



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215S060102

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

1.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.1 Develop 24-model lessons in "character" curricula for all Pre K-12 students in core content areas.	Project	24	/		24	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1.1.1 Records analysis. Were the lessons developed?

A simple count of lesson plans was conducted from the Floresville Independent School District (FISD) Character Counts Web Site: <http://www.fisd.us/CharacterED/lessonplans/default.htm>

Twenty-four new character education lessons were available as of April 5, 2007.

Were 12 "developers" involved?

Yes. A simple count of character education developers was done. Twenty-two "developers" were involved as of April 5, 2007.

1.1.2 Content analysis. To what extent does the new curriculum address the elements of character?

Using a standardized checklist of the "six pillars of character education" being used in this grant program as a qualitative measurement all submitted lessons appear to meet the criteria.

1.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
1.2 Design and implement professional development to train all Pre K-12 teachers in the best methods for establishing character education using the curricula developed in strategy 1.1 (<i>Performance Measure 1.a. above</i>) and other character education activities.	GPRA	223	/		280	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1.2.1 Records analysis. Was the professional development designed?

Yes. Three character education workshops were conducted in January 2007.

Did 223 teachers participate in the professional development?

The raw number for this measure is estimated over the life of the grant (4 years). Therefore, up to 56 teachers annually will participate in character education professional development based on the following schedule:

- 2006-2007 school year = 56 teachers
- 2007-2008 school year = 56 teachers
- 2008-2009 school year = 56 teachers
- 2009-2010 school year = 56 teachers = 224 teachers

During the 2006-2007 school year 280 teachers participated based on the following workshop roster count:

- High school + Alternative school = 61
- Middle school = 60
- Early childhood, primary, and elementary school = 159

1.2.2 Interrupted time series instrument. To what extent did teachers' knowledge and awareness increase?

Baseline administration of a new, customized instrument, the Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES) was completed with an experimental group ($n=22$) and a randomized control group ($n=24$). Alpha reliability for the 53-item instrument was 0.97. Reliability for each of six scales was: Trustworthiness = 0.88; Respect = 0.94; Responsibility = 0.84; Fairness = 0.90; Caring = 0.92; and Citizenship = 0.86. These scales are grounded in the "six pillars" this objective is based on.

Results: Overall there was nearly no difference in the mean of the control group compared to the experimental group (0.03) in the baseline administration on the response scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = almost never, 2 = rarely, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, and 5 = Almost Always. Levine's item-by-item test of heteroschedasticity was used to determine if the variance of the two groups' distributions differed significantly. At a 95% confidence level CCES Trustworthiness item 6 ($F = 5.29, p = 0.026$), Respect item 10 ($F = 4.78, p = 0.034$), Caring item 43 ($F = 7.97, p = 0.007$), and Citizenship items 48 ($F = 9.19, p = 0.004$) and 54 ($F = 5.87, p = 0.020$) were found to have significant variances and on the following Independent-Samples t -test unequal-variance estimates were used rather than the equal-variance estimates for these items. The results of the Independent-Samples t -test indicated that means of the experimental group and the control group did not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level on any items except Trustworthiness item 7 ($t = -2.09, df = 44, p = 0.042$) when equal variances were assumed and Fairness item 28 ($t = 2.05, df = 44, p = 0.046$) when equal variances were assumed. Cohen's $d = 0.3$ indicating a small effect size.

Second administration of the Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES) was completed with an experimental group ($n=21$) and a randomized control group ($n=24$). Alpha reliability for the 53-item instrument was 0.98. Reliability for each of six scales was: Trustworthiness = 0.91; Respect = 0.92; Responsibility = 0.82; Fairness = 0.90; Caring = 0.95; and Citizenship = 0.92.

Results: There was a mean difference of 0.20 between the control group (scoring lower) responses on the 1 – 5 pt. scale and the experimental group (scoring higher) for the second administration of the CCES. This is a mean increase of 0.17 from the baseline administration to the second administration of the CCES.

Levine's item-by-item test of heteroschedasticity was used to determine if the variance of the two groups' distributions differed significantly. At a 95% confidence level CCES Trustworthiness item 7 ($F = 5.76, p = 0.023$) and Citizenship item 53 ($F = 6.88, p = 0.014$) were found to have significant variances. Therefore, on the Independent-Samples t -test unequal-variance estimates were used rather than the equal-variance estimates for the above items.

