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.

1.1. 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**	**/**		**35**	/	

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

1.1.1 Records analysis. Were the lessons developed?

Nine primary and 26 secondary-level character education lessons were available as of April 17, 2008, for a total of 35 submitted lessons.

Were 12 "developers" involved?

Yes, 17 developers were involved.

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 35 lessons meet the criteria.

1.2. 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 (*Performance Measure 1.a. above*) and other character education activities.	**GPRA**	**223**	/		756	/	

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 throughout the 2007-2008 academic year.

Did 223 teachers participate in the professional development?

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

--High school + Alternative school = 204
--Middle school = 157
--Early childhood, primary, and elementary school = 395

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

The Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES) was administered in August 2007 and December 2007. In order to examine the relationships that may exist among the subscales correlation analyses were conducted. The results indicate poor associations among the six scales of Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship (August 2007 $r < .45$, December 2007 $r < .51$).

Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability of each scale and overall instrument reliability of the August administration of the CCES. Scale reliability fell between 0.82 and 0.98, while the overall reliability was 0.98 for the entire instrument for this administration. Scale reliability fell between 0.59 and 0.94, while the overall reliability was 0.97 for the entire instrument for the December administration.

A MANOVA with the August and December 2007 administrations as independent variables (Time) and experimental group Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship as the dependent variables demonstrated no statistically significant effect [$F(11, 6) = 1.0$, $p = 1.00$, *Wilk's lambda* = 1.0, partial *partial eta* = .00, power = .05]. Examination of experimental group results vs. control group results indicated no statistically significant main effect [$F(2,12) = 2.35$, $p = .178$, *Wilk's lambda* = .151, partial *partial eta* = .85, power = .38].

A Phase II qualitative follow-up was conducted on April 16, 2008. Experimental group primary/elementary teachers (n=10), middle school teachers (n=7), and high school teachers (n=4) participated in three separate focus group sessions. Participants were shown bar graphs of a variety of Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES) results and asked as a group to speculate on particular scale anomalies as well as 2006 – 2007 data trends. They were also asked to identify process issues of (1) program barriers, (2) program things that work well, and (3) possible program changes that could improve character education as at the school level.

All teachers – When asked about the trend of falling perceptions of student character on six scales from 2006 to present, teachers attributed them to their rising expectations of students (thus, teachers are more aware of character education issues in their classrooms and don't rank their students as strong as in the early part of the grant program) and "survey fatigue" (i.e. constantly doing surveys for this program and others).

Primary/Elementary teachers – When asked about a drop in perceptions related to the scale of Trustworthiness from 8-2007 to 12-2007, teachers stated that as students become more comfortable in their classes they are less inhibited by teachers and fellow students, thus they tend to push truth and honesty-oriented characteristics further.

Middle school teachers – When asked about a drop from 8-2007 to 12-2007 on the scale of Respect teachers attributed it to the nearing holiday season. They stated that a similar phenomenon happens just before spring break and the end of the school year. Further, when shown a bar chart of middle school student CCES results compared to middle school teacher CCES results where there is a noticeable difference between teacher/student perceptions on the scales of Trustworthiness and Fairness (teachers perceiving stronger character than the students), teachers noted that students know what is "really going on" related to trust in the school. Likewise, teachers attributed their stronger perceptions of student fairness as related to their limited classroom perspectives as teachers. They think students may know more about "hallway behavior" being less fair than the teachers' view in the classroom.

High school teachers – When asked about a sharp rise in their perspectives related to the scale of Responsibility from 8-2007 to 12-2007, teachers attributed it to students becoming familiar with teacher expectations over the course of the school year. Also, CCES teacher results and CCES student results were presented. On the scales of Respect and Citizenship teachers had stronger perceptions than their students. The high school teachers, like the middle school teachers, attributed this difference to the fact that they don't see what goes on in the hallways and before/after school related to students respecting each other and teachers, and students "doing the right thing" as found in the Citizenship scale items.

1.3. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
1.3 Implementation of the model curricula developed in strategy 1.1. (*Performance Measure 1.a. above.*)	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		56	/		86	/	

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, 86 teachers implemented character education lessons as of April 25, 2008.

