimal Implementation $(0.00-1.50)$ | Partial Implementation (1.51-3.00) | Substantial Implementation (3.01-4.50) | Full Implementation (4.51-5.00) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parent and Community Support | Teachers disagree that parents and community members support the school and STAR goals. Parents support STAR goals by assisting their child with school work or college plans several times a month. Less than $30.0 \%$ of parents attended five or more | Teachers are unsure if parents and community members support the school and STAR goals. Parents support STAR goals by assisting their child with school work or college plans several times a week. Between $30.1 \%$ and $60.0 \%$ of parents attended five or | Teachers strongly agree that parents and community members support the school and STAR goals. Parents support STAR goals by assisting their child with school work or college plans every day. Between $60.1 \%$ and $90.0 \%$ of parents attended five or | Teachers strongly agree that parents and community members support the school and STAR goals. Parents support STAR goals by assisting their child with school work or college plans every day. Between $90.1 \%$ and $100.0 \%$ of parents attended five |

Sources: STAR Classroom Observations; STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey; TEA Course Completion Records; College Board AP Examination Participation and Performance Overview Reports; STAR Middle School and High School Student Surveys; PEIMS 2008-09; POC Summer Program Attendance Records; STAR Parent
Notes. For further information about STAR surveys during the 2010-11 school year, including administration procedures and the characteristics of respondents, see Tables $1.3,1.4$, and 1.5 in chapter 1. For further information about STAR classroom observations, including selection and observation procedures, see Table 1.2 in chapter 1.

The STAR project strives to improve students' academic preparation for postsecondary education and to increase the number of students who pursue higher education opportunities. Over the course of the project, STAR districts are expected to increase the proportions of students who enroll in and complete AP and other rigorous coursework, graduate from high school, and enroll in college. This Appendix compares fourth year (2009-10), and in some cases fifth year (2010-11) data with baseline data (2005-06) across a variety of academic indicators that are benchmarks against which districts' progress toward STAR goals may be measured. Differences in data sources determine whether Year 4 or Year 5 results are included in findings. For indicators drawn from TEA data, such as the number of AP teachers working in schools or the percentage of students passing AP courses, data are lagged a year, and therefore are limited to STAR's fourth implementation year (i.e., 2009-10). However, indicators drawn from College Board data, such as AP exam participation and performance, were available through STAR's fifth implementation year (i.e., 2010-11). Note that the data included in the appendix's analyses reflect the performance of all students in STAR schools and are not limited to cohort student.

The appendix draws on data provided through TEA's PEIMS and AEIS databases for the 2005-06 through 2009-10 school years ${ }^{23}$, Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board reports for the 2003-04 to 2009-10 school years, as well as College Board reports for the 2005-06 through 2010-11 school years and includes measures related to enrollment in AP coursework, AP and college entrance examination scores, attendance rates, college readiness indicators, as well as graduation, dropout, and college enrollment rates. Results are reported across indicators for STAR districts and campuses and, where appropriate, for TEA-identified "peer group" campuses, ${ }^{24}$ as well as state averages for purposes of comparison.

## Advanced Placement Program

AP teachers. Table I. 1 shows that the number of AP teachers ranged from 3 to 18 across STAR high schools in 2009-10, and that the number of AP teachers not changed considerably from the baseline year of 2005-06.

[^20]Table I.1. Number of AP Teachers in STAR High Schools, 2005-06 through 2009-10

|  | Number of AP Teachers |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Campus | $2005-06$ <br> (Baseline) | $2006-07$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ |
| Falfurrias HS | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Alice HS | 13 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 18 |
| H. M. King HS | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| Miller HS | 13 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 12 |
| Mathis HS | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| Odem HS | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 9}$ |

Sources: 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10 TEA staff responsibilities files.
AP courses. AP courses are designed to prepare students for college level work and require sophisticated analysis of content, advanced reasoning and problem solving skills, as well as substantially more independent study. Relative to high school honors courses, AP courses are expected to be more academically challenging and require a larger commitment from students in terms of the time and effort devoted to coursework. Successful completion of AP coursework suggests that students have mastered rigorous course content and have the study skills and self-discipline required to master challenging college-level work.

Table I. 2 reports the percentage of students in Grades 9 through 12 at each STAR high school who received credit for AP coursework from 2005-06 (baseline year) through 2009-10. Across years, the largest percentages of students tended to take English Language and Composition, English Literature and Composition, U. S. History, U. S. Government and Politics, and World History. Overall, STAR high schools experienced a 7 point increase in the percentage of students passing AP coursework, although results varied by campus. For example, Mathis High School increased the percentage of students passing at least one AP course from 7\% in 2005-06 to $39 \%$ in 2009-10 (a gain of 32 percentage points). In contrast, the percentage of Odem High School students passing at least one AP course declined slightly from $12 \%$ in 2005-06 to $10 \%$ in 2009-10.
Table I.2. Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Received AP Course Credit by STAR High School, 2005-06 Through 2009-10

|  | Falfurrias High School |  |  |  |  |  | Alice High School |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP Course | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009- \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005-06 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 2009-10 \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009- \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005-06 \text { to } \\ 2009-10 \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| AP Biology | 0.0 | 4.3 | 7.9 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.4 |
| AP Chemistry | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.3 |
| AP Physics B | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Calculus AB | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 1.9 |
| AP Calculus BC | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Statistics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 3.6 |
| AP English Lang. \& Comp. | 4.8 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 8.3 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 10.0 | 4.0 |
| AP English Lit. \& Comp. | 1.8 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 6.7 | 11.9 | 5.3 |
| AP Microeconomics | 3.6 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 7.4 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Macroeconomics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| AP U. S. Gov. \& Politics | 3.8 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 5.2 | 7.4 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 |
| AP U. S. History | 8.5 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 6.6 | 11.2 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | -1.7 |
| AP Human Geography | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.8 | 11.8 |
| AP World History | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 4.4 | 5.4 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 10.4 | 6.0 |
| AP French language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP French literature, level V | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Spanish language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| AP Art, Drawing | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| AP Art, 2-Dimenion Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, 3-Dimension Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| At least one AP course passed | 12.5 | 14.8 | 13.9 | 18.4 | 29.5 | 17.0 | 17.7 | 19.3 | 17.8 | 18.8 | 24.5 | 6.8 |

Table I.2. Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Received AP Course Credit by STAR High School, 2005-06 Through 2009-10 (Continued)

|  | H. M. King High School |  |  |  |  |  | Miller High School |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP Course | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008 \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009- \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005-06 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 2009-10 \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005-06 \mathrm{to} \\ 2009-10 \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| AP Biology | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 |
| AP Chemistry | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | -0.1 |
| AP Physics B | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| AP Calculus AB | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | -1.8 |
| AP Calculus BC | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -1.0 |
| AP Statistics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.5 |
| AP English Lang. \& Comp. | 4.3 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 6.2 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 3.4 | 5.2 | 1.4 |
| AP English Lit. \& Comp. | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 0.1 |
| AP Microeconomics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Macroeconomics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 3.1 | -0.3 |
| AP U. S. Gov. \& Politics | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 2.9 | -0.6 |
| AP U. S. History | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 3.3 | 5.2 | 2.0 |
| AP Human Geography | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| AP World History | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.8 | -0.5 |
| AP French language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -0.2 |
| AP French literature, level V | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.2 |
| AP Spanish language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.3 |
| AP Art, Drawing | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | -0.4 |
| AP Art, 2-Dimenion Design | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, 3-Dimension Design | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| At least one AP course passed | 6.6 | 5.3 | 3.9 | 6.1 | 8.5 | 1.9 | 14.2 | 19.8 | 17.9 | 13.6 | 14.6 | 0.4 |