The results of the Independent-Samples t -test indicated that means of the experimental group and the control group differed significantly at the 95% confidence level on 15 items. These results indicate that the experimental group perceived more character education characteristics on six CCES scales than did the control group, with the most changes related to teachers' perceptions of student Respect (6 items) and Caring (4 items). However, control group teachers had stronger perceptions related to student Responsibility than did the experimental teachers. Effect size remained small at Cohen's $d = 0.1$.

A Phase II qualitative follow-up was conducted on May 22, 2007, four character education "experimental group" teachers randomly selected and four control group teachers randomly selected to participate in two separate focus group sessions. Each group consisted of one Primary, Elementary, Middle, and High school teacher. Each session was approximately one hour long. Participants were shown a bar graph of the Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES) combined results and asked as a group to speculate on particular scales. The scales of focus were Respect, Caring, and Citizenship since the response differences between

groups were most evident on these scales. On the scale of student Respect, experimental group teachers seemed to simply assume character education is just a part of their day-to-day teaching, however, the control group teachers tended to place blame for their low-level perceptions on the students or a lack of time to add character education to the curriculum (viewing character education as a add on). On the scale of Caring control group teachers tended to place the direction of student caring on external factors such a home environment and the students themselves. Meanwhile, the experimental group had fewer comments; one Elementary teacher's speculation was that because they [the teachers] are aware of Caring as a result of professional development, they naturally notice it more. On the scale of Citizenship both groups of teachers seemed to acknowledge that the concept of citizenship is difficult to understand. Even with the Citizenship survey items in hand during the focus group session the teachers focused on the Pledge of Allegiance, a recent school discipline situation involving a High School athlete, and the dress code rather than what the survey indicated related to citizenship—resolving conflicts, taking an active role in governance, and working together. Perhaps teachers themselves have difficulty understanding the concept of citizenship when placed in this context of character education.

1.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
1.3 Implementation of the model curricula developed in strategy 1.1. (<i>Performance Measure 1.a. above.</i>)	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		223	/		27	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1.3.1 Content analysis. Did 223 teachers implement character education lessons with students?

The raw number for this measure is estimated over the life of the grant (4 years). Therefore, up to 56 teachers annually will implement model curricula based on the following schedule:

- 2006-2007 school year = 56 teachers
- 2007-2008 school year = 56 teachers
- 2008-2009 school year = 56 teachers
- 2009-2010 school year = 56 teachers = 224 teachers

Based on a review of teacher lesson plans and lesson summaries, 27 teachers implemented character education lessons as of April 4, 2007.

All 223 teachers were not trained in character education until January 2007. There was not sufficient time for teachers to implement the training they received into their lessons. All teachers will receive character education training August 2007 and be able to implement character education lessons for the 2007-08 school year.

1.3.2 Randomized experimental design with instrument. Use Solomon's four-group design to measure the extent to which students internalize the 6 scales (character traits) for objective 1.

Instrument developed in three grade-appropriate variations. High school = 54-item pilot; Middle school = 54-item pilot; Elementary = 18-item pilot.
To be content validated, early May 2007.
To be administered in August/September 2007.

1.3.3 Student interviews & focus groups. Follow-up quantitative data gathering to support findings.

Scheduled for fall 2007.

1.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
--------------------------	--------------	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--

1.4 Develop and include modification options to the character education curricula for students with learning and physical disabilities.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		29	/		47	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

1.4.1 Content analysis. Did 29 teachers implement character education lessons with special education students?

Based on lesson plans, lesson plan summaries, and teacher self-reports, 47 teachers teaching special education students implemented character education. Forty-three teachers implemented in their mainstream classes and four teachers implemented in their resource/life skills (severe & profound) special education classes. At least 325 special education students (303 mainstream students + 22 resource/life skills) were served by these lessons.

1.4.2 Same as that for strategy 1.3, but post-test only randomized experimental design due to small numbers of students.

Instrument developed in three grade-appropriate variations. High school = 54-item pilot; Middle school = 54-item pilot; Elementary = 18-item pilot. The new instruments developed were content validated on May 8, 2007, with the following student groups:

Primary School students – $n = 57$ second grade students, 6 of whom were classified as special education students.