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.

Elementary Level: The Classroom Community Environment Survey (CCES)-Elementary was administered in December 2007 to a control group consisting of 17 elementary school students and an experimental group of 115 students. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability of each scale and overall instrument reliability. Scale reliability fell between 0.23 and 0.57, while the overall reliability was 0.75 for the entire instrument for this administration. A second administration was conducted in early February 2008 and a third was conducted in late March 2008.

In order to examine the relationships among the subscales, correlation analyses were conducted for the three administration periods. The results indicate a moderate to statistically significant degrees of associations exists among the scales of Trustworthiness, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship, and very weak associations between the scales of Respect and Responsibility. Therefore, Trustworthiness, Caring, Citizenship, and Respect were grouped as a new composite variable called Character Values, while Responsibility and Fairness remained independent of one another and the new composite variable.

A MANOVA with administrations one (n = 115), two (n = 92), and three (n = 91) as the repeated variable and Responsibility, Fairness, and Character Values as the dependent variables demonstrated no significant effect for time ($p < 0.01$). No control group data were available for administrations two and three, thus no meaningful repeated measures analyses between groups could be conducted over time. However, control and experimental data from administration one (baseline) was collected and the results of an Independent-Samples *t*-test indicated that scale means of the experimental group and the control group did not differ significantly at the 95% confidence level.

Middle School and High School Level: The CCES for middle school and high school is the same instrument. It was administered in November 2007, February 2008, and March 2008 to middle and high school students. Correlation analyses results indicated poor associations among the six scales of Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship from the combined second and third administration results ($p < .01$, N = 594).

Middle School Level: Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability of each scale and overall instrument reliability administered at the middle school level (November 2007, N = 97). Scale reliability fell between 0.80 and 0.97, while the overall reliability was 0.97 for the entire instrument for this administration. A MANOVA with administrations one (November 2007), two (February 2008), and three (March 2008) as independent variables (Time) and experimental group Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship as the dependent variables demonstrated no statistically significant effect [$F(12, 38) = 1.08$, $p = .403$, *Wilk's lambda* = .556, partial *partial eta* = .254, power = .51]. However, a significant univariate interaction between scale of Trustworthiness and

time was found [*F*(2, 24) = 3.79, *p* = 0.25, partial *partial eta* = .24, power = .634] where November's *M* = 3.5, *SD* = .17; February's *M* = 3.1, *SD* = .17; and March's *M* = 3.3, *SD* = .16, indicating a "leveling off" after the initial CCES administration. Examination of experimental group results vs. control group results indicated no statistically significant main effect [*F*(2, 16) = 3.287, *p* = 0.099, *Wilk's lambda* = .113, partial *partial eta* = .887, power = .516].

High School Level: The CCES was administered in November 2007, February 2008, and March 2008 to the experimental and control group. Reliability was verified using the November 2007 data set of the control group consisting of 54 high school students and the experimental group of 155 students. Cronbach's Alpha was used to determine the reliability of each scale and overall instrument reliability. Scale reliability fell between 0.84 and 0.91, while the overall reliability was 0.97 for the entire instrument for this administration. A MANOVA with administrations one (November 2007), two (February 2008), and three (March 2008) as independent variables (Time) and experimental group Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship as the dependent variables demonstrated a statistically significant main effect [*F*(12, 38) = 6.47, *p* = .000, *Wilk's lambda* = .108, partial *partial eta* = .671, power = 1.00] of a drop then slight rise in the experimental students' perceptions of their environment over time. Examination of experimental group (*n* = 155) results vs. control group (*n* = 54) results using MANOVA for the November 2007 administration indicated a statistically significant main effect [*F*(6, 11) = 5.33, *p* = 0.008, *Wilk's lambda* = .256, partial *partial eta* = .74, power = .92], where the experimental group subscale means were stronger than those of the control group. Examination of experimental group (*n* = 145) results vs. control group (*n* = 8) results using MANOVA for the February 2008 administration indicated a statistically significant main effect [*F*(6, 11) = 8.06, *p* = 0.002, *Wilk's lambda* = .185, partial *partial eta* = .82, power = .99]. Examination of experimental group (*n* = 110) results vs. control group (*n* = 21) results using MANOVA for the March 2008 administration indicated a statistically significant main effect [*F*(6, 11) = 5.33, *p* = 0.08, *Wilk's lambda* = .256, partial *partial eta* = .74, power = .92].