Table I.2. Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Received AP Course Credit by STAR High School, 2005-06 Through 2009-10 (Continued)

|  | Mathis High School |  |  |  |  |  | Odem High School |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AP Course | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005-06 \\ & \text { to } \\ & 2009-10 \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009 \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005-06 \mathrm{to} \\ 2009-10 \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| AP Biology | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 3.8 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 4.2 | -2.2 |
| AP Chemistry | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Physics B | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Calculus AB | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 9.6 | 7.6 |
| AP Calculus BC | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Statistics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP English Lang. \& Comp. | 2.2 | 4.6 | 7.3 | 8.7 | 32.5 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| AP English Lit. \& Comp. | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 28.3 | 26.6 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 5.8 | 5.2 | 2.2 | -2.2 |
| AP Microeconomics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Macroeconomics | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP U. S. Gov. \& Politics | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP U. S. History | 2.5 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 37.6 | 35.1 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 1.6 | 3.5 | -0.6 |
| AP Human Geography | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP World History | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP French language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP French literature, level V | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Spanish language, level IV | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, Drawing | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, 2-Dimenion Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, 3-Dimension Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| At least one AP course passed | 7.2 | 5.0 | 8.3 | 15.3 | 38.8 | 31.6 | 12.2 | 10.6 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 10.3 | -1.9 |

[^21]Table I.2. Percentage of Students in Grades 9 Through 12 Who Received AP Course Credit All STAR High Schools, 2005-06 Through 2009-10 (Continued)

| AP Course | All STAR High Schools |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009- \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005-06 \\ \text { to } \\ 2009-10 \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| AP Biology | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 |
| AP Chemistry | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| AP Physics B | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -0.2 |
| AP Calculus AB | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 1.4 |
| AP Calculus BC | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.2 |
| AP Statistics | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 |
| AP English Lang. \& Comp. | 4.2 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 9.9 | 5.7 |
| AP English Lit. \& Comp. | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 8.2 | 5.2 |
| AP Microeconomics | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.9 |
| AP Macroeconomics | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.3 |
| AP U. S. Gov. \& Politics | 1.7 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 0.6 |
| AP U. S. History | 2.5 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 6.4 | 3.9 |
| AP Human Geography | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 4.8 | 4.6 |
| AP World History | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 3.3 |
| AP French language, level IV | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| AP French literature, level V | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Spanish language, level IV | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| AP Art, Drawing | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| AP Art, 2-Dimenion Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| AP Art, 3-Dimension Design | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| At least one AP course passed | 12.5 | 13.7 | 12.8 | 13.9 | 19.8 | 7.3 |

The characteristics of students who did and did not receive credit for at least one AP course in 2005-06 (baseline year) and across STAR implementation years (2006-07 through 2008-09) are compared in Table I.3. As indicated in the table, economic advantage is associated with AP program success-the majority of students who received credit for at least one AP course did not qualify for free- or reduced-price lunches. In addition, females were more likely than males to receive credit for an AP course.
Table I.3. Characteristics of Students Receiving Credit and Not Receiving Credit for at Least One AP Course at STAR High Schools,

| Category | Passing At Least One AP Course |  |  |  |  | Not Passing At Least One AP Course |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
| Hispanic | 78.9\% | 80.2\% | 83.1\% | 81.2\% | 86.3\% | 86.0\% | 86.6\% | 86.3\% | 83.4\% | 82.3\% |
| White | 16.9\% | 15.1\% | 14.0\% | 14.5\% | 9.6\% | 10.2\% | 10.2\% | 9.9\% | 8.6\% | 8.1\% |
| Other | 4.2\% | 1.1\% | 2.9\% | 4.3\% | 4.0\% | 3.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.8\% | 8.0\% | 9.6\% |
| Female | 60.2\% | 62.2\% | 61.5\% | 59.8\% | 54.8\% | 47.5\% | 47.7\% | 48.2\% | 49.7\% | 50.5\% |
| Male | 39.8\% | 37.8\% | 38.5\% | 40.2\% | 45.2\% | 52.5\% | 52.3\% | 51.8\% | 50.3\% | 49.5\% |
| Free/reduced lunch | 43.3\% | 43.4\% | 47.0\% | 47.3\% | 56.6\% | 65.5\% | 65.2\% | 64.2\% | 65.6\% | 67.7\% |
| No free/reduced lunch | 56.7\% | 56.6\% | 53.0\% | 52.7\% | 43.4\% | 34.5\% | 34.8\% | 35.8\% | 34.4\% | 32.3\% |

Sources: Student course completion records from TEA for 2005-06 through 2009-10.
Notes. The numbers of students who passed at least one Advanced Placement (AP) course were 693 in 2005-06, 684 in 2006-07, 623 in 2007-08, 622 in 2008-09, and 915 in 2009-10. The numbers of students who did not pass at least one AP course were 4,762 in 2005-06, 4,323 in 2006-07, 4,274 in 2007-08, 3,860 in 200809 , and 3,707 in 2009-10.

Advanced Placement (AP) Examinations. In May of each year, students who have completed AP classes may take national AP examinations prepared by the College Board. These examinations are offered in over 30 content areas in 16 disciplines. They contain both multiple-choice questions and free response items that require students to write essays, solve problems, and demonstrate other advanced skills. The examinations include Art, Art History, Studio Art, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Economics, English (Language and Composition, Literature and Composition), Environmental Science, French, German, Government and Politics (Comparative, U.S.), History (European, U.S., and World), Latin, Calculus, Statistics, Music Theory, Physics, Psychology, and Spanish (Language, Literature). In June, college and secondary school teachers score the examinations, and in July, students receive scores. AP examinations are scored using a 5 -point scale:

- $5=$ extremely well qualified,
- $4=$ well qualified,
- 3 = qualified,
- 2 = possibly qualified, and
- $1=$ no recommendation.

Individual colleges decide which AP examination scores they will accept in return for course credit or advanced placement.

Figure I. 1 presents information on AP examination participation in STAR high schools from 2006 to 2011. While the number of AP test takers and exams taken declined from 2006 to 2009, high schools saw a notable increase in the number of test takers and exams taken in 2010 when the first cohort of STAR students (i.e., Grade 7 students in 2006-07) were in Grade 10.


Figure I.1. AP examination participation at STAR high schools, 2005-06 through 2010-11.
Sources: College Board Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview reports for 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.

Also reported in Table I. 4 presents information on the number of test takers, tests taken, and the percentage of exams earning a score of 3 to 5 for the 2005-06 through 2010-11 school years and the percentage of growth (or decline)for each STAR high school, for all Texas public schools, and all public schools nationally. The table indicates that most STAR high schools increased the number of students who took tests at a rate that was greater than the national average ( $54 \%$ vs. $50 \%$ ), but which lagged the state average ( $63 \%$ ). In terms of the number of tests taken, STAR high schools (49\%) lagged the average rate of increase of both Texas ( $63 \%$ ) and the nation ( $52 \%$ ). While overall trends indicate declines in the percentage of AP exams earning a score of 3 or better across years, the rate of decrease in STAR high schools ( $-54 \%$ ) substantially exceeded those of state ( $-7 \%$ ) and the nation ( $-3 \%$ ). The size of rate changes at STAR high schools is largely the result the small number of students they enroll relative to the state or the nation. Figure I. 2 depicts the decreasing rates in the percentage of AP exams earning a 3 or better across years. Although the average decrease for STAR schools is greater than that of Texas and the nation, overall, decreases are small.
Table I.4. AP Examination Performance of STAR High Schools, 2005-06 Through 2010-11

