THE EFFECTS OF A MIDDLE SCHOOL

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM ON THE

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF AT-RISK STUDENTS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Melissa Bradley

December 2014

THE EFFECTS OF A MIDDLE SCHOOL

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM ON THE

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF AT-RISK STUDENTS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

A Doctoral Thesis for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

Melissa Bradley

Approved by Doctoral Thesis Committee

_____

Dr. Robert Borneman, Chairperson

_____

Dr. Angus MacNeil, Co-Chairperson

_____

Dr. Michael Wayne Emerson, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Steven Busch, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Robin McGlohn, Committee Member

                                        _____

                                        Dr. Robert H. McPherson, Dean

                                        College of Education

December 2014

Acknowledgement

There are many people who have supported me throughout this study and degree.

To my parents, Harry and Judy Bradley, and grandmother, Erika Wann, thank you for instilling a desire to learn, strong work ethic and a commitment to serve others. I appreciate their encouragement and support, not only throughout this process, but in each of my endeavors.

Thank you to the many leaders and staff members in Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District. I appreciate their ongoing commitment to excellence and desire to learn. They have provided a tremendous amount of support and pushed me to grow as an educator.

I would also like to thank the professors and staff at the University of Houston who have helped broaden my thinking and strengthen my craft. I especially appreciate the guidance and support Dr. Robert Borneman has provided as my committee chair. His attention to detail and thought provoking questions helped guide this study and inspire me to continue to pursue a lifelong commitment to learning.

THE EFFECTS OF A MIDDLE SCHOOL

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAM ON THE

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT OF AT-RISK STUDENTS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL LEADERS

An Abstract
of a Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Melissa Bradley

December 2014

Bradley, Melissa. "The Effects of a Middle School Dropout Prevention Program on the Academic Achievement of At-Risk Students: Implications for School Leaders." Unpublished Doctor of Education Doctoral Thesis, University of Houston, December 2014.

Abstract

Approximately 27% of students drop out of school each year in the United States (Dianda, 2008). Many of these students complete graduation requirements later giving the United States a 93% high school completion rate (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). While there are many factors that may cause a student to not complete high school, retention can play a significant role. While there are positive effects to retaining a student, grade retention increases the risk of dropping out by 30 – 50 percent (Shane R. Jimerson, Anderson, & Whipple, 2002). Students that are retained in two grades are 90 percent more likely to drop out (Mann, 1987).

Across the United States, there are interventions and programs designed to reduce the dropout rate by providing previously retained students the opportunity to complete two years of course material in one year in an effort to catch students up to their original graduating class. The purpose of this study was to examine the academic success of one of these grade recovery programs over time. Archival data on students who participated in Course Acceleration Remediation and Enrichment (C.A.R.E.) Academy were collected from Gizmo Independent School District (GISD) (pseudonym). Math and reading state assessment scores and end of the year math and language arts course grades for seventh and ninth grade were examined along with graduation completion rates of students who were successful in the program ($n = 579$). High school completion data were analyzed for the two cohorts who have matriculated past grade twelve. The study revealed

C.A.R.E. Academy students had a lower passing percentage on seventh and ninth grade math state assessment exams and the ninth grade reading state assessment exam; however, had a higher passing percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam and all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) when compared to the district at-risk population. Overall, C.A.R.E. Academy students that continued their education in GISD completed high school with a 97% graduation rate. The results of this study should encourage school leaders to not only understand the impact retention can have on the dropout rate and student progress but also what interventions are successful in supporting retained students.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Schools are faced each year with the harsh reality of student dropouts (Alexander, Entwisle, & Dauber, 2003). This is not a new problem, nor a problem found only in high schools, but one that has impacted all levels of public education (Pollack, 2010). Despite efforts made by the federal and state government, as well as local school districts, the problem continues to gain momentum (Bridgeland, Dilulio, Jr., & Morison, 2006). There are outside indicators, that schools cannot control, that lead to student dropout; however, there are multiple strategies and programs that can be implemented during the school day to increase student engagement and reduce the number of student dropouts (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Hauser, Pager, & Simmons, 2000). Before educators are able to minimize the dropout rate of students we must understand the factors that contribute to success and failure. "Dropouts are much more likely than their peers who graduate to be unemployed, living in poverty, receiving public assistance, in prison, on death row, unhealthy, divorced, and ultimately single parents with children who drop out from high school themselves" (Bridgeland et al., 2006, p. 2).

Background of the Problem

Compulsory education, moral obligations and laws have required parents to send students to school since the mid seventeenth century. In the early 1640's it was considered a parent's moral obligation to send their children to school; they were to raise good, Christian citizens (Katz, 1976). "Schools were designed to select and sort young people into two groups: a small handful of thinkers and a great mass of doers according to workplace needs of an agro-industrial society" (Vollmer, 2010, p. 41). By 1852, laws

had been put into place that required students to attend public school and provide a more standardized approach to education (Katz, 1976). These laws were designed to control the conditions of children but were only mandated to children between the ages of eight and sixteen. Children had to attend school for at least three months a year, of these twelve weeks; six had to be consecutive (Katz, 1976). Over the next decade, laws were passed to uniform public education and require students to attend school for longer periods at a time and for more years (Cabus & De Witte, 2011). Attendance was waved if a child was either in attendance in another school for the same amount of time, could provide proof of already learning the material, or could effectively demonstrate extreme poverty or physical or mental disability (M. S. Katz, 1976). It was not until 1965, with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), that attendance and student dropout rates were addressed (Cabus & De Witte, 2011).

It is important to know the history of compulsory attendance laws in order to understand the impact of student dropout as well as the contributing factors. Students are required to attend school and their level of success is dependent upon their motivation and ability to comprehend core academic material (Powell, 2005). When a student is unsuccessful, s/he could be retained in an effort to increase her/his learning capacity. Before retaining a student, educators should have a clear reason for retention and a solid plan for remediation (Hauser et al., 2000; S. R. Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003). The student should not simply repeat the grade without receipt of any targeted interventions and support. Future implications for the student could outweigh the benefits of retention. Educators should understand the effect of retention on students and how to prevent retention before it is necessary (Light, 2006).

Researchers have demonstrated both positive and negative retention results. Powell (2005) views retention as a harmful event that can lead to the student having feelings of inadequacy, while others such as Light (2006) view retention as an opportunity to overcome struggles. When a student struggles after being given strategies and opportunities to learn, and continues to struggle even with extra tutoring by teachers or parents, then other options and remediation, including the act of retention, are often considered (Light, 2006). Much research supports the negative effects of retention; more specifically, the research supports the negative effects of retention of minority or lower income students more than middle class students (Hauser et al., 2000).

The national dropout rate has decreased since 1990. The high school completion rate has moved from 88% to 93% (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2014); however, the graduation rate is still only about 74% (Dianda, 2008). Student retention is a high predictor of student dropout. Because there is such a wide range of knowledge based on student retention, further research is needed to examine the programs put into place to prevent student dropout on students that have been previously retained.

Statement of the Problem

Each year schools continue to deal with the dilemma of students dropping out of school. *The Silent Epidemic*, a report funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, reports that almost one-third of all high school students are projected to drop out; almost half of African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans are projected to drop out (Bridgeland et al., 2006).

In 1995, the Texas Education Code made provisions for the creation of extended year programs and mandated that districts offering a yearlong program adopt a policy designed to lead to immediate reduction and ultimately elimination of student retention. The legislation further required principals, teachers and counselors to meet with parents requesting retention for their children, in order to provide information on the effects of retention on student achievement, self-esteem and on the likelihood of student dropout (*Texas Education Code*, 1995). In contrast, Texas has instated "promotional gates" in grades three, five and eight with the creation of Student Success Initiative (SSI). In these grades, students must pass certain state assessments to be promoted to the next grade or be retained. This also requires districts to provide accelerated instructional programs to low performing students who did not pass (*State of Texas Student Success Initiative (SSI)*, 1999)

Retention has shown some academic gains in several studies and proven to be beneficial (Alexander et al., 2003; Light, 2006; Vail, 2002). The problem with much of this research is that it has focused on the academic achievement exclusively during the first few years following retention (Grantham, 2004; Vail, 2002; Zimny, 2003). Long-term interventions through secondary education for retained students is limited; however, ample research exists regarding "educational models that have been effective in reducing the dropout rate within the socio-economic context in which they exist are identified and effective strategies are translated into a suggested plan of action to address current dropout rates through innovative educational change" (Pollack, 2010, p. 2).

Purpose of the Study

Gizmo Independent School district (GISD) (pseudonym) in Texas supports a unique program for qualifying retained students to participate in an academy that allows students to complete two years of course work in one year. The Course Acceleration Remediation and Enrichment (C.A.R.E.) Academy allows students in seventh grade to recover the retained year in an effort to prevent student dropout. A modified curriculum combining seventh and eighth grade course material is used to reach this goal. Overage, at-risk students are chosen to participate in the program by a committee of school administrators and teachers. Students are identified as program qualifiers during their sixth grade year. The students are notified early during the spring semester that they qualify for the program. This allows students to set goals during their last sixth grade semester and work towards acceptance into C.A.R.E. Academy the following year. Factors such as attendance, behavior, course grades, state assessment scores, Lexile level, special program participation and teacher evaluation are taken into account when choosing the participants of the program. Students also complete a survey and participate in a one on one interview with the C.A.R.E. Academy administrator before the cohort is formed.

The purpose of this study was to determine if students who participate in C.A.R.E. Academy perform at mastery level in math and reading during and after their participation. More importantly, is this program effective in supporting the efforts to reduce student dropout of at-risk students? All students in this study were retained in previous grades or started school a year late, putting them at risk of becoming a dropout in later grades. Students participate in C.A.R.E. Academy as seventh graders, and, if

successful, are promoted to ninth grade the following year. This program allows students who are one or more years behind to regain an academic year in hopes of reducing the risk of student dropout. Seventh grade math and reading state assessment scores as well as seventh grade math and language arts course grades aided in the determination of initial academic program effectiveness. C.A.R.E. Academy data was compared to the district at-risk population state assessment scores and end of the year course grades of GISD at-risk students. Since ninth grade is a high determining indicator of student success or failure (Neild, Stoner-Eby, & Furstenberg, 2001), research continued on to students who participated in the C.A.R.E Academy program and their success on ninth grade math and reading state assessments and Algebra I and English I course grades. Former seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy students' ninth grade math and reading state assessments and Algebra I and English I end of course grades were compared to GISD's at-risk student population. Data show that once students make it to tenth grade, they are more likely to graduate from high school (McCallumore & Sparapani, 2010). High school graduation data were also evaluated among students who participated in the program. The study revealed the percentages of former C.A.R.E. Academy students who graduated and those that are still enrolled in GISD. The study reported variations between C.A.R.E. Academy campuses, cohorts and demographics and whether participating in C.A.R.E Academy, in an effort regain an academic year, appeared to effect student achievement and reduce the risk of student dropout.

Research Questions

This study was designed to report the academic successes in grades seven and nine, of students who participate in GISD's C.A.R.E. Academy in seventh grade. The

study examined high school graduation data as a measure of student success. This study

tracked students who qualified and were chosen for the C.A.R.E. Academy program as

seventh graders over several years. A need to evaluate program academic effectiveness

led to the following questions:

1. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing

   C.A.R.E. Academy mastering math state achievement exams?

2. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing

   C.A.R.E. Academy mastering reading state achievement exams?

3. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing

   C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified math course?

4. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing

   C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified language arts course?

5. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

   completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade math state assessments?

6. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

   completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade reading state

   assessments?

7. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

   completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade Algebra I courses?

8. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

   completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade English I courses?

9. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

   completing C.A.R.E. Academy completing high school?

Theoretical Framework

The self-systems model provides a theoretical framework that includes a set of motivational variables believed to be sensitive to contextual events, such as grade retention (Connell, 1990). "This model indicates that individuals are motivated to engage in activities that meet their psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness" (Pierson & Connell, 1992, p. 300). On the other hand, they are disaffected with situations that do not meet their psychological needs. "In a school setting, students' need for autonomy is met when they feel they have a choice about what they are doing and identify with the value of the chosen activity; their need for competence is satisfied if they feel they can achieve their desired ends; and their need for relatedness is realized if they feel accepted and respected by their peers" (Pierson & Connell, 1992, p. 301).

Carstens (1985) discusses multiple models of learning and development as it relates to grade retention. Gesellian Theory of Development advocates retention. This theory is "rooted in the belief that behavior is primarily genetically determined, environmental interventions are given less credence" (Zimny, 2003, p. 15). Skinnerian Behavior Analysis states that learning is hierarchical and based on a mastery of prerequisites (Carstens, 1985). Mastery will be attained when the weak skills are strengthened, regardless of grade level; however, if the weak skills are not addressed after retention, the retention will not help the success of the student.

Mastery Learning Theory is based on the principle that 95 percent of all students can learn reasonable objectives with appropriate instruction and sufficient time to learn (Zimny, 2003). This theory of learning emphasizes that student learning is related to the amount of time allowed to learn a specific content. While there are additional variables

in learning, retention only addresses the amount of time allowed with academic material and thus is not supported by Mastery Learning Theory (Carstens, 1985). More time with the same kind of instruction, that was originally unsuccessful, will not help a child that was retained.

The Transactional Model suggests that contact between the individual and the environment is a transaction in which each influences the other, stating behavior is a product of current circumstances and one's developmental history (Carstens, 1985; Shane R. Jimerson, 1999; Zimny, 2003). The Transactional Model suggests that "to understand the effects of education on children we must acknowledge the transactional nature of the student's developmental history, school and contemporaneous experiences" (Zimny, 2003, p. 17). Instead of assuming cause and effect, "the transactional perspective reminds us to consider the complex interplay of individual and experiential influences across time" (Shane R. Jimerson, 1999, p. 248).

Bass and Riggio (2006) explain how transformational leaders transform their organization through leadership that influences, motivates, stimulates, and considers the needs of individual followers. Transformational leadership theory suggests that an organization's effectiveness will increase if leadership focuses on the mission, vision, goals, ethics, values, meeting individual needs and developing leadership capacity in others (Northouse, 2007). Practice of the transformational leadership theory can push people to perform beyond their expectations resulting in increased performance (Bass & Riggio, 2006). "It takes the forward movement of school leaders, teachers, students and the community to follow a true transformation leader" (Fenn & Mixon, 2011, p. 3).

Limitations

The Class of 2013 was the first graduating class to contain C.A.R.E. Academy students. There were six years of seventh grade data, five years of ninth grade data and two years of high school graduation information for students that have participated in C.A.R.E. Academy. C.A.R.E Academy is only housed in four of the eighteen middle school campuses in GISD. Therefore, the number of students that have participated in the program ($n = 579$) is small when compared to the over 110,000 students in the district.

Due to high mobility numbers in the middle schools housing the C.A.R.E. Academy program, not all students who participated in the program as seventh graders graduated from a GISD campus. Students were often withdrawn back to their home country, another district or out of state. Data on these students are limited. These students were included in sections of the data, however, may not have been included in final graduation data. Only the set of students who completed seventh grade, ninth grade or graduation criteria was included in the subsequent data.

Academic interventions during and after seventh grade also vary. Interventions were specific to each middle school and high school campus. C.A.R.E. Academy students were enrolled among four middle schools and eleven high schools in GISD. Students received a variety of interventions based on the campus they attended, teachers and school wide intervention programs. These interventions are not consistent and can cause variations in the data.

District comparison data varied. Seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy math and reading state assessment scores were compared to the total at-risk population in GISD.

State assessment demographic data was not available for only at-risk students; therefore, C.A.R.E. Academy demographic data was compared to the comparable demographic population of GISD. Data was compiled in the same manner for ninth grade math and reading state assessments. Course grade (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) were compared to the total at-risk population in GISD. The course grade demographic data was also compared to the total at-risk demographic district data for seventh grade math and language arts as well as ninth grade Algebra I and English I. Two-thousand thirteen and fourteen graduation data is currently unavailable; therefore, C.A.R.E. Academy graduation rates were not compared to another population.

Definitions of Terms

> *At-risk* – A student who is under 21 years of age and meets one of the following criteria as defined by the Texas Education Agency (TEA): was not advanced from one grade level to the next for one or more school years; is in grades 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 and did not maintain an average equivalent to 70 on a scale of 100 in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum during a semester in the preceding or current school year or is not maintaining such an average in two or more subjects in the foundation curriculum in the current semester; did not perform satisfactory on an assessment instrument administered to the student under TEC Subchapter B, Chapter 39, and who has not in the previous or current school year subsequently performed on that instrument or another appropriate instrument at a level equal to at least 100 percent of the level of satisfactory performance on that instrument; is in prekindergarten or grade 1, 2, or 3 and did

not perform satisfactory on a readiness test or assessment instrument administered during the current school year; is pregnant or is a parent; has been placed in an alternative education program in accordance with TEC 37.006 during the preceding or current school year; has been expelled in accordance with TEC 37.007 during the preceding or current school year; is currently on parole, probation, deferred prosecution, or other conditional release; was previously reported through the PEIMS to have dropped out of school; is a student of limited English proficiency, as defined by TEC 29.052; is in the custody or care of the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services or has, during the current school year, been referred to the department by a school official, officer of the juvenile court, or law enforcement official; is homeless, as defined by 42 U.S.C. Section 11302 and its subsequent amendments; or resided in the preceding school year or resides in the current school year in a residential placement facility in the district, including a detention facility, substance abuse treatment facility, emergency shelter, psychiatric hospital, halfway house, or foster group home (Texas Education Agency, 2010).

C.A.R.E. Academy – A Gizmo Independent School District (pseudonym) program designed to help previously retained students complete seventh and eighth grade in one year in an effort regain an academic year and prevent student dropout.