Middle School students – $n = 40$ 8th grade students, 5 of whom were classified as special education students.

High School students – $n = 18$ students (mixed grade levels), 2 were classified as special education students.

$N = 115$

These instruments are to be administered in August/September 2007.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215S060102

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

2. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

2.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.1 Implement Service Learning classes for middle school (elective) and high school students (mandatory).	GPRA	2	/		2	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

2.1.1 Records Analysis. Was a service learning elective added to the middle school curriculum?

Yes, in the form of a middle school "study skills" elective course.

How many students enrolled/completed?

Fifty nine students enrolled.

Was service learning made mandatory for high school students?

No, due to Texas Education Agency core curriculum requirements a mandatory class could not be established. However, a service learning class was developed as an elective.

Was the course added to the curriculum?

Yes, in the form of a high school elective called "Voice, Action, Leadership-U" (VALUe).

How many students enrolled/completed?

Ninety-two students enrolled. Courses are still ongoing as of this reporting period.

How many hours did students participate in service learning?

Based on student time logs kept as a part of their courses and teacher reports, 84 high school students completed a total of 1,883 service learning hours (mean=22.4 hours each).

2.1.2 Randomized experimental design. Use Solomon's four-group design to measure the extent to which students learned, to which their attitudes changed, and to which they were impacted.

A draft instrument, the Service Learning Survey, has been developed and was content validated with mixed grade levels of High School students (N = 37) May 8, 2007. The instrument was field tested online the week of May 22, 2007. When these field test data were subjected to Chronbach's alpha for examining reliability the overall instrument

held up at 0.96 ($N = 211$). Individual scale alpha coefficient's ranged from 0.56 to 0.92, with the weakest being the scale of Challenge and the strongest the scale of Attitudes toward Service. When subjected to factor analysis the scales of Learning, Autonomy, Challenge, Belonging, Empowerment, and Responsibility (analyzed together since they had the same four point response scale) mostly held to their a priori scale when the cut-off score was set at 0.40. Some Learning scale items crossed factors, presumably because the entire instrument was administered under the pretext of learning regarding service learning. When independently subjected to factor analysis the two attitude scales (analyzed independent of the impact scales since the attitude scales have a different (4 point) response scale) mostly held to their a priori scale expectations when the cut-off score was set at 0.50. Given these analyses results demonstrate good validity.

Following instrument validity and reliability analyses an independent-samples t -test was conducted to analyze if the means of the experimental group (students enrolled in the VALU Service Learning class) and the control group students (those not enrolled in the service learning class) differed significantly at the 95% confidence level. The results indicated that means of the experimental group and the control group differed significantly at the 95% confidence level on 15 items. These data suggest that on the scales of Learning, Challenge, Belonging, Empowerment, Responsibility, and Attitude toward Community Activity that there was very little difference between experimental group students and control group students. However, on the scales of Autonomy and Attitude toward Service, there is a difference overall between VALUE Service Learning class students and students not enrolled in the VALUE class.

In an effort to explore for any associations between the impact scales of Learning, Autonomy, Challenge, Belonging, Empowerment, and Responsibility, and the two attitude scales simple correlation analyses were conducted. No statistically significant associations were found in the correlation analyses (r) between how service was performed (i.e. as part of a class, part of a school-sponsored activity, or as part of a non-school group) and the impact scales. Similarly, simple correlations were explored between enrollment in the VALU Service Learning class and the eight SLS scales. Statistically significant correlations were found on all scales, however, they were all negative, suggesting that service learning course enrollment and how one does service, if s/he does it, does not have an impact on students' attitudes toward service or other factors studied in this measure.

2.1.3 Student interviews & focus groups. Follow-up quantitative measures with qualitative measures.

To be completed spring 2008.

2.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
2.2 Ensure that 90% of Floresville High School students graduate with 75 hours of service learning by 2010.	Project		/	90		/	9

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

2.2.1 Records analysis. What percentage of students graduate with how many hours of service learning?

2006-2007 – 92 students (9%) in Floresville High School are expected to graduate with 75 hours of service learning each.