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

Scheduled for May 2008.

1.4. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
1.4 Develop and include modification options to the character education curricula for students with learning and physical disabilities.	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		29	/		66	/	

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, 66 teachers teaching special education students implemented character education with at least 934 special education students.

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

Instrument developed in three grade-appropriate variations and piloted in early 2007. The instruments were administered in the fall of 2007; however, with the small number of "mainstreamed" special education students, there were insufficient results in the random design as reported below:

Elementary-Level CCES 2007 Baseline for Special Education - The CCES was administered in November 2007 to a control group consisting of 17 elementary school students and an experimental group of 115 students selected by random. Of the 115 experimental group students only six were identified as special education students. Of the 17 control group students none were identified as special education students. Therefore, the special education sample drawn from the larger random population was insufficient for conducting meaningful analyses.

Middle School Level CCESS 2007 Baseline for Special Education - The CCES was administered in November 2007, to a randomly selected experimental group of 97 students of which only two were identifiable as special education. No control group results were available. Therefore, the special education sample drawn from the larger random population was insufficient for conducting meaningful analyses.

*High School-Level CCES 2007 Baseline for Special Education - T*he CCES was administered in November 2007 to a control group consisting of 54 high school students and an experimental group of 155 students. Of this randomly-selected population only 12 experimental group students were identifiable as special education and only two control group students were identifiable as special education. Therefore, the special education sample drawn from the larger random population was insufficient for conducting meaningful analyses.

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.

2.1. 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.

How many students enrolled in the middle school service learning class?

Seventy-seven students enrolled in the year-long class.

How many students enrolled in the high school service learning class?

Fall 2007 = 43 students
Spring 2008 = 106 students, of which 23 are graduating.

How many hours did high school students participate in service learning?

Fall 2007, 940 total hours of service learning (mean = 21.86 hrs/student)
Spring 2007, term is not complete and hours are ongoing at the time of this report.

2.1.2 Randomized experimental design to measure the extent to which students learned, to which their attitudes changed, and to which they were impacted.

The 56-item *Service Learning Survey* (SLS), with eight scales of: Learning (8 items), Autonomy (6 items), Challenge (3 items), Belonging (3 items), Empowerment (5 items), and Responsibility (5 items), with a 4-item response scale of *Never, Seldom, Often*, and *Always*, and two semantic differential scales of Attitude toward Community Activity (11 items) and Attitude toward Service (10 items) was administered to 38 mixed-grade high school students in August 2007, December 2007, January 2008, and April 2008.

August 2007: When subjected to Chronbach's alpha, the overall instrument held up at 0.97. The individual scale alpha coefficient's ranged from 0.60 to 0.94 (N = 38). Correlation analysis revealed good to strong correlations between dependent variables, so Learning, Autonomy, Challenge, Belonging, and Empowerment were combined to form a new variable called Service Learning. A second correlation analysis between the new variable Service Learning and the previous Responsibility, and Attitude variables revealed weak correlations ($r < .26$).

December 2007: When subjected to Chronbach's alpha analysis, the overall instrument for the field test held up at 0.98. The individual scale alpha coefficient's ranged from 0.67 to 0.96 (N = 43). Like the August administration, correlation analysis revealed good to strong correlations between dependent variables, so Learning, Autonomy, Challenge, Belonging, and Empowerment were combined to form a new variable called Service Learning. Responsibility and Attitude remained as dependent variables. A new correlation analysis was conducted on the new variable set revealing $r < .52$.

August – April Analyes: In order to determine if service learning influenced students' Service Learning perceptions, Responsibility, and Attitudes, a MANOVA was conducted with group (experimental vs. control) as the independent variable and August and December administrations of variables Service Learning Composite, Responsibility, and Attitude as the dependent variables. No significant main effect was found [*Wilk's lambda*= .061, $F(6, 3) = 7.67$, $p = .061$, *partial eta* = .94, power = .58].