Community-School Interaction – A system of involvement in which the school, students, parents, and the community act toward the benefit of all.

Dropouts – Students who did not complete and did not receive a high school diploma.

Dropping Out – A "process of disengagement" by which students do not persist toward graduation and drop out before gaining a high school diploma. This process is often incremental and may begin as early as elementary years (Bridgeland et al., 2006).

Drop Out Rates – A quantification of the number of events for students who have dropped out of school within a designated population.

Intervention – An attempt to add to the educational process so that the outcome is improved. Practices used as a means of increasing student achievement and deterring students from dropping out of school.

Learning Modalities – Different methods or styles in which individuals gain learning.

Lexile level – An individual's reading ability or difficulty.

Poverty – Insufficient financial resources to provide necessary care and services for individuals and families. The federal government publishes poverty measure yearly (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2012).

Retainees – Children who fail to meet the requirements of a specific grade (Bonvin, Bless & Schuepbach, 2008), and therefore repeat a grade.

School Completion – Completion of grades one through twelve in order to gain a high school diploma.

Social Promotion – The practice of passing students to the next grade regardless of their academic skills or school performance (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007, p. 4)

Socio-Economic Status (SES) – The student's or group of students' social position that is based on income level.

Student Success Initiative (SSI) – Promotional gates, in grades three, five, and

eight. Students must pass the Texas state assessment to be promoted to the next

grade level. This also requires districts to provide accelerated instruction

programs to low performing students who did not pass the first and second

administration (*State of Texas Student Success Initiative (SSI)*, 1999).

Success – For purposes of this study, success will be defined as meeting state

assessment passing criteria, obtaining a 70 or above on end of course grades, and

graduating high school.

Summary

It is important to look at all aspects of a child before retention occurs (Light,

2006). Retention can damage a child, not only academically over time but may cause

emotional constraints. Factors such as socio-economic status and grade placement are

only two of the many that should be taken into account when making decisions about

retention (Hauser et al., 2000). A strong home-school partnership should also be in place

and the effects regarding retention should be communicated. Historically, not much

research has been done past the first few years of retention. Parents often ask school

administrators to take into account not only a child's academic failures, but the child's

emotional status, social competence, and behavioral aspects (Bridgeland et al., 2006).

The research shows there is a contrast between perceptions of the usual stakeholder

groups: school personnel, parents and the child. Sources of this conflict range from

theory-based concepts of human development and learning to experimental-based

opinions (Vail, 2002).

Students retained in grades kindergarten through eighth grade are twice as likely to drop out when compared with non-retained peers (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002). Often, little thought is given to dropout statistics when the initial discussion of student retention occurs. It is not until the act of dropping out that previous retention discussions arise. Programs must be put into place before retention has a chance to occur. If a student is retained, intervention must be in place for the student's success not only the year after retention, but for the duration of their academic career.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

History of Education

The earliest signs of an educational system date back to the early 1640 are in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Education was not set by standards and laws, but by the moral obligation of parents to raise their children as good Christian citizens (M. S. Katz, 1976). Education was not restricted to formal education. Failure to educate your children was considered to be a threat to the moral and economic well-being of the community. In 1642, Puritan leaders feared parents were neglecting this moral responsibility and passed what could be viewed as the first compulsory education law. This law transformed the moral obligation of sending children to school into a legal one (Katz, 1976). As community establishments grew, the Massachusetts Bay Colony laws of 1647 were not effectively enforced. It was not for another fifty-five years that the Colony "established two prerogatives of the state: the right to lay down minimal standards for the education of children; and the right to compel the establishment of two educational provisions-teachers and schools" (Katz, 1976).

In 1781, through *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Thomas Jefferson proposed a network of districts with a school within three miles of every home. Families could send their children to these schools, at no cost, for three years (Vollmer, 2010). Prior to 1820 schools were not formalized systems. Schools consisted of a collage of Latin or English grammar schools, dame schools, academics, evening schools or colleges. Most, if not all, were funded by religious groups or charitable organizations (Katz, 1976). The mid 1800's saw an increasing need for education. In 1820 only five percent of people lived in

communities with more than 8,000 people; by 1860 this percentage had grown to 16 percent (M. S. Katz, 1976). Small villages developed into industrial areas. While the number of immigrants increased, so did many other aspects of community life. As the population grew so did the number of crimes, in particular those committed by immigrants. By 1850, this social diversity caused the public to establish free, public nonsectarian schools. The establishment of these schools caused reformers like Horace Mann and Henry Barnard to lead a moral crusade in support of common schools.

Horace Mann later became the first state superintendent of education in Massachusetts of free public schools (1837-1848). During this time he wrote twelve annual reports, much of which contained the unique features of a free system of common schools. In 1852, more than 200 years after the first passing of compulsory education law, Massachusetts required parents to send their children to school. School consisted of at least twelve weeks, six of which had to be consecutive. This law was highly ineffective, as no attempt was made to enforce it. Over the next sixty-six years, the other colonies formed their own versions of compulsory schooling. It was not until the early 1900's that all states had their own set of compulsory education laws. Some states enforced truancy officers when students did not go to school while others took a more laid back approach. Attendance in elementary school was high while attendance dropped off as the students got older. This was largely due to the child labor laws in place at the time (Vollmer, 2010).

"The early twentieth century the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching further formalized the process: they standardized the school day, including the exact time of each class and the number of 'Carnegie Units' awarded for each subject"

(Vollmer, 2010, p. 46). "By 1920 compulsory schooling legislation tended to include longer schooling periods each year, a required school census, the employment of attendance officers, and the elimination of various common exemptions such as equivalent instruction, mental or physical deficiencies, and poverty" (Katz, 1976, p. 22). At this time, students were attending school an average of sixteen years and three months. By 1930 state aid became tied to average daily attendance. Parents and children were being prosecuted for non-attendance and a shift was being made from the career of work to the career of schooling. As the population grew, the idea of parents sending children to school rather than work became widely accepted. New immigrants viewed school as a way to Americanize their children and learn English. At this time, students were grouped strictly according to age and expected to progress with their group. This expectation of "graduating with your class" introduced the concept of failure into the education process along with a social stigma (Vollmer, 2010).

Over the next 35 years, states had the ultimate ruling over compulsory education. The federal government provided "funding or land for schools and special programs but was careful not to intrude on states' rights to make decisions on curriculum and the general operations of schools" (Standerfer, 2006, p. 26). Within a generation, the bar was raised from requiring universal attendance to demanding universal student achievement (Vollmer, 2010).

It was not until 1965, under the Johnson administration, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed. This law was passed to help close the achievement gap between students of different backgrounds. It was also the first time dropout rates and prevention was addressed by the federal government. Along with the

increased federal funding, a desire for accountability grew. "A decade of school reform followed during the 1970's […] but did not deliver the anticipated corrections to the achievement gap" (Standerfer, 2006, p. 26). The next decade was marked by the National Commission on Excellence in Education's report *A Nation at Risk* (1983). This report painted the picture that schools were failing and if the United States wanted to remain economically competitive, corrective action was necessary (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

As a reaction to *A Nation at Risk*, President George H.W. Bush established "America 2000" which committed to develop standards for all core content subject areas. President Bill Clinton continued this effort in his "Goals 2000: Educate America Act", a reauthorization of ESEA (Vollmer, 2010). This Act provides resources to states and communities to ensure that all students reach their full potential. This Act also states the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is the most current reauthorization of ESEA. NCLB requires states to have students demonstrate proficiency on state academic standards through a state assessment (Standerfer, 2006). NCLB provides funds to State educational agencies, who in return divide up those funds to school whose annual dropout rate is higher than the State average. Funds are made available to enable high schools or feeder middle schools to implement effective and sustainable dropout prevention and reentry programs. Supported activities include professional development, obtaining curricular materials, planning and research, remedial education, reduction in pupil-to-teacher ratios, counseling and mentoring for at-risk students, or school reentry programs (*No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*, 2002). Each one of these Act's, from ESEA

through NCLB has held schools accountable for retention and dropout rates. Each addresses a proactive approach to student success and learning and encourages leaders to find ways to reduce student retention and the dropout rate.

Perceptions of Retention

The act of retaining students to improve academic understanding and social growth has been, and will continue to be, a highly debated topic among law makers, school personnel and the community. With recent laws put into place requiring students must meet performance standards on certain grade level state assessments, opinions about retention are becoming more and more impassioned. The demand for educational accountability has placed the use of retention in the forefront of educational conversation. Research during the past decade suggests that the popular belief that it is better to retain a child in kindergarten or first grade rather than upper grades is unfounded (Tanner & Combs, 1993). Another popular belief is that elementary grade retention may result in temporary achievements, but often these effects taper off and the student will eventually fall behind or show no gains relative to their socially promoted peers (S. Jimerson, Carlson, Rotert, Egeland, & Sroufe, 1997). The decision to retain a child should be weighed heavily by all stakeholders. Teachers and school administrators, parents, and the child must collaboratively work together to make the best decision for the student. Perceptions and biases should be accounted for but looked at on an individual basis.

Teacher and school administrator perceptions. Teachers and school administrators want students to perform at their highest level. Retention is typically viewed as a school-level decision made by principals and teachers in response to students' academic difficulties (Bali, Anagnostopoulos, & Roberts, 2005). Studies

(Edson, 1990; Tomchin & Impara, 1992; Smith & Shepard, 1988) were done utilizing a survey of 196 elementary and middle school teachers. These studies revealed two major belief patterns: the "nativist" and the "remediationist." The educators viewed as "nativist" believed that children develop according to an internal biological clock and can only learn when they are physiologically able to do so. This belief yielded the only intervention acceptable would be to give the child more time in which he/she could mature. The "remediationists" think that the learning process can be influenced through the teacher's selection of instructional methods and material. Tomchin and Impara (1992) identified a third group. This group of teachers demanded that a child be retained when he/she fell short of the expected academic standard and when the child had not put, what seemed to be, ample efforts into his/her schoolwork. This group of teachers identified by Tomchin and Impara viewed school failure as an act of defiance on the part of the child, and therefore, did not think that the child should be rewarded by moving to the next grade (Stock Knoll, 2003). Smith and Shepard (1988) found that these beliefs determined their views of retention. Not surprising, the "nativist" teachers retained a higher number of students than the "remediationists" teachers.

There are arguments for and against retention. Much of the research on teacher perspectives is based upon anecdotes and personal experiences (Stock Knoll, 2003). This has a powerful influence on the attitude of retention. Smith and Shepard (1987) discovered that teachers strongly supported the use of retention; however, they determined that teachers based their opinions on their observations of students during the course of the repeated year when it was often thought that substantial gains had been made. Research suggests many teachers view retention as successfully improving

academic performance and it also results in a more homogeneous grouping of students with a grade (Haberman & Dill, 1993). A majority of teachers seem to share positive attitudes toward the effectiveness of retention (Tomchin & Impara, 1992); however, their perspectives regarding the efficacy of grade retention are generally limited, as they are usually only aware of student outcomes in the immediate years following retention decisions (Tanner & Combs, 1993).

The findings by Smith and Shepard (1987) illuminate the factors that influenced teachers' beliefs on retention. Teachers in elementary schools supported the use of grade retention for students with weak basic skills (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Haack, 1984), those that demonstrated developmental immaturity (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Miller, Frazier, & Richey, 1980), and students with little motivation toward school (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Haack, 1984). An administrator's or teacher's attitude toward the student may also influence the retention decision (Bonvin, Bless, & Schuepbach, 2008). The teachers did recognize that retention can be stigmatizing for a student and have tried to minimize the impact (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986). It is also reported that teachers do not believe that retention is a motivating incentive for student achievement (Tanner & Combs, 1993).

In general, elementary level teachers view retention to be beneficial, and those at the middle and secondary level find it to have a negative impact on their students (Miller et al., 1980). More frequently, teachers base retention on poor academic performance, low ability, lack of maturity, and lack of effort, but there is not a clear shared rule. Teachers apply grade retention for reasons that vary from one teacher to another (Tomchin & Impara, 1992). Support for the use of retention has also been found among

elementary principals, especially for use with immature students, students with weak academic skills, those with frequent absences and those children who lack the prerequisite skills for the next grade (Byrnes & Yamamoto, 1986; Haack, 1984).

Parental and public perceptions. Surveys have been used to determine parents' attitudes on student retention. In a study by Byrnes and Yamamoto (1986) it was found that parents supported retention in cases of social immaturity, academic failure, and weak fundamental skills. The study also noted that higher income parents favored using retention more often than lower income parents. Other studies (Haack, 1984; Schuyler, 1985) have found that parents of retained students believe their student benefited from the retention, even if there was a decrease in their student's academic achievement.

In an effort to impact attitudes about the use of grade retention, parent training sessions were held to explore the potential benefits and detrimental aspects of retention (Carter, 1990). Two first grade classes were selected as part of the study. Parents were given a survey before and after the meeting. The pre-workshop meeting showed parents strongly supported the use of retention. The post-workshop survey revealed, while parents still supported the use of retention, there was a decline in the level of support.

The public is not aware of long term effects on retention. The 22nd Annual Gallup Poll of the public's Attitude Toward Public Schools (1990) indicated that the average person does not know the connection between retention and high school dropout. When asked whether children who fail achievement tests and have to repeat a grade of children who fail achievement tests are promoted anyway are more likely to drop out of high school, 54 percent viewed socially promoted children are more likely to drop out whereas 32 percent viewed retained students as more likely to drop out (Elam, 1990).

Student perceptions. Little research has been done in the past to gain knowledge of the attitudes and feelings of students who have been retained. Byrnes and Yamamoto (1986) surveyed retained elementary students during their year of retention and found that most were not able to articulate any benefits of being retained. The majority of the students reported feeling "sad," "bad," "upset," and/or "embarrassed." These students reported a perception of retention as a punishment. The stress created by retaining a student has been documented in research that demonstrated decreased socio-emotional adjustment (Jimerson, 2001). Studies have also asked student to rate stressful events in life. When sixth grade students were surveyed about stressful life events, they rated grade retention as the single most stressful life event, higher than going blind or losing a parent (G. E. Anderson, Whipple, & Jimerson, 2002).

Pomplun (1988) interviewed students who were retained two years prior and found differing perspectives depending on the time of their retention. Students who were retained in elementary school rated their retention more favorably than those retained during middle or high school. Another survey of nearly 600 fifth and sixth grade students up to eight years after retention, and found that these students were equally divided in regard to the effects of their retention (Russell, Alexander, Shellhammer, & Smitter, 1952). It was noted that the retained group had a more negative attitude toward school than their non-retained peers. In contrast with these findings, another study interviewed elementary students who had been retained. This study found that students believed their retention assisted them in their academic gains (Pierson & Connell, 1992). One of the difficulties to gaining a child perspective on the impact of retention is that there is no baseline data on the child's sense of self prior to the retention; all self-perceptions were

made after the retention, and therefore, the ability to make generalizations from surveys is greatly limited (Alexander et al., 2003).

Reasons for Retention

Increasing Nation and State standards have made retention a popular alternative to remediation in Texas. NCLB, with its focus on accountability, further heightened concerns over child "readiness," and what factors might contribute to school success (*No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*, 2002). In Texas, there is no longer a state law limiting the number of student retentions; the student must meet the mandated state curriculum to advance to the next grade. Core content curriculum in each grade and mastery on third, fifth and eighth grade reading and math state assessments will allow a student to be promoted to the next grade. A student may be promoted only on the basis of academic achievement of demonstrated proficiency of the subject matter of the course or grade level (*State of Texas Student Success Initiative (SSI)*, 1999). Even though this law does require students to demonstrate mastery on reading and math state assessments to be promoted to the next grade, Texas has put in place some safeguards to help students. The student can take the reading and math state assessment up to three times to demonstrate mastery. Intervention must be provided between each administration. If the student is not successful on the third administration of the reading or math state assessment a committee of administrators, teachers and the parents is formed to discuss options for the upcoming school year. Not demonstrating mastery on these state assessments is an automatic retention; however, the parent has the right to appeal that placement. The committee can agree to grant the appeal and send the student to the next

grade level (6th or 9th); however intervention must be provided throughout the next grade (*State of Texas Student Success Initiative (SSI)*, 1999).

Before retaining a child, all stakeholders must be informed of the potential benefits and detrimental factors associated with retention. With the increasing state standards and legislation, retention has become a more common practice. The recent push for educational accountability has brought this issue back to the forefront of education debates. In an effort to improve student achievement, many states have recently implemented policies that require elementary and secondary school children to meet explicit performance goals in order to be promoted (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007). This is not a new initiative. Since the 1990's merit promotion policies have required students who perform poorly on standardized tests to repeat a grade. This has become a central component of the standards-based reform agendas enacted by school districts and state legislatures nationwide. As a result of these policies, thousands of students have been retained in grade (Bali et al., 2005). The federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, with its emphasis on standardized testing to measure student and school performance and identify and intervene in low-performing schools, may put additional pressure on states and districts to retain low-performing students (Bali et al., 2005). An emphasis on accountability and standards lead by political pressure has led to concern that there will be increased retention rates in order for school to demonstrate a commitment to standards, rather than consideration of the long-term beneficial outcomes for students, particularly given that retention is strongly associated with high school dropouts (Jimerson, Anderson, & Whipple, 2002). Studies find that retaining students does not benefit them academically but rather increase the likelihood of dropout (Xia & Glennie,

2005). It has been estimated that "five to ten percent of students are retained annually in the United States, increasing the risk of dropping out by 20 to 50 percent" (S. R. Jimerson, 2001, p. 420). With increasing state standards, retention is becoming more popular as a result of student underachievement. One study reported that up to 78 percent of dropouts were retained at least once (S. R. Jimerson, 2001). The reasons for grade retention is wide spread, however students in many school districts are retained in a grade in order to allow them to gain the academic or social skills that teachers believe are necessary to succeed academically (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007).