Newly state-mandated changes required that the high school service learning class change from a mandatory class to an elective. The initial goal of 75 service learning hours was based on the example from Maryland schools. The high school class is a one semester course; students averaged 22.4 hours on two major projects in the Spring semester 2007. The graduation requirement for 75 service learning hours will be discontinued.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215S060102

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

3. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

3.a. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
3.1 Develop and implement professional development for classroom and campus leaders in individual student and ecological character assets.	GPR	152	/		168	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.1.1 Records analysis. Was the professional development developed?

- “Building Developmental Assets” professional development for Primary and Elementary schools was implemented in January 2007.
- “Powerful Teaching” professional development for Middle schools was implemented in January 2007.

Did 152 teachers participate in the professional development?

- 108 teachers and 21 staff members participated in the “Building Developmental Assets” professional development.
- 60 teachers participated in the “Powerful Teaching” professional development.
- A total of **168 teachers participated**.

3.1.2 Interrupted time series. To what extent did participants’ knowledge, awareness, and efficacy increase?

For each professional development (“Building Developmental Assts” and “Powerful Teaching”) a test of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy was developed based on the professional development content and Krathwhol’s Revised Taxonomy (for knowledge/awareness items). An interrupted time series evaluation method was used—one pre-test and two post-tests. This is a change in the original evaluation plan of two pre-tests and two-post tests due to insufficient time from grant award/IRB approval to professional development implementation. This quantitative phase was followed by a qualitative phase using focus groups to extract teacher perceptions related to the quantitative results.

“Building Developmental Assets” Results – The pre-test was administered in December 2006 (N=171) and the first post-test was administered in January 2007 (N=119). There were 52 fewer responses to the post-test. The post-test showed an **increase of 15.8%** in teacher knowledge and awareness of character education and a **marginal increase of 0.38** on a 1-5 pt. scale on the measure of efficacy.

Phase I quantitative results

There was one statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test 1 at $p < .05$ using a paired-samples t -test with no correlation between those scoring high on one test scoring high on another ($r = -0.004$, $p = 0.963$). The remaining paired-samples t -tests demonstrated no statistically significant differences between the test administrations. Using a one-sample t -test with a preset test value of 70 (a passing grade in many academic environments) teachers scored significantly below the target on each test administration. These quantitative results indicate that outside of an immediate post-professional development increase in

character education knowledge at the simple recall-remember cognitive level teachers' overall knowledge, awareness, and efficacy regarding character education, strictly in terms of Building 40 Development Assets, had little lasting impact during the study period.

Phase II qualitative results

On May 22, 2007, three Primary teachers and three Elementary teachers were randomly selected ($N = 6$) to participate in a one-hour long focus group to speculate on reasons behind selected quantitative test results. The selected results were those that appeared as outliers or extreme cases when descriptive test scores from each administration of the Building Developmental Assets (BDA) 10-item measure of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy were presented. Selected test items discussed included items:

3. *Support* can be practiced by which of the following?
4. *Social Competencies* can be practiced by which of the following?
7. The primary developmental asset schools can most directly impact is/are:
8. Which one of the following is a "new attitude" according to the Search Institute?
9. How competent do you feel as a Developmental Assets teacher?
10. Overall, how effective do you feel you are at teaching "character"?

Regarding item 3, the low overall mean was attributed by the focus group as material not learned during the Building Developmental Assets (BDA) professional development that was held in January 2007 (after the pre-test).

The group indicated that the consistently low mean on item 4 could be attributed to the lack of context clues in the response items (there were four response choices—one correct and three distracters). In other words, they could not guess the correct answer. The group also noted that a lot of material was presented during the training ("...a lot to take in...") and they were not certain what they were supposed to be learning at that point.

Regarding item 7, the group consensus was that they did not learn the material covered in the item having to do with achievement motivation as the primary developmental asset schools could most directly impact.

The consistent mean rise in knowledge reflected in item 8 was attributed by the focus group to their previous knowledge rather than that acquired in the BDA professional development. One teacher noted that students as resources "reflects student-centered learning."

Efficacy items 9 and 10, ranked on a Likert-like scale of 1 to 5, were presented and teachers indicated the consistent rise in the mean could be attributed to more exposure to character education and the simple fact that over time and throughout the school year teachers feel more competent and effective.

"Powerful Teaching" Results – The pre-test was administered in December 2006 ($N=61$) and the first post-test was administered in January 2007 ($N=48$). There were 13 fewer responses to the post-test. The post-test demonstrated an **increase of 23.1%** in teacher knowledge and awareness of character education and an **increase of 0.73** on a 1-5 pt. scale on the measure of efficacy.