| Category | Campus | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2006-11 <br> Percentage Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Test Takers | Falfurrias HS | 22 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 70 | 98 | 345.4\% |
|  | Alice HS | 279 | 278 | 249 | 246 | 311 | 290 | 3.9\% |
|  | H. M. King HS | 61 | 32 | 41 | 64 | 123 | 169 | 177.0\% |
|  | Miller HS | 141 | 122 | 105 | 87 | 90 | 159 | 12.7\% |
|  | Mathis HS | 33 | 18 | 43 | 49 | 141 | 127 | 284.8\% |
|  | Odem HS | 22 | 8 | 16 | 20 | 12 | 16 | -27.2\% |
|  | Group Total | 558 | 465 | 469 | 475 | 747 | 859 | 53.9\% |
|  | Texas Public Schools | 114,427 | 125,526 | 137,654 | 149,045 | 168,378 | 186,576 | 63.0\% |
|  | All Public Schools | 1,131,814 | 1,239,336 | 1,346,925 | 1,448,982 | 1,585,679 | 1,701,934 | 50.4\% |
| Number of Examinations Taken | Falfurrias HS | 34 | 8 | 17 | 10 | 87 | 118 | 247.1\% |
|  | Alice HS | 419 | 416 | 414 | 390 | 431 | 453 | 8.1\% |
|  | H. M. King HS | 98 | 42 | 50 | 81 | 185 | 220 | 124.5\% |
|  | Miller HS | 236 | 188 | 144 | 137 | 147 | 226 | -4.2\% |
|  | Mathis HS | 43 | 29 | 55 | 63 | 297 | 236 | 448.8\% |
|  | Odem HS | 24 | 8 | 16 | 25 | 12 | 21 | -12.5\% |
|  | Group Total | 854 | 691 | 696 | 706 | 1,159 | 1,274 | 49.2\% |
|  | Texas Public Schools | 208,646 | 228,885 | 252,701 | 269,685 | 305,815 | 339,406 | 62.7\% |
|  | All Public Schools | 1,943,164 | 2,133,594 | 2,321,311 | 2,495,252 | 2,747,437 | 2,959,895 | 52.3\% |
| Percentage of Scores 3-5 | Falfurrias HS | 2.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.1\% | 0.8\% | -72.4\% |
|  | Alice HS | 10.3\% | 6.5\% | 9.4\% | 6.7\% | 6.3\% | 5.1\% | -50.4\% |
|  | H. M. King HS | 21.4\% | 47.6\% | 28.0\% | 49.4\% | 24.9\% | 10.9\% | -49.5\% |
|  | Miller HS | 10.6\% | 5.3\% | 6.3\% | 5.1\% | 6.1\% | 4.4\% | -58.4\% |
|  | Mathis HS | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.2\% | 1.3\% | 2.1\% | -8.6\% |
|  | Odem HS | 4.2\% | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 4.0\% | 16.7\% | 4.8\% | +14.2\% |
|  | Group Total | 10.8\% | 8.2\% | 9.2\% | 10.8\% | 7.7\% | 5.0\% | -53.7\% |
|  | Texas Public Schools | 47.0\% | 46.0\% | 45.1\% | 46.4\% | 45.6\% | 43.9\% | -6.5\% |
|  | All Public Schools | 57.5\% | 57.2\% | 55.7\% | 56.7\% | 55.7\% | 55.8\% | -2.9\% |

Sources: College Board Advanced Placement Examination Performance and Participation Overview reports for 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11.


Figure I.2. Percentage of AP examination scores earning a 3 or higher, 2006 through 2011.
Sources: College Board 2005-06, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 School Integrated Summary Reports; and 2006-07 and 2007-08 District Integrated Summary reports.

Table I. 5 reports the number of specific AP examinations taken and the percentage having scores of 3 or above aggregated across STAR high schools for the 2005-06 through 2010-11 school years. Result are masked for exams taken by fewer than five students. In 2010-11, the largest proportion of AP exam takers to receive a score of 3 or better took the Spanish Language test ( $23 \%$ ). Although more students took the English Language and Composition test ( 220 vs .48 for Spanish Language), a smaller proportion of these students earned a score of 3 or better ( $8.2 \%$ ).
Table I.5. STAR AP Examination Scores, 2005-06 Through 2010-11

| AP Examination | 2005-06 |  |  | 2006-07 |  |  | 2007-08 |  |  | 2008-09 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  | N Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  | N Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  | N Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  |
|  |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |
| Art History | 4 | 1 | 25.0\% | 3 | Mask ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mask | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| Art : Studio 2D Design | 7 | 3 | 42.9\% | 7 | 0 | 0.0\% | 8 | 4 | 50.0\% | 6 | 5 | 83.3\% |
| Studio Art-Drawing | 10 | 3 | 30.0\% | 8 | 2 | 25.0\% | 8 | 1 | 12.5\% | 13 | 4 | 30.8\% |
| Biology | 39 | 3 | 7.7\% | 32 | 3 | 9.4\% | 31 | 4 | 12.9\% | 16 | 5 | 31.3\% |
| Chemistry | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% | 8 | 2 | 25.0\% | 1 | Mask | Mask | 7 | 2 | 28.6\% |
| Economics-Macro | 38 | 2 | 5.3\% | 56 | 0 | 0.0\% | 44 | 3 | 6.8\% | 47 | 2 | 4.3\% |
| Economics-Micro | 15 | 2 | 13.3\% | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| English Lang. \& Comp. | 186 | 17 | 9.1\% | 138 | 14 | 10.1\% | 183 | 23 | 12.6\% | 183 | 24 | 13.1\% |
| English Lit. \& Comp. | 122 | 5 | 4.1\% | 109 | 5 | 4.6\% | 90 | 9 | 10.0\% | 131 | 5 | 3.8\% |
| French Language | 5 | 1 | 20.0\% | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Gov. \& Pol., U.S. | 58 | 6 | 10.3\% | 51 | 2 | 3.9\% | 46 | 3 | 6.5\% | 54 | 3 | 5.6\% |
| European History | 1 | 1 | 100.0\% | 4 | Mask | Mask | 1 | Mask | Mask | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| U.S. History | 98 | 8 | 8.2\% | 82 | 5 | 6.1\% | 121 | 6 | 5.0\% | 96 | 3 | 3.1\% |
| World History | 99 | 5 | 5.1\% | 99 | 3 | 3.0\% | 83 | 1 | 1.2\% | 62 | 5 | 8.1\% |
| Human Geography | 10 | 0 | 0.0\% | 17 | 0 | 0.0\% | 7 | 1 | 14.3\% | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Calculus AB | 60 | 1 | 1.7\% | 35 | 6 | 17.1\% | 32 | 2 | 6.3\% | 41 | 7 | 17.1\% |
| Calculus BC | 5 | 2 | 40.0\% | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | Mask | Mask | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| Music Theory | 1 | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | Mask | Mask | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Physics B | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4 | Mask | Mask | 13 | 1 | 7.7\% | 3 | Mask | Mask |
| Physics C, Mechanics | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| Psychology | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Spanish Language | 50 | 31 | 62.0\% | 16 | 9 | 56.3\% | 5 | 3 | 60.0\% | 7 | 4 | 57.1\% |
| Spanish Literature | 3 | 1 | 33.3\% | 0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | 1 | Mask | Mask |
| Statistics | 28 | 0 | 0.0\% | 19 | 0 | 0.0\% | 22 | 2 | 9.1\% | 24 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Totals | 854 | 92 | 10.8\% | 691 | $57^{\text {b }}$ | 8.2\% | 696 | $64^{\text {b }}$ | 9.2\% | 704 | $75^{\text {b }}$ | 10.7\% |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ In 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 scores are not reported when there are fewer than 5 examinations. Table Continues ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Includes numbers that were masked in the rows above.
Table I.5. STAR AP Examination Scores, 2005-06 Through 2010-11 (Continued)