Academic performance. Throughout history, grade retention has been linked to academic performance. "When a student fails to complete a grade curriculum successfully, it often results in the child being recommended to be retained and to repeat the same curriculum the following school year" (Stock Knoll, 2003, p 32). One of the basic pedagogical principals behind grade retention is the idea of granting students more time to learn. However, learning objectives or instructional methods are often not modified to meet the retained students' needs (Bonvin et al., 2008).

Many studies over the years have been performed to test if retained elementary student perform better among students of the same grade and age due to the retention. Stock Knoll (2003) outlines 48 kindergarten through sixth grade retention studies; 35 did not find significant positive effects for the student that were retained. Two studies, one performed by Abidin, Galladay and Howerton (1971) and another performed by Anderson (as cited in Stock Knoll, 2003) studied first and second graders who had been retained due to reading and math scores. The students were performing at the same level

in core content classes however, reading scores were still below students in the same grade.

Bohl (1989) examined seventh graders that had been retained in kindergarten through sixth grade due to low achieving scores in reading and math. Positive effects were shown among the kindergarteners that had been retained but negative effects were observed in the students that had been retained in first through sixth grade. These effects were determined by an author developed teacher questionnaire and compared with same age peers. Godfrey (1972) tracked 1,200 six and seventh grade students who had been retained in elementary school due to low reading, math and language scores. Standardized test scores revealed a negative effect in comparison to grade level peers. This test also compared students who had been retained once and those that had been retained twice. Students that been retained twice in elementary school performed lowed than those that had been retained once.

Kamii and Weikart (1963) studied seventh graders who were retained in first through fifth grade due to course grades in reading, math, social studies, language arts, science and literature. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills and teacher assigned grades were used to determine significance of the retention. Students that were retained performed lower than students in the same grade. In contrast, using the same measures, another study by Pierson and Connell (1992) found positive effects when comparing retained students to other students of the same age. A study of ninth through twelfth graders retained in kindergarten through sixth grade performed by Sandoval and Fitzgerald (1985) measured teacher assigned grades. Positive effects were found in math of students retained in kindergarten while all other grades were about the same as grade level peers.

Many of the 48 studies outlined by Stock Knoll (2003) yielded no significant positive or negative effects of retention in the area of reading, math (Abidin et al., 1971; Godfrey, 1972; Sandoval & Fitzgerald, 1985) or general achievement (Kamii & Weikart, 1963).

Effects of Retention

The effects of retention are visible throughout a student's educational career. They are often not only seen in the first few years after retention occurs but can be visible through dropout rates across the nation. Grade retention increases the risk of dropping out by 30 – 50 percent (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002). Students that are retained in two grades are 90 percent more likely to drop out (Mann, 1987). Jimerson, Anderson and Whipple (2002) review several studies reporting that grade retention was found to be the strongest predictor of later dropouts and students are less likely to attend post high school educational programs. Retention is not the sole factor in predicting student dropout.

> Retention should not be misconstrued as the single event leading to dropout but rather it appears that certain children have or are exposed to risk factors (immaturity, low socio-economic status, and low parental level of education) which place them at greater risk for retention as well as high school dropout. Once retention occurs, other events (disengagement, absenteeism, low self-esteem) associated with dropout are more likely to occur, reinforcing developmental pathways leading to high school dropout (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002, p. 454).

Dropping out is influenced by the confluence on a student's developmental history (e.g., early family experience, home environment, individual characteristics), educational experiences, and current circumstances. Dropout is a developmental process, not an

event (S. Jimerson, Egeland, Sroufe, & Carlson, 2000). Stroup and Robins (1972) identified grade retention as the most powerful predictor of future dropout followed by excessive absences, and then frequent school changes. "Retention adversely impacts social, emotional and cognitive development among children, and leads at-risk students to drop out of school" (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007, p 33). Grade retention may have a negative effect on the self-concept and leads to social and emotional problems (Alexander et al., 2003). Low-achieving, children with learning disabilities, and children with a lower IQ are more likely to be retained. Other demographic risk factors such as socioeconomic background, ethnicity, nationality and gender appear to increase the risk for retention (Hauser et al., 2000).

Most scholars will argue retention is effective within the two years following retention; however, there is a negative correlation on long term student achievement. It is believed that retaining a student will help the student grow academically and socially when in actuality the benefits are only short term. Teachers often track student growth in the short term for retained students but a direct link to retention effectiveness is unable to be determined. "Teachers usually only know of student achievement in the immediate years following retention, and typically cannot follow the long-term student trajectories after retention" (Xia & Glennie, 2005, p. 4). Since many retained students make some progress the second year, retention may appear effective to educators. Although some studies indicate students exhibit short-term benefits, these gains quickly fade (Alexander et al., 2003), especially when students move into secondary grades (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002).

Literature reporting the effectiveness of grade retention focuses on two student outcomes: the academic achievement of students and the socioemotional outcomes of students (G. E. Anderson et al., 2002). Jimerson's (2001) study on academic achievement and socioemotional implications of grade retention proved the retention of students did not show significant academic growth. Forty-seven percent of the students preformed at the same level as those students that had been promoted, 5 percent of the retained students performed at a higher level than promoted students and 48 percent indicated no significant difference between the retained and promoted groups.

Research in favor of retention. Positive effects of retention are scattered throughout research, usually conditioned with suggestions for the retained year and years to follow. Many studies found a combination of positive and negative effects such as a study by Jacob and Lefgren (2007), sixth grade retention does not have a significant effect on student dropout, however eighth grade retention increases the likelihood that a student will dropout by 14 percent.

> Once students reach high school, they are able to attend summer school in order to obtain credits at a faster rate. For this reason, the impact of grade retention may well be mitigates through a combination of optimizing behavior on the part of students and their increased capacity to overcome subsequent hurdles to graduation (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007, p. 6).

Grantham (2004) completed a study of kindergarten and first graders in a rural school district. Retained students were compared to students who had also been struggling academically, but had been socially promoted. The students that had been retained showed long-term achievement in both reading and math. The students that had

been socially promoted showed lower achievement scores than those that had been retained. While Grantham's research showed positive results in retention, his data supported not ruling out retention as a means to helping a student achieve academically.

Vail (2002) analyzed data on over 13,000 students in Texas, most of which had been retained students in kindergarten, first or second grade. Over 90% of these students met the passing standard set by the State of Texas Accountability System in fifth grade. Vail also found parents of these students were supportive of their child being retained in early elementary school and felt the retention was beneficial for their student to be academically successful.

Scholars argue whether grade retention will benefit low-performing students. Greene and Winters (2006) suggest grade retention works. A study analyzed two groups of low-performing third and fourth grade students; one group was retained and the other was promoted. At the end of the two year study, they found both groups experienced gains on reading and math standardized exams; however low-performing students that had been retained experienced larger relative improvements than those that had been promoted.

On the Success of Failure was originally published in 1994 by Alexander, Entwisle, and Dauber (2003). Their study, Beginning School Study (BSS), focused on the long-term results of disadvantaged, minority youth. Monitoring students began in 1982 when these students were beginning first grade. Overall findings reported that students that had been retained had higher scores after retention and were not emotionally hurt.

Powell (2005) interviewed adults who had been retained in school between 1931 and 1987. Retention was the only intervention used to help remediate all but one of these students. Initially, the adults reported having a feeling of inadequacy after the retention; however, their overall long-term effects were positive. Many of the adults reported becoming better students after the retention occurred. Although the adults reported positive results, Powell's study supported providing interventions for low academic performance as opposed to retention.

Pierson and Connell (1992) provide evidence of positive effects on retention, however they are all based on the short term. According to this study, students retained made the most gains during the year after retention. Their study also found retained student fell behind several years after retention. This study was compared with classmates in the same grade as opposed to students of the same age. "This kind of comparison usually results in a bias in favor of the retainees, who have studied the same subject matter twice and who have attended school one year longer than their peers" (Bonvin et al., 2008, p. 3).

Research against retention. Whether researchers are for against the use of retention as an intervention, the students that are most likely retained are at-risk students, minorities, males, low SES students, and those deemed to be immature in actual age or behavior (Grantham, 2004; Powell, 2005). These students often encompass other factors that will lead to dropout other than retention. Early research reveals that pupils that have been retained show poorer academic performances during the following years than their promoted classmates despite comparable low academic achievement, thus, the negative effects outperform the positive ones (Bonvin et al., 2008). Nason (1991) summed up

literature on kindergarten and first grade retention: "retention in kindergarten or first grade does not produce long-lasting academic gains, but rather increases the likelihood that a student will become a high school dropout" (p. 303).

Anderson (1998) reviewed research on retainees who felt retention was a punishment. Another study of kindergarten retention was cited where there was no boost or academic advantage from the extra year and retaining student actually had negative effects on the school. Another study he reviewed of a Texas high school concluded retention did not help students academically and increased the dropout rate when students are older than their peers. The findings on this study were: (a) there was a 27 percent higher chance on black males dropping out of school, and (b) white females had a 21 percent increased chance of dropping out.

Darling-Hammond (1998) cited a study that found "children fear grade retention so much that they cited it No. 3 on their list of anxieties following only the fear on blindness and death of a parent" (p. 1). Darling –Hammond felt using retention was a negative approach that would put students in the mindset of giving up on themselves and that there was a better approach to remediate struggling learners.

Jimerson, Anderson, and Whipple (2002) examined several studies that resulted in retention being a strong factor of high school students dropping out. Lloyd (1978) studied characteristics of third grade students who later became high school dropouts and concluded that the dropouts were more likely to have been retained in grades one through three when compared to high school graduates. He also concluded that retention in one through three was a strong predictor of later drop out. The National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 found that students that had repeated an early grade (k-4)

were nearly five times more likely to drop out of school between the eighth and tenth grade in comparison to those student who had not been retained. Roderick (1994) demonstrated that students retained in grades kindergarten through eighth are twice as likely to drop out compared with non-retained peers. Sixty-nine percent of students retained once between kindergarten and eighth grade dropped out compared with a 27 percent dropout rate among student that had never been retained. There was a 58 percent dropout rate for youths who are overage due to starting school late.

Jimerson and Kaufman (2003) concluded that benefits of retention appear in the short-term, however they disappear in the long-term and retention is an "extremely stressful" event for students. The following results were concluded from their meta-analysis:

1. "The results of the meta-analysis of over 300 analyses of socioemotional and behavioral adjustment from over 50 studies during the past 75 years fail to support socioemotional adjustments." (p. 6)

2. "The results of the meta-analysis of nearly 700 analyses of achievement, from over 80 studies during the past 75 years, fail to support the use of grade retention as an early intervention to enhance academic achievement." (p. 6)

3. "Findings from these studies indicate that retained students are between two and eleven times more likely to drop out during high school than nonretained students and that grade retention increases the risk of dropping out between 20% and 50%." (p. 7)

Reynolds, Temple, and McCoy (1997) completed a longitudinal study of over 1500 Chicago student who completed kindergarten in 1986. Their study concluded with

three major reasons why retention "is an ineffective educational policy for most students"

(p. 1):

1. "Grade retention is an unwise policy because it has the unintended effect of

    contributing to the school dropout problem" (p. 1).

2. "The decision to retain is often made haphazardly and for nonacademic

    reasons" (p. 1).

3. "Retained children do not do better academically after they are made to repeat

    a grade" (p. 1).

In addition to the reasons against retention, they feared struggling students were not

going to be given the support needed during their retained year and they student would

lose the desire to try.

Grade retention can have many negative side effects. These side effects can

include dropping out, emotional distress, behavior problems, and substance abuse (Xia &

Glennie, 2005). School administrators should use grade retention as a last resource to

student achievement. Other alternatives may include individualized student instruction,

early identification and targeted assistance, parental involvement, a change in curriculum

development, summer school or personalized tutoring programs (Xia & Glennie, 2005).

Retention Factors

Those that have written about retention believed that if retention is to be used, it

should be coupled with several specific interventions beginning in the primary grades.

Before considering retention the following interventions should include:

1. Provide an early emphasis on needed support and services (Darling-

    Hammond, 1998; Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003).

2. Provide smaller class sizes (Hauser et al., 2000; Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003).

3. Have higher expectations (Hauser et al., 2000)

4. Provide after school and summer support (Hauser et al., 2000; Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003).

5. Provide all adults involved information on particular student situations (Darling-Hammond, 1998).

6. Provide better teacher training (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Grantham, 2004; Hauser et al., 2000).

7. Create a personal intervention plan for retained students (Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003).

8. Parental support is necessary (Jimerson & Kaufman, 2003).

Light's (2006) Retention Scale lists 20 criteria to be considered before making the decision to retain or promote a child. He has maintained the opinion that retention cannot be based on academic achievement or grade level alone. The 20 factors to be considered before retention are listed below:

1. Preschool attendance

2. Current grade placement

3. Student's age

4. Physical size

5. Gender and grade placement

6. Previous grade retention

7. Knowledge of the English language

8. Immature behavior

9. Emotional disorders

10. Conduct disorder/defiance

11. Experiential background

12. Siblings

13. Parent's participation

14. Student mobility

15. School attendance

16. Academic achievement

17. Student's attitude

18. Motivation

19. History of learning disability

20. Estimate of intelligence

Intervention and Retention Prevention

There are several models that have proved powerful interventions for reducing the dropout rate. Many of these models are mainly project-based, experimental, student-centered learning with an emphasis on mentoring and community support. Although these models are effective there is little research to support them as a wide range initiative. A report from The Principal's Partnership identified both effective and ineffective practices in place to prevent student dropout (Gleason & Dynarski, 2009). Effective programs have several strategies in common including: student-centered, multi-tiered activities, emotional support, emphasis on literacy with remediation, an organized and safe environment, a committed school staff and high expectations (Gleason & Dynarski, 2009). Three models stand out when looking to prevent student dropout. All

have been proven a success with middle school students. This models include the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP), Johns Hopkins Talent Development Middle School (TDMS), and a development from the TDMS model, Diplomas Now.

KIPP is a private charter school management system put into place as a result of NCLB. Eighty-two schools nationwide cater to socio-economic at-risk students in hopes to increase the number of students who graduate high school with a diploma.   The student body consists of 90 percent minority students, both African American and Hispanic, with 80 percent on a free or reduced meal plan (Peterson, 2010). This program was designed after several successful business ventures. "It offers a nine hour day, some weekend classes, and summer school with motivational strategies, such as using names associated with success for class names, and morale building team practices" (Pollack, 2010, p. 37). While KIPP has proven successful strategies, there are some questions regarding the applicability for public schools. The majority of teachers recruited for KIPP are recruited from colleges and universities rather than the available teacher workforce, making for possible issues with teacher recruitment (Peterson, 2010).

The Johns Hopkins Talent Development Middle School (TDMS) model used proven research to develop a program to help reduce the number of dropouts and discipline problems in urban schools. The TDMS model has been implemented in several large, urban area middle schools within poverty areas. It has been met with considerable success. Johns Hopkins used research to increase math and reading achievement and absenteeism reductions as intervention for this model ("Making a difference in high poverty middle schools," 2005). Research within a high poverty middle school in Philadelphia showed gains through the Stanford 9 Achievement test

during the first year of implementation and gains nearly twice the national average in year two (Balfanz & MacIver, 2000). The TDMS model's main design plan is made up of five contributing initiatives: extra learning help and support provided by outside agencies, outside agency personnel serving as mentors, high teacher support including multi-level professional development, research-based, standards-driven curriculum and assessment, continuous formative evaluation of model effectiveness, and development of supplementary local social and private associations to support student achievement (Balfanz, Herzog, & Iver, 2007). While the model consists of these five initiatives, it is focused on middle school populations by improving school climate and identifying signs of academic failure and focusing support all while providing progressive curriculum changes to address deficits in mathematics and reading (Balfanz et al., 2007).

The Diplomas Now model was developed from the TDMS model. This model has been effective in deterring students from dropping out of school by first, recognizing the early warning signs and second, providing interventions for success (Gewertz, 2001). Students are likely to display warning signs of dropping out as early as their middle school years (R Balfanz & MacIver, 2000). These early signs include poor attendance, disciplinary problems and low academic achievement. The Diplomas Now model identifies these signs as early as possible and address them through academic and social services for the individual student (Gewertz, 2001).

High school credit recovery. Many ninth graders experience academic distress during the first marking period of high school; of these, more than half will experience failing grades throughout their ninth grade year, many of these students are already overage (Neild et al., 2001). Nationally, ninth grade overage students grew from 20 to 32

percent between 1980 and 1993 (Roderick, 1994). "Research be the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) demonstrates that students who fall 'off-track' during the first year of high school have a substantially lower probability of graduating than students who stay 'on-track'" (Heppen et al., 2012, p. 1). With so many students already a grade behind and/or not earning high school credits, it is important for high schools to implement credit recovery programs to help students meet graduation requirements. The primary goal of credit recovery is to give students an opportunity to retake classes that they failed in an effort to get them back on track and keep them in school (Watson & Gemin, 2008).

In Texas, ninth graders are expected to pass End of Course (EOC) exams for Algebra I, English I and Biology. If a student is not successful on these exams, retake opportunities are offered. Credit recovery for Algebra I is increasingly important in an effort to support struggling students. Chicago Public School (CPS) is the third largest U.S. district with an overall graduation rate of 54%. A study was completed on first time Algebra I failures to determine the effectiveness on Algebra I recovery. Students were divided into two groups; half would complete Algebra I recovery online while the other half retook the Algebra I course traditionally. While both programs shower similar successes and concerns, students were more engaged in the online learning environment as opposed to the traditional classroom setting (Heppen et al., 2012).