In order to determine if service learning influenced students' Service Learning perceptions, Responsibility, and Attitudes during a second round of evaluation, a MANOVA was conducted with group (experimental vs. control) as the independent variable and January and April administrations of variables Service Learning Composite, Responsibility, and Attitude as the dependent variables. No significant effect was found [*Wilk's lambda*= .119, $F(6, 3) = 3.52$, $p = .154$, *partial eta* = .88, power = .33]. Likewise, MANOVA was used to investigate if students' perceptions changed over time with the August, December, January, and April results as the dependent variable. No significant effect was found [*Wilk's lambda*= .834, $F(9, 34) = .294$, $p = .972$, *partial eta* = .059, power = .11].

2.2. Performance Measure	**Measure Type**	**Quantitative Data**					
		Target			**Actual Performance Data**		
2.2 Ensure that 90% of Floresville High School students graduate with 20 hours of service learning by 2010.	**Project**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**	**Raw Number**	**Ratio**	**%**
			/	**90**		/	**2**

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?

2007-2008 – 48 students (2% of all high school students; 22% of high school seniors) in Floresville High School are expected to graduate with 20 hours of service learning this year.

Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

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.

Floresville ISD will serve as a Character Education model by providing our youth with a caring environment that supports the integration of excellence and ethics in all phases of life.

3.1. 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.	GPRA	152	/		605	/	

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

3.1.1 Records analysis. Was the professional development developed?

Yes. “Smart & Good Schools” professional development was conducted on August 21, 2007 and January 4, 2008 at the Early Childhood Campus, Primary, Elementary and Middle School.

Campus Leadership professional development was conducted on October 4, 2007 and February 4, 2008.

Did 152 classroom and campus leaders participate in the professional development?

August 21, 2007
Early childhood campus = 42 participants
Primary campus = 102 participants
Elementary campus = 78 participants
Middle school campus = 83 participants

October 4, 2007
School administrators = 23 participants

January 4, 2008
Early childhood campus = 41 participants
Primary campus = 51 participants
Elementary campus = 81 participants
Middle school campus = 74 participants

February 4, 2008
School administrators = 30 administrators

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

Building Developmental Assets and Powerful Teaching measures were dropped for the 2007-2008 school year and replaced with the Smart and Good Schools (S&GS) measure due to changes in the professional development program adopted by Floresville ISD.

The Smart and Good Schools instrument was administered in October 2007, January 2008, and March 2008 to the experimental group and the control group (note: no control group data were collected for March 2008 Middle School teachers, no Elementary-level teacher data was provided at all for March 2008).

Middle School: MANOVA results of group by score percentage and efficacy scale mean demonstrated no statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .956, $F(4, 67) = .763$, $p = .553$, *partial eta* = .044, power = .233]. MANOVA results for the experimental group over time demonstrated a statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .625, $F(4, 358) = 23.75$, $p = .000$, *partial eta* = .210, power = 1.0] whereby the mean test score of each administration dropped over time [October $M = 51$, $SD = 16.0$, $n = 61$; January $M = 29$, $SD = 11.3$, $n = 79$; March $M = 29$, $SD = 12.2$, $n = 42$) while efficacy scale mean ($M = 3.5$) held steady on a 1 to 5 scale.

Primary School: MANOVA results of group by score percentage and efficacy scale mean demonstrated a statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .863, $F(4, 70) = .2.78$, $p = .033$, *partial eta* = .137, power = .735]. A follow-up ANOVA revealed the October administration's between groups scores $F(1, 103) = 4.35$ was significant at $p = .039$, where the experimental group test score percentage $M = 41$, $SD = 15.4$, $n = 92$ and the control group test score percentage $M = 51$, $SD = 17.2$, $n = 12$). Likewise, the January administration demonstrated between groups scores as $F(1, 76) = 4.63$ was significant at $p = .035$, where the experimental group test score percentage $M = 26$, $SD = 12.2$, $n = 66$ and the control group test score percentage $M = 34$, $SD = 10.3$, $n = 14$). Efficacy perceptions were not significantly different.