| AP Examination | 2009-10 |  |  | 2010-11 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  | N <br> Exams | Scores 3, 4, or 5 |  |
|  |  | N | \% |  | N | \% |
| Art History | 1 | Mask ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Art : Studio 2D Design | 7 | 1 | 14.3\% | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Studio Art-Drawing | 11 | 0 | 0.0\% | 10 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Biology | 34 | 4 | 11.8\% | 58 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Chemistry | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 7 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Economics-Macro | 34 | 0 | 0.0\% | 44 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Economics-Micro | 42 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | -- |
| English Lang. \& Comp. | 213 | 22 | 10.3\% | 220 | 18 | 8.2\% |
| English Lit. \& Comp. | 169 | 14 | 8.3\% | 127 | 9 | 7.1\% |
| French Language | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Gov. \& Pol., U.S. | 110 | 1 | 0.9\% | 107 | 1 | 0.9\% |
| European History | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| U.S. History | 135 | 4 | 3.0\% | 174 | 4 | 2.3\% |
| World History | 133 | 3 | 2.3\% | 169 | 8 | 4.7\% |
| Human Geography | 105 | 5 | 4.8\% | 172 | 7 | 4.1\% |
| Calculus AB | 43 | 7 | 16.3\% | 38 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Calculus BC | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Music Theory | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Physics B | 4 | Mask | Mask | 27 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Physics C, Mechanics | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Psychology | 1 | Mask | Mask | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Spanish Language | 71 | 11 | 15.5\% | 48 | 11 | 22.9\% |
| Spanish Literature | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Statistics | 36 | 0 | 0.0\% | 30 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Totals | 1,159 | $89^{\text {b }}$ | 7.7\% | 1,236 | 58 | 4.7\% | Sources: Sources: College Board 2005-06, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 School Integrated Summary Reports; and

2006-07 and 2007-08 District Integrated Summary reports.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ In 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 scores are not reported when there are fewer than 5 examinations. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Includes numbers that were masked in the rows above.

## ATTENDANCE RATES

Regular school attendance is necessary for academic achievement. Attendance rates are indicators of students' commitment to learning as well as the ability of the school to meet students' academic needs. Figure I. 3 shows the average attendance rates for all STAR campuses from 2005-06 (baseline) through 2009-10. Also shown are peer campus attendance rates along with state averages. Although STAR attendance rates have generally improved across years they remained somewhat lower than both peer campuses and the state average in 2009-10.

Table I.6. Attendance Rates of STAR Schools, 2005-06 Through 2009-10

| Group |  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2006-10 } \\ & \text { Change }^{\text {b }} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junior High and Middle Schools | Falfurrias JH | 91.6\% | 92.2\% | 91.8\% | 93.3\% | 93.8\% | +2.2 |
|  | Adams MS | 91.6\% | 91.1\% | 92.1\% | 91.3\% | 91.4\% | -0.2 |
|  | Memorial MS | 92.5\% | 92.9\% | 92.2\% | 92.8\% | 92.0\% | -0.5 |
|  | Driscoll MS | 93.6\% | 93.9\% | 94.2\% | 94.8\% | 94.7\% | +1.1 |
|  | Mathis MS | 94.6\% | 95.4\% | 95.0\% | 95.2\% | 94.3\% | -0.3 |
|  | Odem JH | 97.0\% | 96.4\% | 95.8\% | 96.2\% | 96.0\% | -1.0 |
|  | Group <br> Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 93.5\% | 93.7\% | 93.5\% | 93.9\% | 93.7\% | +0.2 |
|  | Group Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 95.6\% | 95.8\% | 95.8\% | 95.7\% | 95.6\% | 0.0 |
| High Schools | Falfurrias HS | 90.0\% | 92.4\% | 87.9\% | 92.7\% | 92.1\% | +2.1 |
|  | Alice HS | 89.3\% | 89.5\% | 89.7\% | 89.8\% | 90.0\% | +0.7 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 92.0\% | 92.9\% | 93.1\% | 92.6\% | 91.5\% | -0.5 |
|  | Miller HS | 90.8\% | 90.6\% | 89.2\% | 93.2\% | 93.3\% | +2.5 |
|  | Mathis HS | 92.7\% | 89.4\% | 91.7\% | 90.7\% | 92.0\% | -0.7 |
|  | Odem HS | 95.5\% | 95.7\% | 95.4\% | 95.0\% | 94.4\% | -1.1 |
|  | Group <br> Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 91.7\% | 91.8\% | 91.2\% | 92.3\% | 92.2\% | +0.5 |
|  | Group Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 93.8\% | 93.7\% | 93.6\% | 93.7\% | 93.6\% | -0.2 |
|  | STAR <br> Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 92.6\% | 92.7\% | 92.3\% | 93.1\% | 93.0\% | +0.4 |
|  | All Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 94.7\% | 94.7\% | 94.7\% | 94.7\% | 94.6\% | -0.1 |
|  | State Average | 95.5\% | 95.5\% | 95.5\% | 95.6\% | 95.5\% | 0.0 |

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus non-TAKS performance indicators data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ Simple average.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Change in percentage points.


Figure I.3. Attendance rates of all STAR campuses, 2006 Through 2010.
Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus non-TAKS performance indicators data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.

## GRADUATION RATES AND OTHER MEASURES OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Graduation rates, advanced course completion rates, and Recommended High School Program/ Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) completion rates are also indicators of high school student and campus academic performance. Table I. 7 presents 2005-06 through 2009-10 information on these measures for STAR high schools with comparison data provided for peer campuses and the state as a whole. The STAR graduation rate increased by about five percentage points (i.e., from $77 \%$ to $82 \%$ ) across this period; however, Mathis High School increased its graduation rate by more than 22 percentage points (i.e., from $70 \%$ to $92 \%$ ). Overall, the average increase in graduation rates for STAR high schools were similar to those of peer comparison campuses and the state (a four percentage point increases for both)..

Table I.7. Graduation Rates, Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program (RHSP/DAP) Completion Rates, and Advanced Course Completion Rates of STAR High Schools, 2005-06 through 2009-10

| Group |  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & 2006-10 \\ & \text { Change } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Graduation Rate | Falfurrias HS | 87.1\% | 81.4\% | 84.7\% | 88.4\% | 89.4\% | +2.3 |
|  | Alice HS | 67.3\% | 58.6\% | 59.3\% | 61.8\% | 66.3\% | -1.0 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 77.3\% | 71.1\% | 68.4\% | 72.1\% | 80.9\% | +3.6 |
|  | Miller HS | 73.3\% | 63.7\% | 68.8\% | 68.8\% | 76.0\% | +2.7 |
|  | Mathis HS | 70.2\% | 81.2\% | 94.5\% | 84.7\% | 92.4\% | +22.2 |
|  | Odem HS | 88.5\% | 80.7\% | 87.5\% | 76.9\% | 86.5\% | -2.0 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 77.3\% | 72.8\% | 77.2\% | 75.5\% | 81.9\% | +4.6 |
|  | Peer <br> Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 80.5\% | 78.0\% | 79.7\% | 80.7\% | 84.9\% | +4.4 |
|  | State Average | 80.4\% | 78.0\% | 79.1\% | 80.6\% | 84.3\% | +3.9 |
| RHSP/DAP <br> Completion <br> Rate | Falfurrias HS | 70.0\% | 74.5\% | 75.4\% | 73.8\% | 89.3\% | +19.3 |
|  | Alice HS | 92.7\% | 93.9\% | 91.4\% | 95.0\% | 85.9\% | -6.8 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 86.7\% | 84.6\% | 90.5\% | 89.6\% | 89.7\% | +3.0 |
|  | Miller HS | 67.6\% | 67.7\% | 70.9\% | 81.3\% | 87.9\% | +20.3 |
|  | Mathis HS | 87.6\% | 93.8\% | 87.1\% | 94.8\% | 91.3\% | +3.7 |
|  | Odem HS | 76.1\% | 73.6\% | 82.2\% | 88.5\% | 89.7\% | +13.6 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 80.1\% | 81.4\% | 82.9\% | 87.2\% | 89.0\% | +8.9 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 84.2\% | 85.5\% | 87.1\% | 88.3\% | 88.8\% | +4.6 |
|  | State Average | 75.7\% | 77.9\% | 81.4\% | 82.5\% | 82.7\% | +7.0 |
| Advanced <br> Course <br> Completion <br> Rate | Falfurrias HS | 12.7\% | 17.5\% | 14.6\% | 21.0\% | 33.2\% | +20.5 |
|  | Alice HS | 20.4\% | 21.0\% | 21.3\% | 23.9\% | 30.8\% | +10.4 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 14.7\% | 15.7\% | 14.4\% | 18.4\% | 17.3\% | +2.6 |
|  | Miller HS | 17.4\% | 19.6\% | 19.8\% | 16.8\% | 20.4\% | +3.0 |
|  | Mathis HS | 10.8\% | 8.6\% | 14.5\% | 25.7\% | 52.4\% | +41.6 |
|  | Odem HS | 14.0\% | 16.2\% | 19.0\% | 24.8\% | 19.7\% | +5.7 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 15.0\% | 16.4\% | 17.3\% | 21.8\% | 29.0\% | +14.0 |
|  | Peer <br> Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 17.8\% | 18.1\% | 19.9\% | 20.9\% | 25.1\% | +7.3 |
|  | State Average | 21.0\% | 22.1\% | 23.1\% | 24.6\% | 26.3\% | +5.3 |

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus completion rates and campus non-TAKS performance indicators data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Simple average.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Change in percentage points.