For many years PLATO Learning has created educational software aimed at the high school population in need of remediation. In 2006, PLATO made an attempt to package semester long courses in core subject areas. This decision was made to help students recover or obtain credits in high school in an effort to move students toward

graduation. PLATO Courses were initially created for the most commonly failed courses including Algebra I and English I. The Courses presented 60-75 hours of instruction designed to be completed over one semester. Each unit within a course included a pre-test, a set of modules with instruction, applications and mastery of tests and a post test (Luopa, 2010). Today, schools not only use the PLATO modules as a course recovery plan but also as a remediation tool for student before credits are not acquired.

 Middle school credit recovery. Intervention programs designed to support at-risk students have been in place as far back as the past six decades. Many of these programs allow students to combine course work for two grade levels in an effort to catch kids up to their original graduating class or move through school at a faster pace to prevent drop outs. In 1959 Greenfield Junior High in El Cajon Valley, California noticed an increase of students who were overage by one or two years on the verge of dropping out of school. Many of these seventh grade students had been retained in elementary school, had experienced academic setbacks, and possessed negative attitudes about school. Late in January 1960, with deliberate drama, school personnel made an announcement to this group:

> Years ago, you LOST a year of your lives. We school people kept you in one grade for two years. For various reasons it was best for you at the time. Now, the school wants to give you a chance to EARN back that year. Would you work as hard as you could, if it meant going to high school next September? Their answer was a jubilant yes (Chamberlin & Catterall, 1963, p. 98).

The thirty-four students, referred to as Core 87, began working on a combination of seventh and eighth grade material. Over the next two months the group shrunk to twenty-

five. In September 1960, all twenty-five Core 87 students began their high school careers. Eighteen of the twenty-five graduated high school. The program study revealed, of the eighteen that graduated, students did as well as or better than typical high school students on achievement tests (Chamberlin & Catterall, 1963).

In the mid 1980's, The Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce membership teamed up with Hartford Public School to take a proactive approach to student dropout. Project BRIDGE was implemented to keep students from dropping out as the faced the end of middle school and had to make the critical transition toward high school. The program deemed to bridge the gap between seventh/eighth grade and ninth grade by allowing student to receive an early promotion from seventh to ninth grade and provide an employment internship or job while finishing high school (Words and Numbers Research Inc., 1991). The study by Words and Number Research Inc. studied the ethnicity, gender, age, household composition, number of siblings, number of offspring/children, educational attainment of parents, primary language spoken at home, attendance, and the employment status of parents of the first four cohorts when determining effectiveness based on test scores. Job attainment was also a large portion of the study. Words and Number Research Inc. studied preparedness for work, ability to produce the desired level of work, communication skills, ability to learn the tasks required, motivation or interest in the job and overall performance as criteria for job performance of BRIDGE students. The study concluded with 90% of the researchers agreeing there was a need for this program in Hartford Public School. The data reported 65% of the students were promoted to the next grade, 18% were retained and continued on to the eighth grade and 17% dropped out (Words and Numbers Research Inc., 1991).

As a response to ineffective practices of retaining underachieving students, Newark School District in New Jersey implemented Project Accelerated Curriculum Classes Emphasizing Learning (ACCEL) during the 1990 school year. Project ACCEL allowed students to skip a grade if they met academic requirements. This approach was made available to sixth and seventh grade students who had been previously retained. Project ACCEL effectiveness was based on principles of Project ACCEL, teacher survey results, student and parent survey results and achievement test results. Results of the study concluded with students demonstrating positive attitudes and educational goals. Teachers and parents reported observing an increase in students' self-esteem. Reading and language achievements scores increased while there was a non-significant improvement in mathematics (Ramaswami, 1993).

Leadership in the Age of Accountability

The theory behind transformational leadership is that an organization's effectiveness increases with the presence of leadership that is concerned with emotions, mission, vision, goals, ethics, values, meeting follower needs, and developing leadership capacity (Northouse, 2007). Bass and Riggio (2006) asserted that the application of transformational leadership theory can move followers to accomplish more than they believed possible and perform beyond expectations resulting in increased organizational effectiveness. It takes the forward movement of school leaders, teachers, students and the community to follow a true transformational leader (Fenn & Mixon, 2011). Leech and Fulton (2008) suggest that identifying the best possible leadership practices for superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders helped create more productive organizational cultures and retain employees.

McGregor (2006) discusses two models of leadership which he calls theories. Theory X assumes the average person is unmotivated and has a dislike of work. Theory X managers believe in an authoritarian style of management and actively intervene to get things done. The major assumptions of Theory X are most people have to be controlled or threatened before they will work hard; people avoid responsibility and need to be directed, people need to be supervised at each step and need to be enticed to produce results otherwise they have no ambition to incentive to work. Theory X organizations tend to have supervisors at each phase of development and centralized means of control. Theory Y describes a participative management style where employees are happy to work, are self-motivated and creative and enjoy responsibility. This theory assumes people are motivated to complete given tasks, seek and accept responsibility and do not need much direction and consider work as a natural part of life (McGregor & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 2006).

Northouse (2007) states leadership can be categorized into three approaches: trait approach, skills approach and style approach. The trait approach describes leadership as being a quality that people are born with. This approach suggests that leaders are born with specific leadership traits that make them a leader and only great people possess them. The skills approach emphasizes skills and leadership abilities that can be learned and developed as opposed to be innate (Northouse, 2007). Leadership depends on three personal skills: technical, human, and conceptual, which are different from personality traits; skills are what leaders can accomplish whereas innate personality traits are who leaders are (Katz, 1955). The style approach differs from both the trait approach and skills approach in that the study of leadership was expanded to include leader actions

toward followers in diverse contexts (Fenn & Mixon, 2011). Northouse (2007) explains that researchers who studied the style approach divided leadership into two different kinds of behaviors: task behaviors and relationship behaviors. Task behavior leaders focused on the concern of production and referred to the accomplishments the organization was seeking while relationship behavior leaders focused on concern for the people or how they worked with the people to accomplish the organizational goals (Northouse, 2007).

Jackson and Davis (2000) discuss the importance of school leadership and the role leaders play on a campus. The leadership team is "the decision-making body, much of the leadership teams' effectiveness hinges on its ability to communicate effectively with the school" (p. 148). The role of the leadership team is to keep the school mission alive by communicating the schools mission and goals and how it is reaching and altering the goals. Jackson and Davis go on to say students in middle grades are mature enough to be active participants in the communication and learning process (Jackson & Davis, 2000).

Synthesis of Literature Review

The perception of student retention varies from school administrators to students. While there are both positive and negative effects to retention, research shows there must be a clear reason for retention and intervention set up to help support the retained student. It is clear that retention increases the chance a student will drop out of school. While retention is a large factor in predicting dropout, Gleason and Dynarski (2009) outline five other factors that may cause students to not complete high school.

1. Demographic characteristics and family background. Many researchers have found Black and Hispanic youth are more likely than White youth to drop out

of high school. Family income, socioeconomic status, and parents'

educational attainment are related to dropout. Other factors include limited

English proficiency, families on welfare and students who live with a sibling

that has dropped out may increase this risk (Ream & Rumberger, 2008).

2. Past school performance. Important indicators of poor academic performance

   include low grades, poor test scores, placement on a nonacademic track, being

   overage for grade level, disciplinary problems, and truancy (Gleason &

   Dynarski, 2009)

3. Personal/psychological characteristics. Student with low expectations and

   plans, low self-esteem and feel they have little control over their destinies are

   more likely to drop out (Ream & Rumberger, 2008).

4. Adult responsibilities. Students that are employed for more than 20 hours a

   week and have a child or have to take care of a child are more likely to drop

   out (Ream & Rumberger, 2008).

5. School or neighborhood characteristics. Dropout rates are higher in urban

   schools than in rural or suburban schools. Neighborhoods whose residents are

   poor are more likely to drop out than those in neighborhoods with wealthier

   residents (Gleason & Dynarski, 2009).

With all the contributing factors that can lead to an increased dropout rate, school leaders

should have interventions and programs in place to help students be successful.

<center>**Chapter III**</center>

<center>**Methodology**</center>

Introduction

Students retained in grades kindergarten through eighth are twice as likely to drop out when compared with non-retained peers (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002). Gizmo Independent School district (GISD) (pseudonym) in Texas supports a unique program for qualifying retained students to participate in an academy that allows students to complete two years of course work in one year. The Course Acceleration Remediation and Enrichment (C.A.R.E.) Academy allows students in seventh grade to recover the retained year in an effort to prevent student dropout. A modified curriculum combining seventh and eighth grade course material is used to reach this goal. Overage, at-risk students are chosen to participate in the program by a committee of school administrators and teachers. Students are identified as program qualifiers during their sixth grade year. The students are notified early during the spring semester that they qualify for the program. This allows students to set goals during their last sixth grade semester and work towards acceptance into C.A.R.E. Academy the following year. Factors such as attendance, behavior, course grades, state assessment scores, Lexile level, special program participation and teacher evaluation are taken into account when choosing the participants of the program. Students also complete a survey and participate in a one on one interview with the C.A.R.E. Academy administrator before the cohort is formed.

The purpose of this study was to determine if students who participate in C.A.R.E. Academy perform at mastery level in math and reading during and after their participation. More importantly, is this program effective in supporting the efforts to

reduce student dropout of at-risk students? All students in this study were retained in previous grades or started school a year late, putting them at risk of becoming a dropout in later grades. Students participate in C.A.R.E. Academy as seventh graders, and, if successful, are promoted to ninth grade the following year. This program allows students who are one or more years behind to regain an academic year in hopes of reducing the risk of student dropout. Seventh grade math and reading state assessment scores as well as seventh grade math and language arts course grades aided in the determination of initial academic program effectiveness. C.A.R.E. Academy data was compared to the district at-risk population state assessment scores and end of the year course grades of GISD at-risk students. Since ninth grade is a high determining indicator of student success or failure (Neild et al., 2001), research was also collected on to students who participated in the C.A.R.E Academy program and their success on ninth grade math and reading state assessments and Algebra I and English I course grades. Former seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy students' ninth grade math and reading state assessments and Algebra I and English I end of course grades were compared to GISD's at-risk student population. Data show that once students make it to tenth grade, they are more likely to graduate from high school (McCallumore & Sparapani, 2010). High school graduation data were also examined among students who participated in the program. The study revealed the percentages of former C.A.R.E. Academy students who graduated and those that are still enrolled in GISD. The study reported variations between C.A.R.E. Academy campuses, cohorts and demographics and whether participating in C.A.R.E Academy, in an effort regain an academic year, appeared to effect student achievement and reduce the risk of student dropout.

Six cohorts (years) have participated in this program over four campuses; however, there have been only two graduating classes since the first cohort during the 2008-2009 school year. Table 3-1 shows the current demographic breakdown between the district and four participating campuses.

Table 3-1

Comparative Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	District		Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
At-risk	41,788	38.8	551	42.5	816	55.5	713	50.6	662	47.2
Economically Disadvantaged	52,348	48.6	837	64.6	1,184	80.5	1,073	75.6	951	72.2
African American	17,387	16.1	376	29.0	194	13.2	406	28.6	357	27.1
Hispanic	46,092	42.8	550	42.4	1,058	72.0	794	55.9	763	57.9
White	32,283	30.0	195	15.0	100	6.8	149	10.5	131	9.9
Asian	8,715	8.1	135	10.4	94	6.4	35	2.5	33	2.5
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	16,189	15.0	71	5.5	188	12.8	118	8.3	129	9.8

Source: Texas Education Agency (2014)

In this quantitative study, the academic achievements of C.A.R.E. Academy students were studied and their achievement data were analyzed and reported. Data were collected from GISD, a large, suburban district in Texas and the Texas Education Agency (TEA). The district provided archival seventh grade math and reading state assessment scores, seventh grade math and language arts course grades, ninth grade math and reading state assessment scores, ninth grade Algebra I and English I course grades, and graduation data.

Research Questions

This study was designed to report the academic successes in grades seven and nine, of students who participate in GISD's C.A.R.E. Academy in seventh grade. The study also examined high school graduation criteria as a measure of student success. A need to examine program academic effectiveness led to the following questions:

1. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering math state achievement exams?

2. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering reading state achievement exams?

3. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified math course?

4. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified language arts course?

5. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade math state assessments?

6. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade reading state assessments?

7. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade Algebra I courses?

8. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade English I courses?

9. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully

completing C.A.R.E. Academy completing high school?

Participants

The population for this study included students who participated in the C.A.R.E.

Academy program in GISD from 2009 through 2014. The C.A.R.E. Academy sample

included 579 participants from four at-risk campuses in this district. There have been six

cohorts that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy. All six cohorts completed seventh grade.

The following tables show seventh grade participants' demographic breakdown.

Table 3-2

Seventh Grade Race Breakdown – African American

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		4/24	16.6	N/A		2/23	8.6	6/47	12.7
09-10	6/29	20.6	3/22	13.6	2/28	7.1	9/26	34.6	20/105	19.0
10-11	5/18	27.7	3/27	11.1	15/27	55.5	10/23	43.4	33/95	34.7
11-12	12/28	42.8	1/28	3.5	11/31	35.4	6/20	30.0	30/107	28.0
12-13	10/29	34.4	2/31	6.4	12/29	41.3	12/32	37.5	36/121	29.7
13-14	11/26	42.3	3/29	10.3	9/28	32.1	7/22	31.8	30/105	28.5
Total	44/130	33.8	16/161	9.9	49/143	34.3	46/146	31.5		

Campus I, III and IV have similar African American populations. As these three

campuses move from school year 2009 to school year 2014, the C.A.R.E. Academy

African American population more resembles that of each campus as a whole. The third

cohort had the largest percentage of African Americans; the majority from campus III

and IV.

Table 3-3

Seventh Grade Race Breakdown – Hispanic

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		17/24	70.8	N/A		19/23	82.6	36/47	76.5
09-10	19/29	65.6	17/22	77.2	18/28	64.2	15/26	57.6	69/105	65.7
10-11	6/18	33.3	20/27	74.0	10/27	37.0	11/23	47.8	47/95	49.4
11-12	13/28	46.4	24/28	85.7	16/31	51.6	10/20	50.0	53/107	49.5
12-13	16/29	55.1	25/31	80.6	12/29	41.3	18/32	56.2	71/121	58.6
13-14	12/26	46.1	26/29	89.6	16/28	57.1	15/22	68.1	69/105	65.7
Total	66/130	50.1	129/161	80.1	72/143	50.4	88/146	60.3		

Campus II has the largest Hispanic population. Their C.A.R.E. Academy

population is aligned with campus demographics. The number of Hispanics participating

in the program at Campus II has increased over the duration of the program. Campus I

enrolled a little more than half as many Hispanics as campus II across the six years.

Table 3-4

Seventh Grade Race Breakdown – White

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/24	0.0	N/A		2/23	8.6	2/47	4.2
09-10	2/29	6.8	0/22	0.0	3/28	10.7	1/26	3.8	6/105	5.7
10-11	3/18	16.6	2/27	7.4	1/27	3.7	1/23	4.3	7/95	7.3
11-12	3/28	10.7	0/28	0.0	1/31	3.2	4/20	20.0	8/107	7.4
12-13	2/29	6.8	1/31	3.2	3/29	10.3	0/32	0.0	6/121	4.9
13-14	2/26	7.6	0/29	0.0	2/28	7.1	0/22	0.0	4/105	3.8
Total	12/130	9.2	3/161	1.8	10/143	6.9	8/146	5.4		

The total C.A.R.E. Academy White population peaked in school year 2012. The data reveal C.A.R.E. Academy White population has decreased since. Campus I enrolled the largest percentage of White students in the program. Campus II enrolled the fewest students.

Table 3-5

Seventh Grade Race Breakdown – Asian

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		2/24	8.3	N/A		0/23	0.0	2/47	4.2
09-10	2/29	6.8	1/22	4.5	1/28	3.5	0/26	0.0	4/105	3.8
10-11	3/18	16.6	1/27	3.7	0/27	0.0	0/23	0.0	4/95	4.2
11-12	0/28	0.0	3/28	10.7	1/31	3.2	0/20	0.0	4/107	3.7
12-13	1/29	3.4	2/31	6.4	0/29	0.0	0/32	0.0	3/121	2.4
13-14	0/26	0.0	0/29	0.0	0/28	0.0	0/22	0.0	0/105	0.0
Total	6/130	4.6	9/161	5.5	2/143	1.4	0/146	0.0		

The Asian population across all campuses is low. While there are no more than four Asian students in each cohort, each one of these students plays an important role in the success of the cohort. Campus II had the largest number of student participating in C.A.R.E. Academy; however, campus I was not far behind in percentage. Campus IV has not enrolled an Asian student in the program throughout the duration of the six cohorts.

Table 3-6

Seventh Grade Economically Disadvantaged Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		5/24	20.8	N/A		1/23	4.3	6/47	12.7
09-10	6/29	20.6	1/22	4.5	3/28	10.7	6/26	21.0	16/105	15.2
10-11	12/18	66.6	19/27	70.3	18/27	66.6	14/23	60.8	63/95	66.3
11-12	19/28	67.8	22/28	78.5	22/31	70.9	15/20	75.0	78/107	72.8
12-13	21/29	72.4	22/31	70.9	23/29	79.3	27/32	84.3	95/121	78.5
13-14	20/26	76.9	26/29	89.6	25/28	89.2	20/22	90.9	91/105	86.6
Total	78/130	60.0	95/161	59.0	91/143	63.6	83/146	56.8		

The data show the percent of C.A.R.E. Academy economically disadvantaged students has increased overall throughout the six years. This is aligned with the total population for each campus. Campus III reported the largest percentage of economically disadvantaged students participating in the program. While campus II has the greatest number of economically disadvantaged students participating in the program; all campuses have similar percentages of economically disadvantaged student enrolled in the program.