Phase I quantitative results

In a series of paired-sample t -tests, the difference in means from the pre-test to post-test 1 on the measure of teacher knowledge was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Likewise, the difference in means from the pre-test to post-test 1 on the measure of efficacy was statistically significant. The remaining means demonstrated no statistically significant differences and there were no correlations between those scoring high on one test scoring high on another. Using a one-sample t -test with a preset test value of 70 (a passing grade in many academic environments) teachers scored significantly below the target on the pre-test and post-test 1. However, on post-test 2 the data do not demonstrate a significantly low score. These results indicate there is a chance that teachers' gained knowledge related to Powerful Teaching as they practiced and became more familiar with the methods.

Phase II qualitative results

On May 22, 2007, four Middle School teachers were randomly selected to participate in a 45-minute long focus group to speculate on reasons behind selected quantitative test results. The selected results were those that appeared as outliers or extreme cases when descriptive test scores from each administration of the

Powerful Teaching (PT) 7-item measure of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy were presented. Overall test results and the following selected test items were discussed:

2. List as many strategies as you can for infusing Developmental Assets in your classroom/content area:

5. There are 8 pro-social asset categories with 4 of them representing external structures, relationships, and activities that create a positive environment for young people. The other 4 categories reflect internal values, skills, and beliefs young people need to fully engage and function.

Please read over the following list and select whether the category focuses on external or internal assets.

Asset Category	External Assets	Internal Assets
Boundaries & expectations	___	___
Commitment to learning	___	___
Constructive use of time	___	___
Empowerment	___	___
Positive identity	___	___
Positive values	___	___
Social competencies	___	___
Support	___	___

6. We know that asset building in classrooms and schools can occur in three key areas. For each area, offer a tangible example of what you are doing/could do to focus more intentionally on asset building:

a. Relationships:

b. The classroom environment:

c. Your classroom curriculum:

Regarding the overall rising trend in mean scores of 60 teachers, the focus group teachers attributed this to teachers simply being more aware of character education after the professional development (post-test 1). They also agreed that they had some awareness of character education after being involved in a Middle School principal-initiated book study prior to the grant period and that after the Power Teaching professional development much of the book and the PT program became more evident and concrete.

When the focus group was asked to speculate on the sharp rise then drop in the mean score for item 2 there was consensus that during post-test 1 “could do” ideas were fresh on our minds.” The drop indicated in post-test 2 was likely due to teachers’ focus on the state-mandated achievement test.

When queried regarding the consistent rise in mean scores for items 5 and 6 the group admitted to using their Powerful Teaching workbook to aid them in recalling facts. They noted that most of the teachers had figured out by post-test 2 that these items could be answered from the book.

3.b. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.2 Develop and implement education for parents and community leaders in individual student and ecological character assets.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		50	/		23	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.2.1 Records analysis. Was information and education developed and implemented?

Yes. A community version of Building Developmental Assets was developed and implemented at two community meetings as follows:

Meeting 1 = February 15, 2007 1 hr
Meeting 2 = April 25, 2007 35 minutes

Did 50 community leaders participate?

No. Twenty-three parents/community members participated in two meetings held February 1 and April 25, 2007, 27 parents/community members short of the objective.

February 15, 2007 = 16 attendees
April 25, 2007 = 7 attendees

The two community meetings were held on weeknights in order for parents to be able to attend after work. Bulletins were sent home with students, press releases were printed in both community newspapers, fliers were placed in local businesses, invitations were hand delivered to community members, and local churches were asked to announce the April 25 meeting. Meetings will be offered in both fall and spring semesters at convenient times for community members and parents to attend.

3.2.2 Quasi-experimental design. To what extent did participants' knowledge, awareness, and efficacy increase?

This measure consisted of a single-group prettest-posttest design and a quasi-experimental nonequivalent-groups posttest-only design. The single-group pre-test—a 10-item quiz of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy—was administered at the beginning of a meeting of parents and community leaders ($N = 22$). A post-test was administered at the end of the information session. Short-term duration knowledge and awareness was significant ($p = .001$) and somewhat correlated ($r = 0.48$). Short-term perceptions of efficacy demonstrated significance ($p = .005$) and correlation ($r = .61$).