Another measure of academic readiness is the RHSP/DAP completion rate. The RHSP requires 24 credits and more rigorous elective courses (e.g., fine arts, languages other than English) than the 22-credit minimum graduation plan. The DAP requires completion of RHSP requirements plus one additional credit in a foreign language and any combination of four advanced measures (e.g., a 3 or higher on an AP examination, a grade of 3.0 or higher on courses that count for college credit, an original, judged,-research project, and a score on the PSAT that qualifies the student for recognition). Compared to the baseline year of 2005-06, there was a 9 point increase in the percentage of students in STAR schools who completed the RHSP/DAP in 2009-10. This increase exceeded gains for both peer campuses and the state average. In addition, compared to the state average, a higher percentage of students in STAR schools completed the RHSP/DAP in 2008-09 ( $89 \%$ vs. $83 \%$ ).

Advanced course completions are another measure of rigorous academic preparation. Advanced courses include AP and IB courses along with higher-level core content area courses (e.g., pre-calculus, research/technical writing, economics advanced studies), advanced elective courses (e.g., French IV, Theatre Arts IV, Music IV Jazz Band), and dual enrollment courses for which a student gets both high school and college credit. Advanced course completion rates in STAR high schools were 14 percentage points higher in 2009-10 than in 2005-06 ( $29 \%$ vs. $15 \%$ ), with the greatest gains occurring at Mathis High School (an increase of 42 percentage points). Gains for STAR high schools exceeded those of both peer campuses and the state. STAR high school students had greater advanced course completion rates than peer campuses ( $29 \%$ vs. $25 \%$ ) and the state ( $29 \%$ vs. $26 \%$ ).

## COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMS

College entrance examination scores for both the SAT and ACT are reported to TEA. TEA includes the percentage of students taking the examinations, the average examination scores, and the percentage of students scoring at or above the criterion ( 1110 on the SAT and 24 on the ACT) in AEIS reports. Data are reported when students are scheduled to be seniors, regardless of when they took the examinations.

Table I. 8 presents college entrance examination data for STAR high schools, peer campuses, and state averages. Data were gathered from the 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS files, but reported results are for the 2005-06 through 2009-10 school years. Between 2006 and 2010, the percentage of students in STAR schools taking college entrance examinations decreased by 7 percentage points. Across the same time period, the rate of peer campus students participation in exams remained largely unchanged and the state rate declined by about 3 percentage points. However, compared to peer campus and state averages, the percentage of students in STAR schools taking college entrance examinations was higher than both comparison groups for each testing year (see Figure I.4). While participation in college entrance exams was greater at STAR campuses, the percentage of students scoring at or above the criterion similar to peer campus averages, but considerably lower than the state averages.

From 2006 through 2010, ACT average scores were generally stable for STAR and peer campuses and the state average. STAR campuses' average ACT scores were lower than the averages of both peer campuses and the state (see Figure I.6). However, STAR high schools improved their average SAT scores over the same time period. In 2005-06, students at STAR high schools earned an average SAT score of 896. In 2010, the average SAT score increased by 23 points to 919 . This increase exceeds that of peer campuses (an average increase of 6 points), and average scores at the state level declined over the period. Despite this trend, average SAT scores at STAR high schools still lagged the state average in 2009-10 (919 vs. 985) (see Figure I.5).

Table I.8. College Entrance Examination Performance of STAR High Schools, 2005-06 Through 2009-10

| Group |  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2006-10 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Taking Exams ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Falfurrias HS | 67.1\% | 72.8\% | 64.0\% | 49.3\% | 74.4\% | +7.3 |
|  | Alice HS | 90.3\% | 86.7\% | 83.2\% | 83.6\% | 71.2\% | -19.1 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 75.7\% | 76.0\% | 76.4\% | 60.3\% | 62.9\% | -12.8 |
|  | Miller HS | 77.1\% | 73.4\% | 64.5\% | 57.8\% | 50.8\% | -26.3 |
|  | Mathis HS | 70.9\% | 64.4\% | 55.2\% | 63.1\% | 80.0\% | +9.1 |
|  | Odem HS | 77.6\% | 75.9\% | 83.9\% | 96.2\% | 78.6\% | +1.0 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 76.5\% | 74.9\% | 71.2\% | 68.4\% | 69.7\% | -6.8 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 65.5\% | 68.7\% | 64.2\% | 63.7\% | 65.4\% | -0.1 |
|  | State Average | 65.8\% | 68.2\% | 65.0\% | 61.5\% | 62.6\% | -3.2 |
| Percent at or Above Criterion ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Falfurrias HS | 2.0\% | 11.9\% | 3.1\% | 5.7\% | 1.6\% | -0.4 |
|  | Alice HS | 7.4\% | 9.2\% | 11.2\% | 11.2\% | 6.9\% | -0.5 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 11.4\% | 11.0\% | 11.8\% | 15.8\% | 18.2\% | +6.8 |
|  | Miller HS | 3.9\% | 6.5\% | 1.8\% | 2.4\% | 1.6\% | -2.3 |
|  | Mathis HS | 8.2\% | 8.9\% | 6.3\% | 1.5\% | 2.6\% | -5.6 |
|  | Odem HS | 11.1\% | 2.3\% | 3.8\% | 6.0\% | 9.1\% | -2.0 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 7.3\% | 8.3\% | 6.3\% | 7.1\% | 6.7\% | -0.6 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 8.5\% | 7.9\% | 8.7\% | 9.2\% | 8.9\% | +0.4 |
|  | State Average | 27.1\% | 27.0\% | 27.2\% | 26.9\% | 26.9\% | -0.2 |
| ACT Average ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Falfurrias HS | 16.4 | 18.4 | 17.2 | 18.0 | 16.6 | +0.2 |
|  | Alice HS | 17.7 | 17.5 | 18.6 | 18.5 | 17.4 | -0.3 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 18.0 | 18.4 | 19.0 | 18.1 | 19.4 | +1.4 |
|  | Miller HS | 15.8 | 16.2 | 16.1 | 16.9 | 16.0 | +0.2 |
|  | Mathis HS | 16.2 | 16.8 | 16.6 | 15.1 | 16.2 | 0.0 |
|  | Odem HS | 18.2 | 17.3 | 17.6 | 17.6 | 17.7 | -0.5 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 17.1 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 17.4 | 17.2 | +0.1 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 18.1 | 17.8 | 18.0 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 0.0 |
|  | State Average | 20.1 | 20.2 | 20.5 | 20.5 | 20.5 | +0.4 |
| SAT Average ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Falfurrias HS | 857 | 979 | 806 | 937 | Mask | Mask ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Alice HS | 918 | 1049 | 1065 | 961 | 1062 | +144 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 910 | 891 | 899 | 965 | 919 | +9 |
|  | Miller HS | 794 | 864 | 794 | 805 | 807 | +13 |
|  | Mathis HS | 1013 | Mask | Mask | Mask | Mask | Mask ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Odem HS | 885 | 870 | 893 | 962 | 888 | +3 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 896 | 931 | 891 | 926 | 919 | +23 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 894 | 898 | 888 | 903 | 900 | +6 |
|  | State Average | 991 | 992 | 987 | 985 | 985 | -6 |

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State
Performance Reports.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Data are masked. The denominator is less than 5 (including 0 ).
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Changes in percentage points
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Changes in average test scores
${ }^{\mathrm{d}}$ Simple average.