Table 3-7

Seventh Grade Sex Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F
08-09	N/A		15/9	63/37	N/A		12/11	52/48	27/20	57/43
09-10	19/10	65/35	11/11	50/50	16/12	57/43	13/13	50/50	59/46	56/44
10-11	9/9	50/50	14/13	52/48	17/10	63/37	11/12	48/52	51/44	54/47
11-12	10/18	36/64	16/12	57/43	19/12	61/39	11/9	55/45	56/51	52/48
12-13	15/14	52/48	17/14	55/45	16/13	55/45	21/11	66/34	69/52	57/43
13-14	13/13	50/50	15/14	52/48	16/12	64/36	13/9	59/41	57/48	54/48
Total	66/64	51/49	88/73	55/45	84/59	59/41	81/65	55/45		

More males participated in C.A.R.E. Academy in seventh grade than females. Campus III had the largest difference between males and females across all cohorts. With the exception of cohort four, Campus I tightened the gap between males and females after their first year participating in the Academy. The fifth cohort across all campuses showed largest difference between males and females than any other cohort.

Table 3-8

Seventh Grade Limited English Proficient (LEP) Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/24	0.0	N/A		5/23	21.7	5/47	10.6
09-10	3/29	10.3	1/22	4.5	0/28	0.0	4/26	15.3	8/105	7.6
10-11	1/18	12.5	1/27	3.7	0/27	0.0	4/23	17.3	6/95	6.3
11-12	0/28	0.0	0/28	0.0	0/31	0.0	1/20	5.0	1/107	0.9
12-13	1/29	3.4	4/31	12.9	0/29	0.0	7/32	21.8	12/121	9.9
13-14	0/26	0.0	5/29	17.2	3/28	10.7	4/22	18.1	12/105	11.4
Total	5/130	3.8	11/161	6.8	3/143	2.1	25/146	17.1		

The number of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students varies between campuses. Campus IV has the largest percentage of LEP students participating in the Academy. Campus III has the smallest percentage of LEP students participating in the program; they did not enroll a LEP student in the program until the final cohort.

Data are available from five cohorts that have completed ninth grade. Most students who participated in C.A.R.E. Academy as seventh graders also continued as ninth graders in GISD; however, several withdrew from the district before graduating. The following tables show the demographic breakdown of students who completed ninth grade in GISD.

Table 3-9

Ninth Grade Race Breakdown – African American

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		4/24	16.6	N/A		2/23	8.6	6/47	12.7
09-10	5/27	18.5	3/22	13.6	2/28	7.1	9/26	34.6	19/103	18.4
10-11	5/18	27.7	3/27	11.1	14/26	53.8	10/22	45.4	32/93	34.4
11-12	11/27	40.7	1/27	3.7	9/28	32.1	5/19	26.3	26/101	25.7
12-13	9/26	34.6	2/28	7.1	11/27	40.7	11/31	35.4	33/112	29.4
Total	30/98	30.1	13/128	10.2	36/109	33.0	37/121	30.6		

When comparing the population of African American students in C.A.R.E.
Academy across cohorts, the only cohort that had a significant drop in the number of
African Americans completing ninth grade in GISD was the third cohort. Campuses I, III
and IV had similar percentages of African Americans continuing to ninth grade in GISD.
There was not a significant decrease in the number of African American students
transiting and completing ninth grade in GISD.

Table 3-10

Ninth Grade Race Breakdown – Hispanic

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		17/24	70.8	N/A		19/23	82.6	36/47	76.6
09-10	18/27	66.6	17/22	77.2	18/28	64.2	15/26	57.6	68/103	66.0
10-11	6/18	33.3	20/27	74.0	10/26	38.5	10/22	45.4	46/93	27.9
11-12	13/27	48.1	23/27	85.2	15/28	53.6	10/19	52.6	61/101	60.4
12-13	14/26	53.8	22/28	78.5	11/27	40.7	18/31	58.1	65/112	58.0
Total	51/98	52.0	99/128	77.3	54/109	49.5	72/121	59.5		

C.A.R.E Academy cohorts 11-12 and 12-13 show a decrease in the number of Hispanics completing ninth grade in GISD. Cohort 11-12 revealed a fourteen student decrease in total, six of which were Hispanic. Cohort 12-13 revealed a ten student decrease in total, seven of which were Hispanic. Campus II has the largest percentage of Hispanic former C.A.R.E. Academy students completing ninth grade in GISD.

Table 3-11

Ninth Grade Race Breakdown – White

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/24	0.0	N/A		2/23	8.7	2/47	4.2
09-10	2/27	7.4	0/22	0.0	3/28	10.7	1/26	3.8	6/103	5.8
10-11	3/18	16.6	2/27	7.4	1/26	3.8	1/22	4.5	7/93	7.5
11-12	3/27	11.1	0/27	0.0	1/28	3.5	4/19	21.1	8/101	7.9
12-13	2/26	7.6	1/28	3.5	3/27	11.1	0/31	0.0	6/112	5.3
Total	10/98	10.2	3/128	2.3	8/109	7.3	8/121	6.6		

Campus I in cohort 11-12 revealed a two White student decrease by the end of ninth grade in GISD. These were the only two White students who participated in C.A.R.E. Academy that did not complete ninth in GISD. Even with this decrease in White students, campus I continued to have the largest percentage of White students.

Table 3-12

Ninth Grade Race Breakdown – Asian

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		2/24	8.3	N/A		0/23	0.0	2/47	4.2
09-10	2/27	7.4	1/22	4.5	1/28	3.5	0/26	0.0	4/103	3.8
10-11	3/18	16.6	1/27	3.7	0/26	0.0	0/22	0.0	4/93	4.3
11-12	0/27	0.0	3/27	11.1	1/28	3.5	0/19	0.0	4/101	3.9
12-13	1/26	3.8	2/28	7.1	0/27	0.0	0/31	0.0	3/112	2.6
Total	6/98	6.1	9/128	7.0	2/109	1.8	0/121	0.0		

Every Asian student who participated in C.A.R.E. Academy completed ninth grade in GISD. Campus II continued to have the largest number and percentage of Asian students participating in the program.

Table 3-13

Ninth Grade Economically Disadvantaged Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		5/24	20.8	N/A		1/23	4.3	6/47	12.7
09-10	6/27	22.2	1/22	4.5	3/28	10.7	6/26	21.0	16/103	15.5
10-11	12/18	66.6	19/27	70.3	18/26	69.2	14/22	63.6	63/93	67.7
11-12	19/27	70.3	22/27	81.5	22/28	78.6	15/19	78.9	78/101	77.2
12-13	21/26	80.7	22/28	78.5	22/27	81.4	27/31	87.1	92/112	82.1
Total	58/98	59.2	69/128	53.9	65/109	59.6	63/121	52.1		

A higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students completed ninth grade in GISD in cohorts 09-10, 11-12 and 12-13. The data reveal, in these cohorts, more non-economically disadvantaged students moved to another school district before the end of ninth grade than those that were considered economically disadvantaged. Campuses I and III continue to have the largest percentage of economically disadvantaged students formerly participating in C.A.R.E. Academy.

Table 3-14

Ninth Grade Sex Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F	# M/F	% M/F
08-09	N/A		15/9	63/37	N/A		12/11	52/48	27/20	57/43
09-10	17/10	63/37	11/11	50/50	16/12	57/43	13/13	50/50	57/46	55/45
10-11	9/9	50/50	14/13	52/48	17/9	65/35	11/11	50/50	51/42	55/45
11-12	10/17	37/63	15/12	56/44	18/10	64/36	11/8	59/41	54/47	53/47
12-13	14/12	54/46	17/11	61/39	15/12	56/44	20/11	65/35	66/46	59/41
Total	50/48	51/49	72/56	56/44	66/43	61/39	67/54	55/45		

The ninth grade completion statuses of former C.A.R.E. Academy students were split between males and females. There were 16 males and 15 females across all cohorts that did not complete ninth grade in GISD. Campus III had the largest discrepancy between males and females.

Table 3-15

Ninth Grade Limited English Proficient (LEP) Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/24	0.0	N/A		5/23	21.7	5/47	10.6
09-10	3/27	11.1	1/22	4.5	0/28	0.0	4/26	15.3	8/103	7.7
10-11	1/18	12.5	1/27	3.7	0/26	0.0	4/22	18.2	6/93	6.4
11-12	0/27	0.0	0/27	0.0	0/28	0.0	1/19	5.2	1/101	0.9
12-13	1/26	3.8	4/28	14.2	0/27	0.0	7/31	22.6	12/112	10.7
Total	5/98	5.1	6/128	4.6	0/109	0.0	21/121	17.4		

All LEP students that successfully completed C.A.R.E. Academy as a seventh grader also completed ninth grade in GISD. Campus IV continues to have the largest percentage of former C.A.R.E. Academy students enrolled in a GISD high school.

Two C.A.R.E Academy cohorts have met high school graduation requirements. The following tables show the demographic breakdown of the students who participated in the program if they remained in GISD and graduated.

Table 3-16

Graduation Race Breakdown – African American

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		2/13	15.3	N/A		2/15	13.3	4/28	14.2
09-10	3/17	17.6	1/13	7.6	4/22	18.2	7/16	43.8	15/68	22.1
Total	3/17	17.6	3/26	11.5	4/22	18.2	9/31	29.0		

Four African American, former C.A.R.E. Academy, students completed high school from cohort 08-09 in GISD. The two African American students who did not complete high school in GISD participated in C.A.R.E. Academy on Campus II. Six former African American C.A.R.E. Academy students did not complete high school in cohort 09-10 across all four campuses.

Table 3-17

Graduation Race Breakdown – Hispanic

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		8/13	61.5	N/A		12/15	80.0	20/28	71.4
09-10	12/17	70.5	11/13	84.6	14/22	63.6	8/16	50.0	45/68	66.2
Total	12/17	70.5	19/26	73.1	14/22	63.6	20/31	64.5		

The two cohorts that have matured past graduation originally contained 152 participants, 96 graduated from a GISD high school. Fifty-seven students withdrew to another district, home country or dropped out of school. Three are still enrolled in GISD and have not met their expected graduation date. All three of these students still enrolled in GISD are Hispanic.

Table 3-18

Graduation Race Breakdown – White

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/13	0.0	N/A		1/15	6.6	1/28	3.5
09-10	0/17	0.0	0/13	0.0	1/22	4.5	1/16	6.2	2/68	2.9
Total	0/17	0.0	0/26	0.0	1/22	4.5	2/31	9.6		

Between the completion of ninth grade and graduation, White C.A.R.E. Academy students dropped by five students. Campus I and II did not report White students graduating from GISD.

Table 3-19

Graduation Race Breakdown – Asian

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		2/13	15.3	N/A		0/15	0.0	2/28	7.1
09-10	2/17	11.7	1/13	7.6	1/22	4.5	0/16	0.0	4/68	5.8
Total	2/17	11.7	3/26	11.5	1/22	4.5	0/31	0.0		

Every Asian student that successfully completed C.A.R.E. Academy as a seventh grader in cohorts 08-09 and 09-10 completed high school in GISD.

Table 3-20

Graduation Economically Disadvantaged Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		3/13	23.0	N/A		0/15	0.0	3/28	10.7
09-10	3/17	17.6	0/13	0.0	2/22	9.1	1/16	6.2	6/68	8.8
Total	3/17	17.6	3/26	11.5	2/22	9.1	1/31	3.2		

The two cohorts listed above show a decline in the number of economically students that completed high school in GISD. Of the 57 students that withdrew from GISD; 17 were economically disadvantaged. The three students still enrolled in GISD and have yet to graduate are all economically disadvantaged.

Table 3-21

Graduation Sex Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
08-09	N/A		7/6	54/46	N/A		6/9	40/60	13/15	46/54
09-10	9/8	53/47	8/5	62/38	13/9	59/41	6/10	38/62	36/32	53/47
Total	9/8	53/47	15/11	58/42	13/9	59/41	12/19	39/61		

The data show a separation of males and females that did not complete graduation in GISD. Forty-nine males and 47 females that successfully completed C.A.R.E. Academy in seventh grade completed high school in GISD. Of the three students that are still enrolled in GISD; two are males and one is female.

Table 3-22

Graduation Limited English Proficient (LEP) Breakdown

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
08-09	N/A		0/13	0.0	N/A		3/15	20.0	3/28	10.7
09-10	1/17	5.8	1/13	7.6	0/22	0.0	2/16	13.3	4/68	5.8
Total	1/17	5.8	1/26	3.8	0/22	0.0	5/31	16.1		

All LEP students that successfully completed C.A.R.E. Academy as seventh graders completed ninth grade in GISD. Six LEP students that completed ninth grade in GISD did not complete high school in GISD. Cohort 08-09 contained two and cohort 09-10 contained four students that withdrew to another district before graduation. Seven LEP students graduated at their expected graduation date from GISD.

Data Collection and Analysis

Approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and GISD was obtained to conduct research on former C.A.R.E. Academy students in GISD. Gizmo Independent School District selected an employee in the Information Services department to collect the archival data used in this study. Archival data on seventh grade math and reading state assessments, seventh grade math and language arts courses, ninth grade math and reading state assessments, ninth grade Algebra I and English I course work, and graduation completion data was collected on C.A.R.E. Academy students from the 2009 school year through the 2014 school year.

Passing percentages were examined for seventh grade math and reading state assessments, seventh grade math and language arts courses, ninth grade math and reading

state assessments, ninth grade English I and Algebra I courses, and graduation completion data was analyzed by cohort and by campus. Passing standards, as defined by GISD, was provided for end of the year course grades and passing standards, as defined by the Texas Education Agency (TEA), was provided for state assessments. Data were reported as percentages and comparisons were made. Each cohort's data were analyzed on an individual basis, by campus and as a whole. This allowed the study to make connections between and among cohorts and campuses in order to note trends.

Comparisons were made between C.A.R.E. Academy and the parallel district at-risk data. The study focused on trends between seventh grade math and reading state assessments, seventh grade math and language arts course grades, ninth grade math and reading state assessments, and Algebra I and English I course grades among cohorts and campuses. Graduation rates were analyzed for the two cohorts that graduated and trends were noted among campuses. Demographic data were used as a point of comparison among cohorts and campuses. Success rates for seventh grade math and reading state assessments, seventh grade math and language arts courses, ninth grade math and reading state assessments, and Algebra I and English I courses were analyzed by ethnicity, economically disadvantaged, sex, and LEP status among cohorts and campuses and compared to the comparable district population.

Limitations

The Class of 2013 was the first graduating class to contain C.A.R.E. Academy students. There were six years of seventh grade data, five years of ninth grade data and two years of high school graduation information for students that have participated in C.A.R.E. Academy. C.A.R.E Academy is only housed in four of the eighteen middle

school campuses in GISD to note trends. Therefore, the number of students that have participated in the program ($n = 579$) is small when compared to the over 110,000 students in the district.

Due to high mobility numbers in the middle schools housing the C.A.R.E. Academy program, not all students who participated in the program as seventh graders graduated from a GISD campus. Students were often withdrawn back to their home country, another district or out of state. Data on these students are limited. These students were included in sections of the data, however, may not have been included in final graduation data. Only the set of students who completed seventh grade, ninth grade or graduation criteria was included in the subsequent data.

Academic interventions during and after seventh grade also vary. Interventions were specific to each middle school and high school campus. C.A.R.E. Academy students were enrolled among four middle schools and eleven high schools in GISD. Students received a variety of interventions based on the campus they attended, teachers and school wide intervention programs. These interventions are not consistent and can cause variations in the data.

District comparison data varied. Seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy math and reading state assessment scores were compared to the total at-risk population in GISD. State assessment demographic data was not available for only at-risk students; therefore, C.A.R.E. Academy demographic data was compared to the comparable demographic population of GISD. Data was compiled in the same manner for ninth grade math and reading state assessments. Course grade (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) were compared to the total at-risk population in GISD.

The course grade demographic data was also compared to the total at-risk demographic district data for seventh grade math and language arts as well as ninth grade Algebra I and English I. Two-thousand thirteen and fourteen graduation data is currently unavailable; therefore, C.A.R.E. Academy graduation rates were not compared to another population.

Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

The study attempted to determine academic success rates on seventh grade math and reading state assessments, in seventh grade math and reading courses, on ninth grade math and reading state assessments and in ninth grade Algebra I and English I courses for C.A.R.E. Academy students in Gizmo Independent School District (GISD) (pseudonym). Graduation data were also gathered on former C.A.R.E. Academy students. Success rates were reported by cohort and by campus and compared to the district at-risk population. Success standards for state assessments were set by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) while success rates for courses were set by GISD. Archival, quantitative data were collected by GISD and were analyzed to answer the following questions.

1. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering math state achievement exams?

2. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering reading state achievement exams?

3. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified math course?

4. What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified language arts course?

5. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade math state assessments?

6. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade reading state assessments?

7. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade Algebra I courses?

8. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade English I courses?

9. What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy completing high school?

Results for Question One

Table 4-1 answers the question, what is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering math state achievement exams? The success standard was set by the TEA. Students in the first three cohorts took the math Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS); the transition to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) took place in 2012. The district comparison denotes the total district at-risk passing percentage of GISD students on the seventh grade math state assessment exam. At this time, district data for the 2014 STAAR exam has not been released by the TEA in full.