MANOVA results for the experimental group over time (October and January) demonstrated a statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .796, $F(2, 152) = 19.5$, $p = .000$, *partial eta* = .204, power = 1.0] whereby the mean test score of each administration dropped over time [October $M = 41$, $SD = 15.4$, $n = 92$; January $M = 26$, $SD = 11.3$, $n = 66$) while the efficacy scale mean ($M = 3.3$) held steady on a 1 to 5 scale.

3.1.3 To what extent did administrators' knowledge, awareness, and efficacy increase?

Leadership Academy in Character Education (LACE) Test of Knowledge and Efficacy – (Study Period = October 2007 Baseline): The LACE Test of Knowledge and Efficacy was developed specifically to assess school administrators' knowledge and efficacy related to character education. The 13-item instrument includes 11 knowledge items and two efficacy items (perceived competence and perceived effectiveness). The LACE Test was administered for the first time in October 2007 to 22 district administrators. Chronbach's alpha was low at 0.42, with inter-item correlation at 0.50 and below. The mean Knowledge score was 74, $SD = 16.2$ on a scale of 0 -100 and the Efficacy $M = 3.5$, $SD = .95$ on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the strongest. Simple linear correlation analysis found no statistically significant association between administrator knowledge and efficacy ($r = -0.19$, $p = 0.401$).

LACE Test of Knowledge and Efficacy – (Study Period = February 2008): The LACE Test was administered again in February 2008 ($N = 12$). Chronbach's alpha was low at 0.16, with inter-item correlation at 0.45 and below. The mean Knowledge score was 62, $SD = 14.2$ on a scale of 0 -100 and the Efficacy $M = 3.8$, $SD = .53$ on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the strongest. In addition to general descriptive analyses, simple linear correlation analysis found no statistically significant association between administrator knowledge and efficacy ($r = 0.27$, $p = 0.35$).

LACE Test of Knowledge and Efficacy – (Study Period = October 2007 and February 2008): When a One-Sample t-test with a 75 cut-off score was conducted on the October 2007 results the mean percent was not significantly lower than the cut-off score ($t = -.34$, $df = 21$, $p = .74$). The results of the One-Sample t-test on the February 2008 data revealed a significantly lower mean percent than the cut-off score ($t = -3.2$, $df = 11$, $p = .009$). A Paired-Samples t-test found the knowledge scores on the second test ($M = 62$) were significantly lower than those on the first test ($M = 74$)($t = 3.23$, $df = 11$, $p = .008$). There were no associations between variables ($r = .11$, $p = .73$). A Paired-Samples t-test found the efficacy levels indicated on the second test ($M = 3.8$) were not significantly different than those on the first test ($M = 3.5$) ($t = -1.86$, $df = 23$, $p = .08$). Likewise, there was no association between variables ($r = .08$, $p = .71$).

3.2. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
3.2 Develop and implement education for parents and community leaders in individual student and ecological character assets.	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		50	/		117	/	

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

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

Yes.
A) A community course called "*Character Development and Parenting Skills"* was developed and implemented. The course held a sequence of 12 meetings from October 11, 2007 to February 7, 2008. A second offering of this course begin in April 2008.

B) An Open House regarding the "Character Education: Character Counts" pillars and information about student service learning was held on September 24, 2007 and again on February 11, 2008.

Did 50 community members participate?

Yes.
A) Ninety-one community members participated in the "*Character Development and Parenting Skills" course*.

B) September open house = 13 parents; February open house = 13 parents.

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

A new instrument was developed to measure a newly-implemented community professional development program called the Common Sense Parenting and Character Education class. The new instrument consisted of an 8-item quiz of knowledge and efficacy. It was administered in March 2008 to three course participants (experimental group) and 10 non-participants (control group). The results were: Experimental Group Knowledge M = 83 (0 – 100 scale), SD = 29.4, Efficacy M = 3 (1 – 5 scale), SD = .00. Control Group Knowledge M = 57, SD = 12, Efficacy M = 2.2, SD = .67. Results of an independent-samples *t*-test indicated there was a significant difference between the experimental and control group Knowledge mean percent scores ($t = 2.4$, $df = 11$, $p = .034$) and between Efficacy scale scores ($t = 3.1$, $df = 24$, $p = .005$).