Figure I.4. Percentage of students taking college entrance examinations (SAT or ACT), 2006 through 2010.
Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.


Figure I.5. Average performance on SAT college entrance examination (criterion score is 1100), 2006 through 2010.
Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.


Figure I.6. Average performance on ACT college entrance exam (criterion score is 24), 2006 through 2010.
Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.

## COLLEGE READINESS

In 2007, AEIS introduced an indicator of college readiness, the percentage of college-ready graduates. This indicator is a measure of preparation for postsecondary success. To be considered college ready as defined by this indicator, a graduate must have met or exceeded specified criteria on the exit-level TAKS test, the SAT, or the ACT. These criteria are listed in Table I.9.

Table I.9. College-Readiness Indicators and Criteria for the Class of 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010

| Subject | Exit-level TAKS |  | SAT |  | ACT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ELA | $>=2200$ scale score on ELA test AND <br> a " 3 " or higher on the essay | OR | $\begin{gathered} >=500 \text { on } \\ \text { Critical Reading } \\ \text { AND } \\ >=1070 \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | OR | $\begin{aligned} & >=19 \text { on English } \\ & \text { AND } \\ & >=23 \text { Composite } \end{aligned}$ |
| Mathematics | $>=2200$ scale score on mathematics test | OR | $\begin{gathered} >=500 \text { on Math } \\ \text { AND } \\ >=1070 \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | OR | $\begin{gathered} >=19 \text { on Math } \\ \text { AND } \\ >=23 \text { Composite } \end{gathered}$ |

Source: TEA AEIS Glossary for 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11.

As Table I. 10 indicates, the percentages of STAR high school graduates who were college ready increased from 2006 to 2010 (by 4 percentage points in mathematics, 16 percentage points in reading, and by 9 percentage point in both subjects). Gains in the percentage of college-ready graduates for both peer campuses and the state were greater mathematics, reading, and both subjects (see Figure I.7.) In mathematics, the percentage of 2009-10 STAR high school graduates who were college ready (43\%) was lower than the state average ( $64 \%$ ) and the peer campus average ( $53 \%$ ). In reading, the percentage of 2009-10 graduates from STAR schools who were college-ready ( $60 \%$ ) was lower than the state average ( $66 \%$ ) but higher than the peer campus average ( $57 \%$ ). In both subjects, the percentage of graduates from STAR schools who were college-ready ( $33 \%$ ) was lower than averages for the state ( $52 \%$ ) and peer campuses (40\%).


Figure I.7. Percentage of graduates college ready in both reading and mathematics, 2006 through 2010.

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.

Table I.10. College Readiness Indicators by Comparison Group, 2005-06 Through 2009-10

| Group |  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2006-10 } \\ & \text { Change }^{\text {b }} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| College <br> Ready <br> Mathematics | Falfurrias HS | 37\% | 48\% | 55\% | 45\% | 36\% | -1 |
|  | Alice HS | 38\% | 38\% | 50\% | 57\% | 49\% | +11 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 41\% | 49\% | 55\% | 47\% | 52\% | +11 |
|  | Miller HS | 36\% | 44\% | 43\% | 39\% | 39\% | +3 |
|  | Mathis HS | 39\% | 30\% | 32\% | 34\% | 30\% | -9 |
|  | Odem HS | 42\% | 29\% | 44\% | 52\% | 53\% | +11 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 39\% | 40\% | 47\% | 46\% | 43\% | +4 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 38\% | 43\% | 46\% | 48\% | 53\% | +15 |
|  | State Average | 52\% | 56\% | 58\% | 60\% | 64\% | +12 |
| College Ready Reading | Falfurrias HS | 44\% | 70\% | 58\% | 57\% | 53\% | +9 |
|  | Alice HS | 60\% | 56\% | 71\% | 72\% | 69\% | +9 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 68\% | 64\% | 71\% | 73\% | 80\% | +12 |
|  | Miller HS | 30\% | 30\% | 36\% | 46\% | 42\% | +12 |
|  | Mathis HS | 21\% | 28\% | 34\% | 44\% | 66\% | +45 |
|  | Odem HS | 39\% | 31\% | 49\% | 56\% | 50\% | +11 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 44\% | 47\% | 53\% | 58\% | 60\% | +16 |
|  | Peer <br> Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 35\% | 38\% | 51\% | 54\% | 57\% | +22 |
|  | State Average | 48\% | 49\% | 59\% | 62\% | 66\% | +18 |
| College <br> Ready Both <br> Subjects | Falfurrias HS | 26\% | 41\% | 28\% | 37\% | 24\% | -2 |
|  | Alice HS | 29\% | 29\% | 34\% | 51\% | 43\% | +14 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 32\% | 36\% | 33\% | 41\% | 48\% | +16 |
|  | Miller HS | 16\% | 18\% | 28\% | 28\% | 24\% | +8 |
|  | Mathis HS | 12\% | 13\% | 30\% | 20\% | 25\% | +13 |
|  | Odem HS | 28\% | 10\% | 35\% | 37\% | 36\% | +8 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 24\% | 25\% | 34\% | 36\% | 33\% | +9 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 20\% | 22\% | 31\% | 35\% | 40\% | +20 |
|  | State Average | 35\% | 37\% | 44\% | 47\% | 52\% | +17 |

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus college and admission rate statistics data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State
Performance Reports.
${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ Simple average.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Change in percentage points.

## ADDITIONAL CAMPUS OUTCOME MEASURES

The General Educational Development (GED) attainment rate is calculated by dividing the number of students in a particular cohort who received a GED by the number of students in the cohort. The Grades 9 through 12 dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of dropouts in Grades 9 through 12 in a particular school year by the number of Grades 9 through 12 students who were in attendance at any time
during that school year. Both GED and Grades 9 through 12 dropout rates are additional indicators of student and campus performance. Table I. 11 reports longitudinal data on these indicators for STAR high schools as well as for peer campuses and the state.

Average STAR GED completion rates exceeded peer campus rates from 2006 through 2010 and exceeded state rates in 2007 through 2010, although overall, STAR high schools have experienced a slight decrease (0.1percentage point decrease) in GED completion rates from 2006 through 2010. Over the same period, peer campus and state rates also decreased (a 0.4 percentage point decrease for peer campuses and a 1.0 percentage point decrease for the state). From 2006 through 2010, the average STAR Grades 9 through 12 dropout rate exceeded the peer campus rate and the state average. Yet the decrease in the Grades 9 through 12 dropout rate at STAR campuses ( 2.1 percentage point decrease) exceeded the decrease at peer campuses ( 2.0 percentage point decrease) and at the state level ( 1.3 percentage point decrease).