Table 4-1

Success Rates of Math State Assessment Exams – Seventh Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		14/24	58.3	N/A		11/23	47.8	25/47	53.9	56
09-10	15/29	51.7	17/22	77.3	17/28	60.7	12/26	46.2	61/105	58.1	60
10-11	12/18	66.7	15/27	55.6	14/27	51.8	12/23	52.2	53/95	55.7	58
11-12	11/28	39.3	19/28	67.8	13/31	41.9	9/20	45.0	52/107	48.6	56
12-13	17/29	58.6	18/31	58.1	13/29	44.8	19/32	59.4	67/121	55.4	59
13-14	21/26	80.3	19/29	65.5	19/28	67.8	12/22	54.5	71/105	67.6	Unavailable
Total	76/130	58.5	102/161	63.3	76/143	53.1	75/146	51.4			

The total performance reveals a decline in C.A.R.E Academy passing percentages after the 11-12 cohort. This is the year Texas made the transition from TAKS to STAAR. Since then, the total C.A.R.E. Academy cohort passing percentage has increased. Campus II had the largest number of participants in the program across all cohorts and had the highest C.A.R.E. Academy percentage of students pass the math state assessment over the six year period of time. After the transition to STAAR, Campus III experienced a large increase between the last two cohorts moving from 44.8% to 67.8% of their C.A.R.E. Academy students passing the math state assessment. While C.A.R.E. Academy students performed lower than the district at-risk population on the math state assessment each year; C.A.R.E. Academy students did come within seven percent of meeting the district at-risk passing percentage. The fourth cohort showed the largest gap between the C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district at-risk population. This was the first year students took the STAAR exam. On average, campus I and campus II reported

the smallest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district at-risk population on the seventh grade math state assessment exam.

Table 4-2 shows the demographic breakdown of seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy students who passed the math state assessment exam. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by combined campus demographics. District demographic data is not available for only at-risk students; therefore, the district comparison denotes the total district passing percentage of GISD students on the seventh grade math state assessment exam for each demographic. District data are not available for disaggregated male and female populations.

Table 4-2

Success Rates of Math State Assessment Exams – Seventh Grade Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	25/44	56.8	8/17	47.1	27/51	52.9	21/46	45.7	81/158	51.3	70
Hispanic	36/66	54.5	82/129	63.5	39/72	54.2	46/88	52.3	203/355	57.2	76
White	10/12	83.3	2/3	66.7	5/10	50.0	5/8	62.5	22/33	66.7	92
Asian	5/6	83.3	9/9	100	1/2	50.0	N/A		15/17	88.2	95
ED	45/78	57.7	56/95	58.9	47/91	51.6	38/83	45.8	186/347	53.6	73
Sex (M/F)	38/38	58/59	60/42	68/57	48/28	57/47	43/32	54/49	189/140	59/54	Unavailable
LEP	3/5	60.0	6/11	54.5	1/3	33.3	11/25	44.0	21/44	47.7	48

African American C.A.R.E. Academy students at each campus performed within nine percent of one another. Campus III had the largest C.A.R.E. Academy African American participants in the program; however, Campus I had the highest percentage of African American students pass the math state assessment exam. Campus II had the largest number of Hispanic students participate in the program and had the highest percentage of Hispanic students pass. Campus II exceeded the next highest C.A.R.E. Academy Hispanic passing percentage by nine percent. Campus I had the largest C.A.R.E. Academy white percentage passing the math state assessment and the highest percentage passing at 83.3%. Of the 347 economically disadvantaged C.A.R.E. Academy students taking the math state assessment across all cohorts, 186 met the passing standard. While Campus IV had the largest number of C.A.R.E. Academy Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, their passing percentage on the seventh grade

math state assessment exam was below the overall LEP passing percentage across all campuses. When demographically comparing C.A.R.E. Academy students to the district; it appears C.A.R.E. Academy students are performing much lower than the district. This comparison is between C.A.R.E. Academy students who are all at-risk while the district data includes the total population of each demographic. Although the comparison between the two groups is limited, the gap between C.A.R.E. Academy LEP students and the total district LEP population is smaller. On Campus I and II the C.A.R.E. Academy student LEP population exceeds the district LEP passing percentage on the math state assessment exam.

Results for Question Two

Table 4-3 answers the question, what is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering reading state achievement exams? The success standard was set by the TEA. Students in the first three cohorts took the reading TAKS; the transition to the STAAR took place in 2012. The district comparison denotes the total district at-risk passing percentage of GISD students on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam. At this time, district data for the 2014 STAAR exam has not been released by the TEA in full.

Table 4-3

Success Rates of Reading State Assessment Exams – Seventh Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		16/24	66.6	N/A		16/23	69.6	32/47	68.1	73
09-10	23/29	79.3	20/22	90.9	24/28	85.7	21/26	80.7	88/105	83.1	73
10-11	16/18	88.8	23/27	85.2	21/27	77.7	16/23	69.5	76/95	80.0	74
11-12	22/28	78.6	20/28	71.4	27/31	87.1	13/20	65.0	82/107	76.6	77
12-13	23/29	79.3	22/31	70.9	24/29	82.7	25/32	78.1	94/121	77.6	78
13-14	24/26	92.3	24/29	82.7	24/28	85.7	12/22	54.5	84/105	80.0	Unavailable
Total	108/130	83.1	125/161	83.1	120/143	83.9	103/146	70.5			

C.A.R.E. Academy reading state assessment exams after the first cohort were overall consistent. The total C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentage, across all campuses, experienced the largest gain between the first and second cohort. This was an increase of 15%. Campus I experienced their largest passing percentage during the last cohort taking the STAAR exam, while Campus II experienced their most successful cohorts while still taking the TAKS exam. Campus III had consistent C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentage on the reading state assessment exams with a variation of only 9.4% across all cohorts. Campus IV experienced a large decline in scores during the last cohort; this was a decline of 23.6%. C.A.R.E. Academy exceeded or met the reading state assessment district at-risk passing percentage during four cohorts.

Table 4-4 shows the demographic breakdown of seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy students who passed the reading state assessment exam. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by total campus demographic. District demographic data is not

available for only at-risk students; therefore, the district comparison denotes the total

district passing percentage of GISD students on the seventh grade reading state

assessment exam for each demographic. District data are not available for disaggregated

male and female populations.

Table 4-4

Success Rates of Reading State Assessment Exams – Seventh Grade Demographic

Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	34/44	77.2	10/17	58.8	44/51	86.3	35/46	76.1	123/158	77.8	83
Hispanic	55/66	83.3	101/129	78.3	59/72	81.9	60/88	68.2	275/355	77.5	83
White	12/12	100	3/3	100	10/10	100	4/8	50.0	29/33	87.9	95
Asian	5/6	83.3	8/9	88.9	2/2	100	N/A		15/17	88.2	95
ED	67/78	85.9	74/95	77.9	75/91	82.4	55/83	66.3	271/347	78.1	81
Sex (M/F)	59/49	89/77	69/56	78/77	71/49	85/83	58/45	73/69	257/199	81/76	Unavailable
LEP	3/5	60.0	7/11	63.6	2/3	66.7	10/25	40.0	22/44	50.0	48

Campus II has the fewest number of African American students participating in

C.A.R.E. Academy and also had the lowest passing percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy

students mastering the reading state assessment exam. All White C.A.R.E. Academy

students at Campus I, Campus II and Campus III passed the reading state assessment.

The percentage of economically disadvantaged C.A.R.E. Academy students passing the

reading state assessment was highest at Campus I. While Campus IV had the largest

number of C.A.R.E. Academy LEP students, the passing percentage on the reading state

assessment was lower than the other three campuses by at least 20%. Each campus had

more males participate in C.A.R.E. Academy than females; however, one sex did not

outperform the other on the reading state assessment. The difference between male and female passing percentage was five percent among C.A.R.E. Academy students. When comparing individual demographics of C.A.R.E. Academy students to the district; it appears C.A.R.E. Academy students are producing a lower passing percentage than the district. This comparison is between C.A.R.E. Academy students who are all at-risk while the district data includes the total population of each demographic. Although the comparison between the two groups is limited, the gap between C.A.R.E. Academy LEP students and the total district LEP population is reduced. On campus I, II and III the C.A.R.E. Academy student LEP population exceed the district LEP passing percentage on the reading state assessment exam.

Results for Question Three

Table 4-5 answers the question, what is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified math course? Passing standards were defined by GISD as earning a minimum of a 70 in the modified math course. The math course consisted of a modified seventh and eighth grade curriculum with concentration on eighth grade Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). The district comparison listed in the table below reflects the seventh grade math passing percentage of at-risk students in GISD.

Table 4-5

Success Rates of Modified Math Course – Seventh Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		23/24	95.8	N/A		22/23	95.6	45/47	95.7	88
09-10	29/29	100	22/22	100	28/28	100	25/26	96.2	104/105	99.0	93
10-11	18/18	100	27/27	100	27/27	100	23/23	100	95/95	100	93
11-12	28/28	100	28/28	100	31/31	100	19/20	95.0	106/107	99.0	94
12-13	29/29	100	31/31	100	29/29	100	32/32	100	121/121	100	94
13-14	26/26	100	29/29	100	28/28	100	22/22	100	105/105	100	93
Total	130/130	100	160/161	99.3	143/143	100	143/146	97.9			

Each student that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy passed the seventh grade modified math course at Campuses I and III. Campus IV had the largest number of C.A.R.E. Academy students that did not pass the modified math course, lowering its passing percentage to 97.9% across all cohorts. The C.A.R.E. Academy students overall had a higher passing percentage per cohort than the district comparison. C.A.R.E. Academy students received a combination of seventh and eighth grade curriculum while the district comparison only received seventh grade curriculum.

Table 4-6 shows the demographic breakdown of seventh grade C.A.R.E. Academy students who passed the modified math course. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by total campus demographic. The district comparison listed in the table below reflects the seventh grade math course passing percentage of at-risk students by demographic in GISD.

Table 4-6

Success Rates of Modified Math Course – Seventh Grade Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	44/44	100	17/17	100	51/51	100	46/46	100	158/158	100	92
Hispanic	66/66	100	128/129	99.2	72/72	100	85/88	96.6	351/355	98.8	93
White	12/12	100	3/3	100	10/10	100	8/8	100	33/33	100	95
Asian	6/6	100	9/9	100	2/2	100	N/A		17/17	100	97
ED	78/78	100	95/95	100	91/91	100	81/83	97.6	345/347	99.4	93
Sex (M/F)	66/64	100/100	88/72	100/98	84/59	100/100	78/64	97/98	316/259	99/99	92/95
LEP	5/5	100	11/11	100	3/3	100	24/25	96.0	43/44	97.7	91

All of the students who participated in C.A.R.E. Academy that were not successful in the modified math course were Hispanic. One female enrolled at Campus II and one female and two males enrolled at Campus IV were among the students who were not successful. One or more of the Hispanic C.A.R.E. Academy students that were not successful in the modified math course at Campus IV were also economically disadvantaged and LEP. Each C.A.R.E. Academy demographic exceeded the district at-risk student demographic comparison. African Americans revealed the largest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district comparison. One-hundred percent of C.A.R.E. Academy African Americans passed the seventh grade modified math course while 92% of the district at-risk, African American students passed their seventh grade math course.

Results for Question Four

Table 4-7 answers the question, what is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified language arts course? Passing standards were defined by GISD as earning a minimum of a 70 in the

modified language arts course. The language arts course consisted of a modified seventh

and eighth grade curriculum with concentration on eighth grade TEKS. The district

comparison listed in the table below reflects the seventh grade language arts passing

percentage of at-risk students in GISD.

Table 4-7

Success Rates of Modified Language Arts Course – Seventh Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
08-09	N/A		23/24	95.8	N/A		21/23	91.3	44/47	93.6	96
09-10	29/29	100	22/22	100	25/28	89.3	26/26	100	102/105	97.1	95
10-11	18/18	100	27/27	100	25/27	92.6	22/23	95.6	92/95	96.8	94
11-12	28/28	100	28/28	100	29/31	93.5	19/20	95.0	104/107	97.2	97
12-13	29/29	100	31/31	100	29/29	100	32/32	100	121/121	100	96
13-14	26/26	100	29/29	100	28/28	100	22/22	100	105/105	100	94
Total	130/130	100	160/161	99.3	136/143	95.1	142/146	97.3			

The first four cohorts of C.A.R.E. Academy contained students that were not

successful in the modified language arts course. Three C.A.R.E. Academy students each

year were not successful across all campuses. Campus II had one student during the first

cohort to not master the material being taught in the modified language arts course.

Campus III contained seven students across the six cohorts that were not successful in the

modified language arts course while Campus IV contained four students that were not

successful. Like math, the C.A.R.E. Academy students overall had a higher passing

percentage per cohort than the district at-risk student comparison. C.A.R.E. Academy

students received a combination of seventh and eighth grade curriculum while the district

comparison only received seventh grade curriculum.

Table 4-8 shows the demographic breakdown of seventh grade C.A.R.E.
Academy students who passed the modified language arts course. Cohort information
was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by
individual campus and by total campus demographic. The district comparison listed in
the table below reflects the seventh grade language arts passing percentage of at-risk
students by demographic in GISD.

Table 4-8

Success Rates of Modified Language Arts Course – Seventh Grade Demographic

Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	44/44	100	17/17	100	49/51	96.1	45/46	97.8	155/158	98.1	94
Hispanic	66/66	100	128/129	99.2	67/72	93.1	85/88	96.6	345/355	97.2	95
White	12/12	100	3/3	100	10/10	100	8/8	100	33/33	100	97
Asian	6/6	100	9/9	100	2/2	100	N/A		17/17	100	100
ED	78/78	100	94/95	98.9	86/91	94.5	80/83	96.4	338/347	97.4	95
Sex (M/F)	66/64	100/100	88/72	100/98	78/58	93/98	76/65	95/100	308/259	97/99	94/97
LEP	5/5	100	11/11	100	3/3	100	24/25	96.0	43/44	97.7	96

Every student that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy enrolled at Campus I was
successful in the seventh grade modified language arts course. The one C.A.R.E.
Academy student enrolled at Campus II that was not successful was a Hispanic,
economically disadvantaged student. The seven C.A.R.E. Academy students that were
not successful at Campus III were the following ethnicities: two were African American
and five were Hispanic; five of these students were economically disadvantaged. Six of
the C.A.R.E. Academy students that were not successful at Campus III were male while

one was female. Campus IV contained four males that were not successful in the modified language arts course. One was African American and three were Hispanic. Of these students, three were economically disadvantaged and one was LEP. Even though C.A.R.E. Academy students received a combination of seventh and eighth grade curriculum and the district at-risk student comparison only received seventh grade curriculum, C.A.R.E. Academy student performance was aligned with the campus demographics.

Results for Question Five

Table 4-9 answers the question, what is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade math state assessments? The success standard was set by the TEA. Students in the first two cohorts took the math TAKS; the transition to the STAAR took place in 2012. The cohort denotes the year students participated in C.A.R.E. Academy; therefore, district ninth grade data was reported for the year C.A.R.E. Academy students were in ninth grade. For example, students participated in C.A.R.E. Academy during the 08-09 school year. These students would have been in ninth grade during the 09-10 school year. The math state assessment passing percentages for 2010 is reported alongside the 08-09 cohort. The district comparison denotes the total district at-risk passing percentage of GISD students on the ninth grade math state assessment exam. Texas school districts were not rated in 2012 and data are not available. At this time, district data for the 2014 STAAR exam has not been released by the TEA in full.

Table 4-9

Success Rates of Math State Assessment Exams – Ninth Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		10/24	41.6	N/A		9/23	39.1	19/47	40.4	55
09-10	8/27	29.6	13/22	59.1	13/28	46.4	6/26	23.1	40/103	38.8	50
10-11	15/18	83.3	21/27	77.8	20/26	76.9	16/22	72.7	72/93	77.4	Not Rated
11-12	15/27	55.6	26/27	96.3	16/28	57.1	15/19	78.9	72/101	71.3	59
12-13	24/26	92.3	27/28	96.4	23/27	85.2	26/31	83.9	100/112	89.3	Unavailable
Total	62/98	63.3	97/128	75.8	72/109	66.1	72/121	59.5			

The third cohort of C.A.R.E. Academy students showed gains on the ninth grade math state assessment. The overall passing percentage grew by 38% from cohort two to cohort three. The last cohort to complete ninth grade had the highest percentage of students passing the math state assessment. Campus III had the largest number and percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy students passing the math state assessment. C.A.R.E. Academy students in the fourth cohort exceeded the passing percentage of the district at-risk students.

Table 4-10 shows the demographic breakdown of C.A.R.E. Academy ninth grade students who passed the math state assessment exam. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by total campus demographic. District demographic data are not available for only at-risk students; therefore, the district comparison denotes the total district passing percentage of GISD students on the ninth grade math state assessment exam for each demographic. District data are not available for disaggregated male and female populations.

Table 4-10

Success Rates of Math State Assessment Exams – Ninth Grade Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	21/29	72.4	9/14	64.3	29/38	76.3	19/37	51.4	78/118	66.1	68
Hispanic	27/49	55.1	75/99	75.7	33/54	61.1	45/72	62.5	180/274	65.7	72
White	7/10	70.0	3/3	100	4/8	50.0	5/8	62.5	19/29	65.5	90
Asian	6/6	100	9/9	100	2/2	100	N/A		17/17	100	95
ED	42/56	75.0	59/69	85.5	46/64	71.9	45/63	71.4	202/252	80.2	69
Sex (M/F)	29/33	58/68	57/40	79/71	41/31	62/72	44/28	66/52	171/132	67/66	Unavailable
LEP	2/5	40.0	6/6	100	N/A		14/21	66.7	22/32	68.7	45

C.A.R.E. Academy African American students at Campus III had a higher passing percentage than the other three campuses. Campus II had the largest passing percentage of Hispanics and economically disadvantaged C.A.R.E. Academy students and every LEP student that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy as a seventh grader passed the ninth grade math state assessment. There were a larger percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy females passing the math state assessment at Campus I and III; Campus II and IV had a larger percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy males passing the math state assessment. Asian, economically disadvantaged and LEP C.A.R.E. Academy students exceeded the comparable district population.

Results for Question Six

Table 4-11 answers the question, what is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade reading state assessments? The success standard was set by the TEA. Students in the first two cohorts

took the reading TAKS; the transition to the STAAR took place in 2012. The cohort

denotes the year students participated in C.A.R.E. Academy; therefore, district ninth

grade data was reported for the year C.A.R.E. Academy students were in ninth grade.