The quasi-experimental nonequivalent-groups posttest-only results used the post-test from the above experimental group ($n = 22$) and a single test from a control group ($n = 11$). The results of an independent-samples t -test indicate a statistically significant difference between experimental group scores and control group scores on knowledge ($p = .000$, 2-tailed) and efficacy ($p = .000$) items at the 95% confidence level.

Finally, a one-sample t -test was conducted using a cut-off score of 70 (a passing grade in many academic environments). Community leaders and parents (experimental group, $n = 22$) scored significantly below the target on the pre-test ($t = -5.4$, $df = 21$, $p = .000$) and the control group ($n = 11$) also scored significantly below the target ($t = -10.1$, $df = 10$, $p = .000$). These results should be viewed with the limits in mind that the community leaders/parents (experimental group) post-test was conducted immediately after the information meeting. It should also be noted that the control group mean (25 of 100%) and the experimental group pre-test

mean (44 of 100%) indicate that some community leaders/parents came in with more knowledge and awareness, which is possibly why they participated in the meeting, simply because they are more aware and active parents/community leaders.

3.c. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.3 Develop and implement professional development for high school teachers in character-building practices based on the <i>Smart and Good High Schools Project</i> .	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		96	/		91	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.3.1 Records analysis. Was the professional development developed?

Professional development based on the “Smart and Good High School” model was developed and delivered in January 2007.

Did 96 teachers participate in the professional development?

91 teachers and 24 staff participated in the professional development, 5 teachers short of the objective.

There are only 85 teachers on the high school campus. The performance measure will be changed to 85 teachers to match the number of teachers on the campus. All teachers will receive professional development August 2007.

3.3.2 Interrupted time series. To what extent did participants’ knowledge, awareness, and efficacy increase?

For the “Smart and Good” professional development a test of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy was developed based on the professional development content and Krathwhol’s Revised Taxonomy (for knowledge/awareness items). An interrupted time series evaluation method was used—one pre-test and two post-tests. This is a change in the original evaluation plan of two pre-tests and two-post tests due to insufficient time from grant award/IRB approval to professional development implementation.

This measure was conducted in two phases. Phase I was a quantitative multiple time-series measure using an 11-item test of teachers’ knowledge, awareness, and efficacy related to Smart and Good High Schools (SGHS) professional development, a mass-produced, pre-packaged character education teacher professional development program presented to 86 High School teachers. Phase II was a follow-up qualitative measure consisting of a focus group with a convenience sample of teachers ($N = 6$) who participated in the SGHS professional development.

Phase I quantitative results

In a series of paired-sample t -tests, the difference in means on the cognitive test component demonstrated no statistically significant differences from pre-test to post-test 1. There was a correlation demonstrated between those scoring higher on the pre-test also scoring high on post-test 1 ($r = .70$).

Using a one-sample t -test with a preset test value of 70 (a passing grade in many academic environments) teachers scored significantly ($p < .05$) below the target on all three tests: Pre-test mean = 47.9 (SD = 16.5, $n = 95$), post-test 1 mean = 55.3 (SD = 19.1, $n = 50$), and post-test 2 mean = 47.8 (SD = 19.2, $n = 60$). However, it should be considered that only the pre-test had a normal distribution.

These quantitative results indicate that there is a chance that teachers’ gained little knowledge related to Smart and Good High Schools professional development since their pre-test mean scores and their time-delayed post-test 2 mean scores are nearly equivalent.

Phase II qualitative results

On May 22, 2007, six High School teachers were selected to participate in a one-hour long focus group to speculate on reasons behind selected quantitative test results. The selected results were those that appeared as outliers or extreme cases when descriptive test scores from each administration of the Smart and Good High Schools 11-item measure of knowledge, awareness, and efficacy were presented. Overall test results and the following selected test items were discussed:

1. Identify the six principles by which an ethical learning community is created.
2. *Performance* and *performance character* are the same thing.
3. *Task orientation* is when a student seeks to:
6. A Professional Ethical Learning Community (PELC) consists of:
7. List specific things you do to promote an ethical learning community in your classroom.
8. Which of the following are considered promising practices for developing diligent and capable performing students?
9. Which of the following are considered promising practices for developing an ethical learning community?