3.3. Performance Measure	Measure Type	Quantitative Data					
		Target			Actual Performance Data		
3.3 Develop and implement professional development for high school teachers in character-building practices based on the *Smart and Good High Schools Project*.	GPRA	Raw Number	Ratio	%	Raw Number	Ratio	%
		96	/		207	/	

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

3.3.1 Records analysis. Was professional development developed?

Yes.

August 2008
"Class Meeting Training and Compact for Excellence" = 96 participants
"Service Learning and Character Education Goals" (at the Alternative School) = 14 (included 3 school peace officers)

January 2008
"Teaching for Student Engagement and Relationship Building" = 97 participants

Did 96 teachers participate in the professional development?

207 high school staff and 3 peace officers participated in the professional development.

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

The Smart and Good Schools instrument was administered in October 2007, January 2008, and March 2008 to the experimental group and the control group. Instrument reliability was low at α = .006 October, α = .028 January, α = .013 March. MANOVA results of group by score percentage and efficacy scale mean demonstrated no statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .923, *F*(4, 67) = 1.41, *p* = .242, *partial eta* = .077, power = .414]. MANOVA results for the experimental group over time demonstrated a statistically significant main effect [*Wilk's lambda* = .675, *F*(4, 406) = 22.01, *p* = .000, *partial eta* = .178, power = 1.0] whereby the mean test score of each administration dropped over time [October *M* = 50, *SD* = 17.0, *n* = 81; January *M* = 31, *SD* = 14.5, *n* = 63; March *M* = 29, *SD* = 10.58, *n* = 65) while efficacy scale means held steady.

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

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

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

Yes, 3 high school staff members (1 counselor and 2 teachers) implemented the program.
How many students were directly impacted?

247 freshmen in the class of 2011 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.

The High School Transition Survey (HSTS) was administered in October 2007 to 270 Floresville ISD (experimental group) incoming freshman and to 100 control group incoming freshman (*N* = 370). Reliability analysis was conducted and Chronbach's alpha for the entire instrument was strong at 0.91. The alpha coefficient was 0.87 for the scale of *Connection to School* and 0.88 for the scale of *Self-Efficacy/Attribution*.

In order to examine the relationship between the scale of *Connection to School* and the scale of *Self-Efficacy/Attribution* a correlation analysis was conducted on the entire data set (N = 370). Results indicated a moderate relationship among the variables, suggesting a composite high school transition variable is more suitable for later analyses (R = .57, p = 0.14 (2-tailed at p < 0.01).

In order to explore differences between the experimental incoming freshman (n = 270) and the control group (n = 100) with this one and only administration to date, an Independent-Samples t-test was conducted. The test established that there was no statistically significant difference at the 95% confidence level between students who participated in the Link Crew treatment program and students who did not (t = .562, df = 34, p = 0.578) where the experimental M = 3.1, SD = .29, and the control M = 3.1, SD = .24.

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

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

3.5.1 Records analysis. Were continued meetings held?

Yes.

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:

September 19, 2007: Veteran's Day Subcommittee Meeting 3 district personnel; 1 student; 0 community members
September 25, 2007: 18 district personnel; 7 community members
October 3, 2007: Veteran's Day Subcommittee Meeting 4 district personnel; 1 community member
October 17, 2007: Veteran's Day Subcommittee Meeting 3 district personnel
October 29, 2007: Veteran's Day Subcommittee Meeting 8 district personnel; 1 community member
November 27, 2007: 16 district personnel; 1 community member
February 7, 2008: 19 district personnel; 3 community members
April 3, 2008: Paw Power Subcommittee Meeting 3 district personnel; 0 community members
April 7, 2008: 15 district personnel; 0 community members

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

Based on the results of a Character Education Committee Involvement Questionnaire administered in April, 2008, 100% of the committee members (n=14) feel they have a voice in the FISD Character Counts program. One hundred percent of those responding (n=14) feel they have been able to contribute to the development of the program.

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.)