For example, students participated in C.A.R.E. Academy in the 08-09 school year. These

students would be in ninth grade during the 09-10 school year. Reading state assessment

passing percentages for 2010 is reported alongside the 08-09 cohort. The district

comparison denotes the total district at-risk passing percentage of GISD students on the

ninth grade reading state assessment exam. Texas school districts were not rated in 2012

and data are not available. At this time, district data for the 2014 STAAR exam has not

been released by the TEA in full.

Table 4-11

Success Rates of Reading State Assessment Exams– Ninth Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		17/24	70.8	N/A		20/23	86.9	37/47	78.7	89
09-10	18/27	66.7	19/22	86.4	21/28	75.0	19/26	73.1	77/103	74.8	81
10-11	13/18	72.2	17/27	62.9	12/26	46.1	13/22	59.1	55/93	54.5	Not Rated
11-12	12/27	44.4	15/27	55.6	16/28	57.1	13/19	68.2	56/101	55.5	76
12-13	13/26	50.0	20/28	71.4	13/27	48.1	15/31	48.4	61/112	54.5	Unavailable
Total	56/98	57.1	88/128	68.8	62/109	56.8	80/121	66.1			

The third cohort saw a 20% decline in ninth grade reading passing percentages of

former C.A.R.E. Academy students. All campuses saw a decline on the reading state

assessment passing percentage except for Campus I during this cohort. While Campus I

was the only campus to show an increase during this cohort, they were the only campus

to show a decrease in C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentages the following year.

Campuses II and IV had similar C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentages across all

cohorts while Campuses I and III had similar C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentages.

While C.A.R.E. Academy students did perform lower than the district at-risk population;

the fourth cohort revealed a larger than average gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students

and the district at-risk population, where C.A.R.E. Academy student performed lower

than the district at-risk population.

Table 4-12 shows the demographic breakdown of C.A.R.E. Academy ninth grade

students who passed the reading state assessment exam. Cohort information was

combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual

campus and by total campus demographic. District demographic data are not available

for only at-risk students; therefore, the district comparison denotes the total district

passing percentage of GISD students on the ninth grade reading state assessment exam

for each demographic. District data are not available for disaggregated male and female

populations.

Table 4-12

Success Rates of Reading State Assessment Exams– Ninth Grade Demographic

Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	15/29	51.7	10/14	71.4	19/38	50.0	21/37	56.7	65/118	55.1	84
Hispanic	26/49	53.1	66/99	66.7	33/54	61.1	50/72	70.8	175/274	63.9	85
White	8/10	80.0	2/3	66.7	4/8	50.0	7/8	87.5	21/29	72.4	95
Asian	6/6	100	8/9	88.9	2/2	100	N/A		16/17	94.1	95
ED	29/56	51.8	45/69	65.2	34/64	53.1	35/63	55.5	143/252	56.7	83
Sex (M/F)	30/26	60/54	48/40	67/71	37/25	56/58	35/45	52/83	150/136	59/68	Unavailable
LEP	2/5	40.0	3/6	50.0	N/A		8/21	38.1	13/32	46.6	48

The percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy African American students passing the

ninth grade reading state assessment was highest at Campus II. Campus IV had the

greatest percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy Hispanics passing the assessment. The passing

percentage for economically disadvantaged and LEP C.A.R.E. Academy students was

greatest among Campus II. Campus IV had the largest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy

males and females passing the ninth grade reading state assessment. Like the ninth grade

math state assessment exam, C.A.R.E. Academy students appear to perform much lower

than the district total demographic population. The gap was reduced among Asian and

LEP populations. C.A.R.E. Academy contains all at-risk students and the district

comparison contains the district total demographic population.

Results for Question Seven

Table 4-13 answers the question, what is the percentage of former seventh grade

students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade Algebra I

courses? Passing standards were defined by GISD as earning a minimum of a 70 in the

Algebra I course. Courses in GISD are not specifically tied to a grade level; however, for

the purposes of this study, the Algebra I course grades were reported as first time

enrollment in the Algebra I course as ninth graders. The district comparison listed in the

table below reflects the ninth grade Algebra I passing percentage of at-risk students in

GISD.

Table 4-13

Success Rates of Algebra I Course – Ninth Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		21/24	87.5	N/A		22/23	95.7	43/47	91.5	77
09-10	23/27	85.2	20/22	90.9	27/28	96.4	19/26	73.1	89/103	86.4	78
10-11	16/18	88.8	23/27	85.2	21/26	80.7	15/22	68.2	75/93	80.6	75
11-12	22/27	81.5	26/27	96.3	23/28	82.1	16/19	84.2	87/101	86.1	79
12-13	17/26	65.4	24/28	85.7	23/27	85.2	25/31	80.6	89/112	79.5	82
Total	78/98	79.6	114/128	89.1	94/109	86.2	97/121	80.2			

Each campus and cohort reported overall success in the Algebra I course as ninth

graders. Campus II had the largest percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy students

demonstrating success on first time enrollment of Algebra I while Campus I was 10%

behind. The third and fifth cohort to participate in C.A.R.E. Academy reported the

highest percentage of students that were not successful in Algebra I. Each cohort

reported a higher passing percentage than the district at-risk comparison population.

Table 4-14 shows the demographic breakdown of ninth grade students who

passed the Algebra I course on their first attempt. Cohort information was combined into

a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by

total campus demographic. The district comparison listed in the table below reflects the

ninth grade Algebra I passing percentage of at-risk students by demographic in GISD.

Table 4-14

Success Rates of Algebra I Course – Ninth Grade Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
African American	23/29	79.3	12/14	85.7	32/38	84.2	28/37	75.7	95/118	80.5	77
Hispanic	40/49	81.6	88/99	88.9	48/54	88.9	59/72	81.9	235/274	85.7	75
White	8/10	80.0	2/3	66.7	7/8	87.5	7/8	87.5	24/29	82.7	84
Asian	6/6	100	9/9	100	2/2	100	N/A		17/17	100	94
ED	44/56	78.6	61/69	88.4	53/64	82.8	48/63	76.2	206/252	81.7	77
Sex (M/F)	40/38	80/79	65/49	90/88	53/41	80/95	51/46	76/85	209/174	82/87	74/83
LEP	3/5	60.0	5/6	83.3	N/A		15/21	71.4	23/32	71.8	75

Campus II had the largest percentage of C.A.R.E. Academy African American

and Hispanic students passing the Algebra I course during first time enrollment. Campus

II had the largest percentage of economically disadvantaged and LEP C.A.R.E. Academy

students passing Algebra I among all four campuses. C.A.R.E. Academy males and

females performed consistently at Campuses I and II; however, females had a higher

passing percentage than males at campuses III and IV. All demographics, except LEP,

reported a higher passing percentage than the district at-risk student population in the

ninth grade Algebra I course.

Results for Question Eight

Table 4-15 answers the question, what is the percentage of former seventh grade

students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade English I

courses? Passing standards were defined by GISD as earning a minimum of a 70 in the

English I course. Courses in GISD are not specifically tied to a grade level; however, for the purposes of this study, the English I course grades were reported as first time enrollment in the English I course. The district comparison listed in the table below reflects the ninth grade English I passing percentage of at-risk students in GISD.

Table 4-15

Success Rates of English I Course – Ninth Grade

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
08-09	N/A		23/24	95.8	N/A		21/23	91.3	44/47	93.6	85
09-10	25/27	92.6	21/22	95.5	26/28	92.9	25/26	96.2	97/103	94.2	86
10-11	18/18	100	25/27	92.6	24/26	92.3	19/22	86.4	86/93	92.5	87
11-12	25/27	92.6	25/27	92.6	26/28	92.9	18/19	94.7	94/101	93.1	88
12-13	23/26	88.4	23/28	82.1	22/27	81.5	29/31	93.5	97/112	86.6	93
Total	91/98	92.8	117/128	91.4	98/109	89.9	112/121	92.6			

The totals across all campus cohorts reported above a 90% passing rate in English I for former C.A.R.E. Academy students who completed ninth grade in GISD, with the exception of the last cohort to complete ninth grade. Campus II and III reported below average passing percentages during this last cohort. The first four cohorts reported a higher passing percentage than the district at-risk comparison population.

Table 4-16 shows the demographic breakdown of ninth grade students who passed the English I course on their first attempt. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by total campus demographic. The district comparison listed in the table below reflects the ninth grade English I passing percentage of at-risk students by demographic in GISD.

Table 4-16

Success Rates of English I Course – Ninth Grade Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
African American	28/29	96.5	12/14	85.7	35/38	92.1	34/37	91.9	109/118	92.4	88
Hispanic	46/49	93.9	90/99	90.9	49/54	90.7	68/72	94.4	253/274	92.3	85
White	10/10	100	3/3	100	7/8	87.5	7/8	87.5	27/29	93.1	93
Asian	6/6	100	9/9	100	2/2	100	N/A		17/17	100	96
ED	55/56	98.2	62/69	89.8	59/64	92.2	59/63	93.7	235/252	93.5	88
Sex (M/F)	46/45	92/94	66/51	92/91	57/41	86/95	61/51	91/94	230/188	90/94	85/91
LEP	5/5	100	6/6	100	N/A		19/21	90.5	30/32	93.8	86

Although Campus II reported only two former African American C.A.R.E. Academy students not passing English I on the first attempt, their passing percentage was lower than the other three campuses. Campus II had a lower C.A.R.E. Academy percentage of economically disadvantaged students pass English I the first time; however, the total passing percentage across all campuses was still above 90%. Campus III reported the largest difference in C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentage for males and females. Only Campus IV reported former C.A.R.E. Academy LEP students not passing English I on the first attempt.

Results for Question Nine

Table 4-17 answers the question, what is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy completing high school? Graduation success is defined as students who have mastered all course material outlined in the graduation plan and met passing standards on state assessment exams. Only students that have graduated or are still in GISD are included in this section of the study.

Two cohorts have graduated. District graduation comparisons are unavailable as they are

reported from the TEA the following year. For example, students that participated in

C.A.R.E. Academy during the 08-09 school year would have had an expected graduation

date of June 2013. This district graduation data would be reported on the 2014 TEA state

report. At this time, district graduation data for 2014 has not been released by the TEA in

full.

Table 4-17

Graduation Success Rates

Cohort	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	%
08-09	N/A		11/13	84.6	N/A		15/15	100	26/28	92.8	Unavailable
09-10	17/18	94.4	13/13	100	22/22	100	16/16	100	68/69	98.5	Unavailable
Total	17/18	94.4	24/26	92.3	22/22	100	31/31	100			

Three C.A.R.E. Academy students from the first two cohorts have not graduated

high school and are still enrolled in GISD. One student is from the second cohort at

Campus I while the other two are from the first cohort at Campus II. One student from

Campus II, that has not yet graduated, has met all the course requirements but has yet to

pass the state assessment exit exam. The other two C.A.R.E. Academy students from

Campus I and II have not met course requirements, putting the other Campus II student

two years behind and the student from Campus I is one year behind their outlined

graduation date.

Table 4-18 shows the demographic breakdown of students who have graduated or

are still enrolled in GISD. Cohort information was combined into a campus total for

reporting purposes. Results are displayed by individual campus and by total campus

demographic. As previously stated, district graduation data for 2013 and 2014 has not been released by the TEA.

Table 4-18

Graduation Success Rate - Demographic Breakdown

Demographic	Campus I		Campus II		Campus III		Campus IV		Total Campus		District Comparison %
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
African American	3/3	100	3/3	100	4/4	100	9/9	100	19/19	100	Unavailable
Hispanic	12/13	92.3	19/21	90.5	14/14	100	20/20	100	65/68	95.8	Unavailable
White	N/A		N/A		1/1	100	2/2	100	3/3	100	Unavailable
Asian	2/2	100	3/3	100	1/1	100	N/A		6/6	100	Unavailable
ED	3/4	75.0	3/5	60.0	2/2	100	1/1	100	9/12	75.0	Unavailable
Sex (M/F)	9/8	90/100	15/11	94/91	13/9	100/100	12/19	100/100	49/47	96/98	Unavailable
LEP	1/1	100	1/1	100	N/A		5/5	100	7/7	100	Unavailable

Three students are currently enrolled in GISD that did not meet their expected graduation date. The student from Campus I, cohort two, is a Hispanic, economically disadvantaged male. Campus II had two students that did not graduate on their expected graduation date. Both students are Hispanic and economically disadvantaged; one is male and the other is female.

Conclusion

The analysis concluded to determine if C.A.R.E. Academy students were successfully passing seventh grade math and reading state assessments, seventh grade math and language arts courses, ninth grade math and reading state assessments, ninth grade Algebra I and English I, and graduating high school. C.A.R.E. Academy students had a lower passing percentage on seventh and ninth grade math state assessment exams and the ninth grade reading state assessment exam; however, had a higher passing

percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam and all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) when compared to the district at-risk population. While many of the students who completed C.A.R.E. Academy as seventh graders did not continue their education in GISD, the majority of students that did stay in GISD completed high school. Out of the students that continued in GISD, three are still currently attending school and have not met graduation requirements. While data show C.A.R.E. Academy students performing at a lower passing percentage than the district at-risk comparison group on most state assessment, C.A.R.E. Academy students are performing at a consistent percentage across campuses.

Chapter V

Discussion, Implications and Recommendations

Introduction

While there are positive effects to retaining a student, grade retention increases the risk of dropping out by 30 – 50 percent (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002). Students that are retained in two grades are 90 percent more likely to drop out (Mann, 1987). Students in Texas that are retained are identified "at-risk." In the state of Texas, a student is identified as at-risk of dropping out of school based upon meeting one or more of 13 different state-defined identifiers. At-risk students are struggling to stay in school, and the ones that do stay in school are achieving at a lower rate than other student groups (Texas Education Agency, 2010).

There are programs across the nation designed to provide support for at-risk students in an effort to keep students in school and graduate high school. The purpose of this study was to examine the academic successes of one of these programs. Academic achievement percentages were identified and examined for students who participated in Course Acceleration Remediation and Enrichment (C.A.R.E.) Academy. This program is designed to support previously retained students by allowing them to complete two years of a modified curriculum in one, in an effort to recapture an academic year. Seventh grade math and reading state assessment scores, seventh grade math and language arts course grades, ninth grade math and reading state assessment scores and ninth grade Algebra I and English I course grades were analyzed to determine program academic effectiveness. Passing percentages were identified and compared to the district at-risk population of students in the parallel grades. Graduation rates of students who completed

high school in Gizmo Independent School District (GISD) (pseudonym) were identified. C.A.R.E. Academy student demographic breakdown was compared to the comparable district demographic population on state assessment exams and the district at-risk population in math and language arts courses.

Discussion of Results

This quantitative study was designed to determine to what degree at-risk students that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy were academically successful on seventh grade math and reading state assessments, in seventh grade math and language arts courses, on ninth grade math and reading state assessments, in ninth grade Algebra I and English I courses and if students graduated high school. C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentages were compared to the comparable district at-risk population. Data were broken down by demographic and compared to the district demographic at-risk population in questions three, four, seven, eight and nine. In questions one, two, five and six, C.A.R.E. Academy student demographics were compared to the comparable total district demographic, as specific at-risk data by demographic were not available. Results of the study are summarized below.

Research question one. *What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering math state achievement exams?* Results of the seventh grade math state assessment revealed C.A.R.E. Academy students show a lower passing percentage than the comparable district population by an average of 3.4%. The largest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district occurred in 2012, by seven percent, with the district at-risk score being higher. This was the first year the state made the transition from the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills

(TAKS) to the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR). The first two cohorts revealed the smallest gap of two percent between the populations, with the district at-risk population being higher. C.A.R.E. Academy students were exposed to both seventh and eighth grade math curriculum, reducing the amount of time spent on seventh grade TEKS. This could have played a role in the lower passing percentages. Campus II reported a higher percent passing over the six year period of time, exceeding the next highest campus by four percent.

Each demographic population of C.A.R.E. Academy performed lower than the comparable district population. This comparison is between C.A.R.E. Academy students who are all at-risk while the district data include the total population of each demographic. African American, Hispanic and economically disadvantaged C.A.R.E. Academy students all reported a 19% lower passing rate than the district populations. White C.A.R.E. Academy students reported a 24% gap. The gap between C.A.R.E. Academy limited English proficient (LEP) students and the total district LEP population closed, with both populations reporting an average of 48% passing. Since LEP students are identified as at-risk in Texas, the comparison between these two groups is more closely related than the comparison between C.A.R.E. Academy and the district of the other identified demographics.

Research question two. *What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering reading state achievement exams?* Results of the seventh grade reading state assessment revealed varying results in passing percentage between students that participated in C.A.R.E. Academy and the seventh grade district at-risk population. The average gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district

was 2.2%, with C.A.R.E. Academy score being higher. The first cohort reported a lower passing percentage than the district at-risk population by five percent while cohort two and three reported a higher passing rate by ten and six percent respectively. Cohorts four and five closed the gap and reported the same passing percentage of 77 and 78 percent respectively. Overall, Campus IV reported the lowest passing percentage across all cohorts, performing 12% lower than the next campus.

Most C.A.R.E. Academy demographic populations performed lower than the district. This could is likely because C.A.R.E. Academy students are all at-risk while the district data includes the total population of each demographic. White and Asian students revealed the largest gap of seven percent while economically disadvantaged students reported a three percent lower passing percentage. Limited English Proficient C.AR.E. Academy students exceeded the district comparison population by two percent. Campus I reported the highest percentage of economically disadvantaged students exceeding the next lowest performing campus by 20%. Campus III reported the highest percentage of African American passing the state reading exam at 86.3% exceeding the next highest campus by 8.5%.