Table I.11. GED Completion Rates and Dropout Rates of STAR High Schools, 2005-06 Through 2009-10

| Group |  | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2006-10 } \\ & \text { Change }^{\text {b }} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GED <br> Completion <br> Rate | Falfurrias HS | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0 |
|  | Alice HS | 2.9\% | 4.9\% | 3.9\% | 6.5\% | 3.8\% | +0.9 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 3.0\% | 4.1\% | 3.7\% | 2.0\% | 1.8\% | -1.2 |
|  | Miller HS | 2.1\% | 3.7\% | 2.7\% | 4.0\% | 3.8\% | +1.7 |
|  | Mathis HS | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 1.7\% | -0.8 |
|  | Odem HS | 1.3\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | -1.3 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.1\% | 2.8\% | 1.9\% | -0.1 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 1.0\% | -0.4 |
|  | State Average | 2.3\% | 2.0\% | 1.5\% | 1.4\% | 1.3\% | -1.0 |
| Grades 9-12 <br> Dropout <br> Rate | Falfurrias HS | 1.7\% | 4.6\% | 1.7\% | 0.9\% | 0.4\% | -1.3 |
|  | Alice HS | 9.3\% | 11.2\% | 9.0\% | 7.3\% | 5.3\% | -4.0 |
|  | H. M. King HS | 6.0\% | 7.1\% | 0.6\% | 3.4\% | 5.4\% | -0.6 |
|  | Miller HS | 9.3\% | 9.4\% | 5.5\% | 3.9\% | 1.8\% | -7.5 |
|  | Mathis HS | 1.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.8\% | 3.7\% | 1.0\% | -0.3 |
|  | Odem HS | 2.8\% | 3.9\% | 4.0\% | 2.4\% | 4.1\% | +1.3 |
|  | Group Average ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 5.1\% | 6.1\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 3.0\% | -2.1 |
|  | Peer Campuses ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3.7\% | 3.8\% | 2.9\% | 2.6\% | 1.7\% | -2.0 |
|  | State Average | 3.7\% | 3.9\% | 3.2\% | 2.9\% | 2.4\% | -1.3 |

Sources: STAR and peer data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) campus completion rates (GED completion rate) and campus non-TAKS performance indicators (Grades 9-12 dropout rate) data files. State data are from 2006-07 through 2010-11 AEIS State Performance Reports.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Simple average.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Change in percentage points.

## ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

STAR seeks to increase the number of high school graduates who enroll in postsecondary educational programs. Thus, higher education enrollment rates are a key indicator of STAR's success. Table I. 12 and Figure I. 8 present data on the percentages of graduates from STAR campuses who entered Texas universities and community colleges or vocational programs. Information is presented for 3 years prior to project implementation (2004 through 2006) and for 4 years following project implementation (2007 through 2010). In 2010, $49 \%$ of graduates from STAR schools entered a postsecondary educational program in Texas- $28 \%$ enrolled in a 4 -year university and $21 \%$ enrolled in a community college or technical school. For each reported year, more than $45 \%$ of graduating seniors could not be located. These students may have enrolled in programs outside of Texas, delayed their enrollment, or chosen to forgo postsecondary education.

Compared with the baseline year of 2006, there was a decrease in the percentage of graduates from STAR schools entering a 4 -year university (a 1 percentage point decrease), but an increase in the percentage of graduates who entered a community college or technical school (a 3 percentage point increase) in 2010. Overall, STAR high schools have seen a slight increase ( 2 percentage points) in the percentage of graduates enrolling in higher education in Texas.

Table I.12. Graduates from STAR Schools Entering Higher Education in Texas, 2004-2010

| High School | University |  | Community/Tech |  | Total |  | Not Located |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Alice HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 107 | 34.5\% | 63 | 20.3\% | 170 | 54.8\% | 140 | 45.2\% |
| 2005 | 73 | 30.0\% | 49 | 20.2\% | 122 | 50.2\% | 121 | 49.8\% |
| 2006 | 92 | 35.3\% | 45 | 17.2\% | 137 | 52.5\% | 124 | 47.5\% |
| 2007 | 81 | 30.8\% | 59 | 22.4\% | 140 | 53.2\% | 123 | 46.8\% |
| 2008 | 85 | 34.7\% | 59 | 24.2\% | 144 | 59.0\% | 100 | 41.0\% |
| 2009 | 87 | 36.4\% | 63 | 26.4\% | 150 | 62.8\% | 89 | 37.2\% |
| 2010 | 81 | 27.8\% | 78 | 26.8\% | 159 | 54.6\% | 132 | 45.4\% |
| Falfurrias HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 30 | 27.8\% | 20 | 18.5\% | 50 | 46.3\% | 58 | 53.7\% |
| 2005 | 33 | 36.3\% | 5 | 5.5\% | 38 | 41.8\% | 53 | 58.2\% |
| 2006 | 27 | 30.0\% | 18 | 20.0\% | 45 | 50.0\% | 45 | 50.0\% |
| 2007 | 28 | 29.8\% | 22 | 23.4\% | 50 | 53.2\% | 44 | 46.8\% |
| 2008 | 20 | 16.9\% | 26 | 22.0\% | 46 | 39.0\% | 72 | 61.0\% |
| 2009 | 17 | 20.2\% | 22 | 26.2\% | 39 | 46.4\% | 45 | 53.6\% |
| 2010 | 27 | 26.2\% | 27 | 26.2\% | 54 | 52.4\% | 49 | 47.6\% |
| H. M. King HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 134 | 55.8\% | 20 | 8.3\% | 154 | 64.2\% | 86 | 35.8\% |
| 2005 | 104 | 44.1\% | 22 | 9.3\% | 126 | 53.4\% | 110 | 46.6\% |
| 2006 | 91 | 44.2\% | 14 | 6.8\% | 105 | 51.0\% | 101 | 49.0\% |
| 2007 | 96 | 49.5\% | 24 | 12.4\% | 120 | 61.9\% | 74 | 38.1\% |
| 2008 | 87 | 43.9\% | 29 | 14.6\% | 116 | 58.6\% | 82 | 41.4\% |
| 2009 | 106 | 48.2\% | 37 | 16.8\% | 143 | 65.0\% | 77 | 35.0\% |
| 2010 | 99 | 42.9\% | 29 | 12.6\% | 128 | 55.4\% | 103 | 44.6\% |
| Mathis HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 14 | 13.7\% | 31 | 30.4\% | 45 | 44.1\% | 57 | 55.9\% |
| 2005 | 18 | 19.6\% | 25 | 27.2\% | 43 | 46.7\% | 49 | 53.3\% |
| 2006 | 11 | 11.3\% | 27 | 27.8\% | 38 | 39.2\% | 59 | 60.8\% |
| 2007 | 21 | 21.9\% | 19 | 19.8\% | 40 | 41.7\% | 56 | 58.3\% |
| 2008 | 18 | 17.8\% | 18 | 17.8\% | 36 | 35.6\% | 65 | 64.4\% |
| 2009 | 27 | 21.6\% | 28 | 22.4\% | 55 | 44.0\% | 70 | 56.0\% |
| 2010 | 22 | 19.3\% | 20 | 17.5\% | 42 | 36.8\% | 72 | 63.2\% |
| Miller HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 51 | 16.4\% | 44 | 14.1\% | 95 | 30.5\% | 216 | 69.5\% |
| 2005 | 44 | 17.6\% | 50 | 20.0\% | 94 | 37.6\% | 156 | 62.4\% |
| 2006 | 38 | 14.5\% | 61 | 23.3\% | 99 | 37.8\% | 163 | 62.2\% |
| 2007 | 35 | 15.3\% | 60 | 26.2\% | 95 | 41.5\% | 134 | 58.5\% |
| 2008 | 23 | 9.7\% | 61 | 25.7\% | 84 | 35.4\% | 153 | 64.6\% |
| 2009 | 39 | 18.7\% | 58 | 27.8\% | 97 | 46.4\% | 112 | 53.6\% |
| 2010 | 21 | 12.4\% | 36 | 21.3\% | 57 | 33.7\% | 112 | 66.3\% |