Regarding item 1 with a spiking mean shortly after the SGHS professional development and then a sharp drop during the second post-test, the focus group agreed that they were confused about the six pillars presented in the professional development and that they did not yet have sufficient information to select a more accurate response.

Item 2 had a particularly high mean for each test administration because it was the only alternative-response (true/false) item and the group speculated that the correct response was easy to guess.

The low and consistently falling mean for item 3 the group suggested was related to what one teacher coined the “apathy factor.” Teachers admitted to just “getting the test done but no worrying too much about it.”

The consistently low mean for item 6 was attributed to uncertainty regarding the word “community” in the item. Teachers, the focus group suggested, may have thought community was related to the city of Floresville, not the school community as presented in the professional development.

The mean score recovery in item 7 was attributed to experience in recognizing ethical learning community and being able to practice teaching the concept in class.

Regarding overall low means for items 8 and 9, the teachers suggested all of the response items were “good answers.” In other words, the teachers could not discriminate between promising practices for developing *capable students* and for developing an *ethical learning community*, two distinctly different concepts, as presented in the SGHS professional development.

3.d. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.4 Implement the positive role model/leadership <i>Link Crew Program</i> to support at-risk and traditionally under-represented students transitioning to high school.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		3	/		1	/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.4.1 Records analysis. Did 3 high school counselors implement the program?

No, one counselor implemented the program with one teacher. This objective was not attained due to pre-grant award re-organization of the high school counselors. Currently, only the 9th grade counselor will participate with one other teacher for the duration of the grant.

A third teacher will receive training early May 2007.

How many students were directly impacted?

292 freshmen in the class of 2010 were directly impacted.

3.4.2 Randomized experimental design. Use Solomon's four-group design to measure the extent to which students perceive the transitional environment.

A new instrument, the High School Transition Survey (HSTS), was developed to measure the extent to which student perceive the transitional environment related to the Link Crew Program aimed at supporting students transitioning from 8th grade to high school. The 18-item instrument consisted of a *Connection to School* scale and a *Self-Efficacy/Attribution* scale derived from modifications of previously developed instruments. The instrument was content validated May 8, 2007, with 40 8th grade students, 5 of whom were special education classified.

The instrument was transformed into a Web-based instrument and administered the week of May 16, 2007. Only 21 responses were received which is insufficient to use for evaluation. Therefore, this objective cannot be measured until 2007-2008 8th grade students transition to 9th grade in August 2008.

3.4.3 Student interviews & focus groups. Follow-up quantitative data gathering to support findings.

These interviews are scheduled to be conducted in October 2007.

3.e. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
3.5 Continue quarterly meetings of the <i>Character Education Committee</i> to provide students, staff, parents, and community members a voice in the design and implementation of the FISD Character Education Program.	GPRA	Target			Actual Performance Data		
		Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		999	/			/	

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

3.5.1 Records analysis. Were continued meetings held?

Yes. Meetings were held on the following dates:

- August 23, 2006
- September 6, 2006 (Red Ribbon sub-committee)
- September 12, 2006 (Positive Coaching sub-committee)
- September 27, 2006
- November 15, 2006
- February 7, 2007
- April 25, 2007

Did community members and FISD staff participate/attend?

Yes. Based on sign-in sheet records the following Character Education Committee members participated in the following meetings:

- August 23, 2006 – 22 school staff, 3 community members
- September 6, 2006 (Red Ribbon Sub-committee) – 9 staff, 0 community members

September 7, 2006 (Positive Coaching Sub-committee) – 7 staff, 0 community members
September 12, 2006 (Community Awareness Sub-committee) -- 9 staff, 0 community members
September 27, 2006 – 23 staff, 3 community members
November 15, 2006 – 20 staff, 3 community members
February 7, 2007 – 18 staff, 2 community members
April 25, 2007 – 17 staff, 8 community members

Mean FISS staff participating in regular meetings = 20.
Mean community members = 4.

3.5.2 Single-group time series design. On an ongoing basis do stakeholders perceive that they have a voice in designing the FISS Character Education Program?

Based on the results of a Character Education Committee Involvement Questionnaire administered April 25, 2007, 93% of the committee members ($n=14$) feel they have a voice in the FISS Character Counts program. Seventy-one percent of those responding ($n=14$) feel they have been able to contribute to the development of the program.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1890-0004
Exp. 10-31-2007

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)