Table Continues

Table I.12. Graduates from STAR Schools Entering Higher Education in Texas, 2004-2010 (Continued)

| High School | University |  | Community/Tech |  | Total |  | Not Located |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Odem HS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 24 | 31.2\% | 15 | 19.5\% | 39 | 50.6\% | 38 | 49.4\% |
| 2005 | 18 | 25.0\% | 19 | 26.4\% | 37 | 51.4\% | 35 | 48.6\% |
| 2006 | 31 | 43.7\% | 11 | 15.5\% | 42 | 59.2\% | 29 | 40.8\% |
| 2007 | 22 | 30.6\% | 12 | 16.7\% | 34 | 47.2\% | 38 | 52.8\% |
| 2008 | 29 | 39.7\% | 11 | 15.1\% | 40 | 54.8\% | 33 | 45.2\% |
| 2009 | 21 | 34.4\% | 13 | 21.3\% | 34 | 55.7\% | 27 | 44.3\% |
| 2010 | 26 | 33.3\% | 17 | 21.8\% | 43 | 55.1\% | 35 | 44.9\% |
| STAR 2004 | 360 | 31.4\% | 193 | 16.9\% | 553 | 48.2\% | 595 | 51.8\% |
| STAR 2005 | 290 | 29.5\% | 170 | 17.3\% | 460 | 46.7\% | 524 | 53.3\% |
| STAR 2006 | 290 | 29.4\% | 176 | 17.8\% | 466 | 47.2\% | 521 | 52.8\% |
| STAR 2007 | 283 | 29.9\% | 196 | 20.7\% | 479 | 50.5\% | 469 | 49.5\% |
| STAR 2008 | 262 | 27.0\% | 204 | 21.0\% | 466 | 48.0\% | 505 | 52.0\% |
| STAR 2009 | 297 | 31.7\% | 221 | 23.6\% | 518 | 55.2\% | 420 | 44.8\% |
| STAR 2010 | 276 | 28.0\% | 207 | 21.0\% | 483 | 49.0\% | 503 | 51.0\% |
| Change 04-10 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | -- | -3.4 | -- | +4.1 | -- | +0.8 | -- | -0.8 |

Sources: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Postsecondary Enrollment by High School reports from 2003-04 to 2009-10.
Notes. Graduates enrolled in higher education for the fall of the year (e.g., 2010 is fall 2010). Statistics include only students entering Texas public and private institutions.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Change in percentage points.


Figure I.8. Percentage of STAR high school graduates entering a 4-year university in Texas, a community college or technical school in Texas, and entering higher education in Texas, 2004 through 2010.
Sources: Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Postsecondary Enrollment by High School reports from 2005-06 to 2009-10.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In 2010-11, 19 GEAR UP partnership grants, or "Statewide Initiatives," operated in Texas.
    ${ }^{2}$ Annual STAR evaluation reports may be accessed at: http://tcer.org/research/star/index.aspx

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ Changes in TAKS passing rates are measured from students' baseline year (Grade 6 TAKS) to the current school year (2010-11). Because STAR serves a range of grade levels the baseline year for each cohort of students will vary. For example, the baseline year for the first cohort of students (seventh graders in 2006-07) is 2005-06, while the baseline year for the second cohort of students to receive STAR services (seventh graders in 2007-08) is 2006-07. ${ }^{4}$ For each campus in the state, TEA has created a peer or comparison group of 40 public school campuses selected on the basis of six student demographic characteristics, including the percentages of African American, Hispanic, and White students, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of limited English proficient students, and the campus mobility rate ( 2007 Accountability Manual, TEA). For a specific performance indicator, TEA reports the median value of the 40 comparison campuses on that indicator. Thus, peer groups allow for comparisons of campus performance for similar schools.

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ Data representing student participation in advanced courses are lagged a year. That is, Year 5 indicators rely on data collected during the 2009-10 school year, and Year 1 indicators rely on data collected during the 2005-06 school year.
    ${ }^{6}$ Although policies vary, most colleges award college credit for AP test scores of 3 or higher.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Nationally, about a third of GEAR UP funds have been awarded in terms of state grants, and two thirds of funds have been awarded in the form of partnership grants (USDE, 2008).
    ${ }^{8}$ In 2010-11, the matching rate for STAR districts was $102.8 \%$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Percentages are drawn from Texas' Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data and are reported for campuses' full enrollment. That is, percentages are not limited to STAR cohorts.
    ${ }^{10}$ In 2010-11, 19 GEAR UP partnership grants and one state grant operated in Texas.
    ${ }^{11}$ Annual STAR evaluation reports may be accessed at: http://tcer.org/research/star/index.aspx

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ TEA-identified peer comparison campuses serve student populations that are similar those served by GEAR UP/STAR campuses.

[^6]:    ${ }^{13}$ For each campus in the state, TEA has created a peer or comparison group of 40 public school campuses selected on the basis of six student demographic characteristics, including the percentages of African American, Hispanic, and White students, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of limited English proficient students, and the campus mobility rate (TEA, 2007). For a specific performance indicator, TEA reports the median value of the 40 comparison campuses on that indicator. Thus, peer groups allow for comparisons of campus performance for similar schools.

[^7]:    ${ }^{14}$ As stated earlier, Cohort 1 students were in Grade 11 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2005-06. Cohort 2 students were in Grade 10 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2006-07, Cohort 3 students were in Grade 9 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2007-08, Cohort 4 students were in Grade 8 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2008-09, and Cohort 5 students were in Grade 7 in 2010-11 and in Grade 6 in their baseline year of 2009-10.

[^8]:    ${ }^{15}$ Horizontal teams are made up of teachers of the same subject and grade level who work together to plan lessons and instructional strategies; vertical teams are made up of teachers of the same subject across grade levels who work to scaffold lesson plans and instructional strategies across grade levels.

[^9]:    ${ }^{16}$ Although policies vary, most colleges and university award credit for scores of 3 or higher on AP exams.

[^10]:    ${ }^{17}$ A detailed overview of STAR's goals and objectives is presented in Appendix F.

[^11]:    ${ }^{18}$ The item measured the number of unique kinds of activities. For example, students may have participated in several campus tours but this would be measured as one kind of activity.

[^12]:    ${ }^{19}$ Most STAR districts did not receive their grant awards until November 2006, and did not fully begin implementing until spring 2007.

[^13]:    ${ }^{20}$ Changes in TAKS passing rates are measured from students' baseline year (Grade 6 TAKS) to the current school year (2010-11). Because STAR serves a range of grade levels the baseline year for each cohort of students will vary. For example, the baseline year for the first cohort of students (seventh graders in 2006-07) is 2005-06, while the baseline year for the second cohort of students to receive STAR services (seventh graders in 2007-08) is 2006-07.
    ${ }^{21}$ For each campus in the state, TEA has created a peer or comparison group of 40 public school campuses selected on the basis of six student demographic characteristics, including the percentages of African American, Hispanic, and White students, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of limited English proficient students, and the campus mobility rate (2007 Accountability Manual, TEA). For a specific performance indicator, TEA reports the median value of the 40 comparison campuses on that indicator. Thus, peer groups allow for comparisons of campus performance for similar schools.

[^14]:    ${ }^{22}$ TEA Course Completion data are lagged a year, so the most current data for any given evaluation year are for the preceding year. For example, that analyses used for the Year 5 evaluation (2010-11) rely on data for the 2009-10 school year.

[^15]:    Source: STAR Teacher, Counselor, and Librarian Survey, spring 2011.

[^16]:    Source: STAR Middle School Student Survey, spring 2011.

[^17]:    Source: STAR High School Student Survey, spring 2011.

[^18]:    Teacher
    $\bigcirc$

    Teachers are routed past the next section which is questions for counselors only.

    Teacher ○

[^19]:    

[^20]:    ${ }^{23}$ The most recent years for which data are available.
    ${ }^{24}$ For each campus in the state, TEA has created a peer or comparison group of 40 public school campuses selected on the basis of six student demographic characteristics, including the percentages of African American, Hispanic, and White students, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, the percentage of limited English proficient students, and the campus mobility rate (2007 Accountability Manual, TEA). For a specific performance indicator, TEA reports the median value of the 40 comparison campuses on that indicator. Thus, peer groups allow for comparisons of campus performance for similar schools.

[^21]:    Table Continues