Research question three. *What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified math course?* Results of this study revealed C.A.R.E. Academy students had a higher passing percentage in the seventh grade modified math course than the district at-risk population had in seventh grade math. The data revealed C.A.R.E. Academy students had an average of a 6.2% higher passing percentage than the district at-risk population. All cohorts had at least a five percent higher passing percentage than the district at-risk population with the first

cohort exceeding the district by eight percent. Students who participated in the program completed a combination of seventh and eighth grade curriculum and were still able to maintain a higher passing percentage than the district students who were enrolled in seventh grade math. Campus I and III reported 100% of their students passing the modified seventh grade math course across all cohorts. While all C.A.R.E. Academy demographic groups performed above the total district at-risk population, African Americans had the largest percent difference at eight percent. Asian students had the smallest gap while reporting a three percent difference.

Research question four. *What is the percentage of seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering the modified language arts course?* C.A.R.E. Academy students and district at-risk students reported varying results in passing percentages in the seventh grade language arts course. The average gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district at-risk population in seventh grade language arts was 3.2%, with C.A.R.E. Academy scores being higher. Cohort one revealed a two percent lower passing percentage than the district at-risk population while the last cohort reported 100% of students passed seventh grade language arts exceeding the district by six percent. Campus I reported 100% of their students passing the course across all six cohorts.

Like seventh grade math, African Americans had the largest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district at-risk African American population. In math, these students performed eight percent higher than the district at-risk population; in language arts they performed four percent higher. Asian students in C.A.R.E. Academy

and the district Asian at-risk population both reported a 100% passing percentage in seventh grade language arts.

      Research question five. *What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade math state assessments?* Overall C.A.R.E. Academy students performed an average of 12% lower than the district at-risk population. Students in the first two cohorts had a lower passing percentage on the ninth grade math state assessment than the district at-risk population by fifteen and eleven percent respectively. The following year, in 2012, Texas made the transition from the TAKS exam to the STAAR exam. At this time, program guidelines changed and C.A.R.E. Academy students were automatically enrolled in an Algebra support class during their ninth grade year. This class is designed to provide support for students who struggled in math in middle school. Due to C.A.R.E. Academy students covering seventh and eighth grade curriculum in one year, the Algebra support class was chosen to provide extra support to students who may struggle in Algebra I. During this year (cohort 10-11), C.A.R.E. Academy Algebra I state assessment scores increased from 39% passing to 77% passing. The following year, cohort four exceeded the district at-risk population by 12%. Campus II had the highest passing percentage across all cohorts exceeding the lowest performing campus by 16%.

      Even though C.A.R.E. Academy students performed lower than the district at-risk population; economically disadvantaged and LEP C.A.R.E. Academy students outperformed the district populations by 11% and 23% respectively. The smallest gap between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district occurred between African Americans where C.A.R.E. Academy performed two percent lower than the district

African American students. The largest gap occurred among white students when C.A.R.E. Academy students performed 25% lower than the district population. C.A.R.E. Academy LEP students outperformed the district population by 23%. The increase in ethnicity demographic gaps could be because C.A.R.E. Academy students are all at-risk while the district ethnicity demographic data include the total population of each demographic. Since LEP students are identified as at-risk in Texas, the comparison between these two groups is more closely related than the comparison between C.A.R.E. Academy and the district of the other identified ethnicity demographics.

Research question six. *What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade reading state assessments?* While C.A.R.E. Academy campus averages remained within 11% of each other, C.A.R.E. Academy students performed lower than the district at-risk population on the ninth grade reading state assessment. Like the ninth grade math state assessment, the reading state assessment transitioned from the TAKS exam to the STAAR exam in 2012. While math scores increased for C.A.R.E. Academy students, reading scores declined during this transition. District scores also declined; however, not as much as C.A.R.E. Academy students. Across cohorts, the district at-risk population scored 12% higher than the C.A.R.E. Academy students. Cohort four reported the largest difference of 21%, while cohort two reported the smallest gap of six percent.

On the ninth grade math state assessment, African Americans have the smallest gap. The district African American population, on the ninth grade reading state assessment, outperformed the C.A.R.E. Academy students by 29%. Campus II reported the largest African American student passing percentage at 71.4%. This is 14% higher

than the next highest campus. Asian C.A.R.E. Academy students attempted to close the gap while performing one percent lower than the comparable district population. C.A.R.E. Academy economically disadvantaged students revealed a 25% lower passing percentage than the district; however Campus II outperformed the other campuses by a minimum of eight percent. Like the Asian population, LEP C.A.R.E. Academy students reported a gap of one percent lower than the comparable district population. Like the ninth grade math state assessment exam, the increase in ethnicity demographic gaps could be because C.A.R.E. Academy students are all at-risk while the district ethnicity demographic data include the total population of each demographic. Since LEP students are identified as at-risk in Texas, the comparison between these two groups is more closely related than the comparison between C.A.R.E. Academy and the district of the other identified ethnicity demographics.

Research question seven. *What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade Algebra I courses?* C.A.R.E. Academy students held a higher passing percentage in Algebra I than the district at-risk population. On average, C.A.R.E. Academy students had a 7.6% higher passing percentage than the district at-risk population. Cohorts one and three reported the largest gap of 14% over the district at-risk population. The last cohort reported a two percent lower passing percentage than district at-risk population.

The largest demographic gap between the two populations occurred with Hispanics. C.A.R.E. Academy Hispanic students reported an eleven percent higher passing percentage in ninth grade Algebra I than the district Hispanic at-risk population. The smallest gap occurred between white and LEP students revealing a one and three

percent lower passing percentage than the comparable district at-risk population. Campus II reported a higher economically disadvantaged passing percentage exceeding the next campus by five percent.

Research question eight. *What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy mastering ninth grade English I courses?* The first through fourth cohorts of C.A.R.E. Academy had a higher passing percentage than the district at-risk population in English I during their ninth grade year. The average gap was 6.8% between C.A.R.E. Academy students and the district at-risk population in ninth grade English I, with C.A.R.E. Academy having the higher percentage. During the first two cohorts, C.A.R.E. Academy students outperformed the district at-risk population by nine and eight percent respectively. The last cohort to complete ninth grade reported a lower passing percentage of six percent.

Each C.A.R.E. Academy demographic reported higher passing percentages than their district at-risk comparison group. The largest gap of eight percent occurred between LEP students. The smallest gap occurred between African American and Asian students at four percent. Campus I had the highest African American passing percentage exceeding the lowest campus by ten percent. White students in both C.A.R.E. Academy and the district at-risk population produced a 93% passing percentage.

Research question nine. *What is the percentage of former seventh grade students successfully completing C.A.R.E. Academy completing high school?* There were 47 students in the first C.A.R.E. Academy cohort and 105 students in the second C.A.R.E. Academy cohort. Of these students, 26 students graduated in GISD from the first cohort and 68 from the second cohort. Only three students were still enrolled in

GISD at the end of this study and did not graduate. From the first cohort, 60% of the students continued their education in GISD; 93% of these students graduated in district. Sixty-six percent of the second cohort continued in GISD and 99% of these students graduated in district. The three students that were still enrolled in GISD at the end of this study were Hispanic and economically disadvantaged, and have more than one factor causing them to be identified as at-risk. Two of the students were from the first cohort and one was from the second cohort. Since grade retention increases the risk of dropping out by 30 – 50 percent (Shane R. Jimerson et al., 2002), the 97% C.A.R.E. Academy graduation rate reveals the program is meeting its goal.

Implications for School Leaders

The results of this study show mixed differences in the academic achievement of C.A.R.E. Academy students and district at-risk students. As a whole, C.A.R.E. Academy students had a lower passing percentage on seventh and ninth grade math state assessment exams and the ninth grade reading state assessment exam; however, had a higher passing percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam and all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) when compared to the district at-risk population. Overall, C.A.R.E. Academy students that continued their education in GISD completed high school with a 97% graduation rate. While there were mixed results when comparing C.A.R.E. Academy student academic achievement results to district populations, the lack of negative effects concludes this program is accomplishing its goal. Data collected from this study, like similar program studies such as Core 87 (Chamberlin & Catterall, 1963), Project

BRIDGE (Words and Numbers Research Inc., 1991) and Project ACCEL (Ramaswami, 1993) provide positive program results on academics.

C.A.R.E. Academy passing percentages were compared to the comparable district at-risk population. Data were broken down by demographic and compared to the district demographic at-risk population for all course (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) data. C.A.R.E. Academy students were compared to the comparable total district demographic, as specific at-risk data by demographic were not available, on all state assessment exam demographic breakdowns; however, since LEP students are identified as at-risk in Texas, the comparison between these two groups is more closely related than the comparison between C.A.R.E. Academy and the district of the other identified demographics.

Campus II reported the highest passing percentage on the seventh grade math state assessment in three out of six cohorts. As these students transitioned to ninth grade, these same students reported the highest ninth grade passing percentages in four out of five cohorts on the ninth grade math state assessment. Hispanic and economically disadvantaged students at Campus II reported the highest passing percentages across all campuses on the seventh and ninth grade math state assessment exams. Campus IV reported students with the highest passing percentage in the ninth grade English I course in three out of five cohorts.

Before choosing students to participate in C.A.R.E. Academy school leaders should consider several factors. All students that participate in C.A.R.E. Academy have been identified as at-risk; many of these students have also been identified as economically disadvantaged or "low performers." School leaders should note trends

among participating program campuses and use this information to make appropriate student and teacher program selections. Leaders should consult campuses demonstrating higher achievement in comparable demographics to better provide quality instruction and support. Choice of teacher, program quality and fidelity of implementation could account for variances among campuses when viewing achievement results.

In order to make programmatic decisions, school leaders should be aware of past and current C.A.R.E. Academy achievement results. Examining such achievement data, such as those in this study, will allow school leaders to monitor credit recovery participant successes. Leaders can then make informed decisions about student selection and program options. School leaders should be aware of how not only their campus is performing on benchmarks and assessments but how their campus compares to other C.A.R.E. Academy campuses and district averages.

While this program is "a school within a school," school leaders should promote this program as an accelerated program that provides daily rich, challenging, and rigorous curriculum to at-risk students. It should be promoted as a positive, rewarding incentive to help previously retained students regain their academic and/or social confidences by earning back a year of their academic career.

Recommendations for Further Research

Results of the study did not suggest any consistent pattern of negative effect on student achievement on seventh grade math and reading state assessments, in seventh grade math and language arts courses, on ninth grade math and reading state assessments, and in ninth grade Algebra I and English I courses. The study revealed that overall, C.A.R.E. Academy students had a lower passing percentage on seventh and ninth grade

math state assessment exams and the ninth grade reading state assessment exam; however, had a higher passing percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam and all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) when compared to the district at-risk student population. Due to the size of the study and program concerns, the following research suggestions would further this body of knowledge:

1. Using similar research questions, track the remaining four C.A.R.E. Academy cohorts through their expected graduation date to look for trends in student success and graduation rates.

2. Conduct a similar study to compare the academic successes of students who participate in C.A.R.E. Academy to those that qualified for the program but did not participate in the program.

3. Conduct a more comprehensive program evaluation study, not only looking at academic successes, but also include program cost, student, teacher, administrator and parent perceptions and program attitude to determine overall program effectiveness.

4. Conduct a similar study to track students following high school graduation, analyzing post-secondary choices and job findings.

5. Conduct a study to examine leadership styles in schools where credit and course recovery programs are in place.

Conclusion

With increasing state standards, retention is becoming more popular as a result of student underachievement. One study reported that up to 78 percent of dropouts were

retained at least once (S. R. Jimerson, 2001). The reasons for grade retention is wide spread, however students in many school districts are retained in a grade in order to allow them to gain the academic or social skills that teachers believe are necessary to succeed academically (Jacob & Lefgren, 2007). Interventions are plentiful in middle and high schools. Struggling students and targeted demographics are provided priority support among campuses. Effective intervention programs have several strategies in common including: student-centered, multi-tiered activities, emotional support, emphasis on literacy with remediation, an organized and safe environment, a committed school staff and high expectations (Gleason & Dynarski, 2009).

The results of this study indicate C.A.R.E. Academy students had a lower passing percentage on math state assessment exams and the ninth grade reading state assessment exam; however, had a higher passing percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam and all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) when compared to the district at-risk student population. Overall, C.A.R.E. Academy students, that continued their education in GISD, completed high school with a 97% graduation rate. There were some comparisons in favor of C.A.R.E. Academy, and a lack of a pattern of negative effects. This program appears to be accomplishing its goals.

When school leaders make decisions regarding credit recover programs, examination of achievement data of participants will allow leaders to make informed decisions regarding student selection and program options. Staffing considerations and student selection should be well thought out. Credit recovery should be perceived as a positive program designed to support the district's at-risk population and regain

graduation opportunities. Ultimately the population of students in this study has demonstrated the capacity and desire to succeed and, when compared with similar populations of students district wide, the study revealed a higher passing percentage on the seventh grade reading state assessment exam, on all examined courses (seventh grade math and language arts and ninth grade Algebra I and English I) and C.A.R.E. Academy students, that continued their education in GISD, completed high school with a 97% graduation rate while the district had a three year average graduation rate of 93.2%.

References

Abidin, R. R., Golladay, W. M., & Howerton, A. L. (1971). Elementary school retention: An unjustifiable, discriminatory and noxious educational policy. *Journal of School Psychology*, *9*, 410–417.

Alexander, K., Entwisle, D., & Dauber, S. (2003). *On the success of failure: A reassessment of the effects of retention in the primary grades* (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, B. (1998). Retention in the early grades: a review of research. *Of Primary Interest*, *6*(1).

Anderson, G. E., Whipple, A. D., & Jimerson, S. R. (2002). Grade retention: Achievement and mental health outcomes. *National Association of School Psychologists*, 1–3.

Balfanz, R., Herzog, L., & Iver, D. J. M. (2007). Preventing Student Disengagement and Keeping Students on the Graduation Path in Urban Middle-Grades Schools: Early Identification and Effective Interventions. *Educational Psychologist*, *42*(4), 223–235.

Balfanz, R., & MacIver, D. (2000). Transforming high-poverty urban middle schools into strong learning institutions: Lessons from the first five years of the Talent Development Middle School. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, *5*(1&2), 137–158.

Bali, V. A., Anagnostopoulos, D., & Roberts, R. (2005). Toward a Political Explanation of Grade Retention. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *27*(2), 133–155.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational Leadership*. New York: Psychology Press.

Bohl, N. (1989, April). *Research study of the pre-first program. Springfield Local Schools (Holland, Ohio).* Association for Childhood International Study Conference, Indianapolis, IN.

Bonvin, P., Bless, G., & Schuepbach, M. (2008). Grade retention: decision-making and effects on learning as well as social and emotional development. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *19*(1), 1–19.

Bridgeland, J. M., Dilulio, Jr., J. J., & Morison, K. B. (2006). *The silent epidemic: Perspectives of high school dropouts. A report by Civic Enterprises in association with Peter D. Hart Research Associates for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation*. Washington, DC: Civic Enterprises.

Byrnes, D., & Yamamoto, K. (1986). Views on grade repetition. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, *20*(1), 14–20.

Cabus, S. J., & De Witte, K. (2011). Does school time matter?—On the impact of compulsory education age on school dropout. *Economics of Education Review*, *30*(6), 1384–1398.

Carstens, A. A. (1985). Retention and Social Promotion for the Exceptional Child. *School Psychology Review*, *14*(1), 48–63.

Carter, E. F. (1990). Decreasing the incidence of first grade retention through a diagnostic-prescriptive intervention program and teacher in-service.

Chamberlin, G., & Catterall, C. (1963). Acceleration for the Overage Potential Dropout? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 98–100.

Connell, J. P. (1990). *Context, self and action: A motovational analysis of self-system processes across the life-span*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Retention in the early grades: a review of research. *The School Administrator*, *55*(7), 18–23.

Dianda, M. (2008). *Preventing future high school dropouts: An advocacy and action guide for NEA state and local affiliates*. National Education Association.

Edson, A. J. (1990). *"Is Johnny ready for first grade?" An analysis of kindergarted teachers' thoughts on and practices of grade retention*. Harvard University.

Elam, S. M. (1990). The 22nd annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *78*, 41–54.

Fenn, W. L., & Mixon, J. (2011). An Examination of Self-Perceived Transformational Leadership Behaviors of Texas Superintendents. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *6*(2).

Gewertz, C. (2001). "Diplomas Now" offers potential dropouts lots of help. *Education Week*, 16–18.

Gleason, P., & Dynarski, M. (2009). Do we know whom to serve? Issues in using risk factors to identify dropouts. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, *7*(1), 25–41.

Godfrey, E. (1972). The Tragedy of Failure. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, *37*(5), 34–35.

Grantham, M. K. (2004). *An examination of the impact of early retention, academic and behavioral interventions, and grade retained on academic achievement* (Ph.D.). Mississippi State University, United States -- Mississippi.

Greene, J. P., & Winters, M. A. (2006). Getting ahead by staying behind. *Education Next*.

Haack, M. K. (1984). *A study of primary grade non-promotion involving educator perceptions, studnet characteristics, and parent opinions*.

Haberman, M., & Dill, V. (1993). The Knowledge Base on Retention vs. Teacher Ideology: Implications for Teacher Preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *44*(5), 352–360.

Hauser, R. M., Pager, D. I., & Simmons, S. J. (2000). *Race-ethnicity, social background, and grade retention*. Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Madison-Wisconsin.

Heppen, J., Allensworth, E., Walters, K., Pareja, A. S., Kurki, A., Nomi, T., & Sorensen, N. (2012). *Efficacy of Online Algebra I for Credit Recovery for At-Risk Ninth Grade Students: Evidence from Year 1*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

Jackson, A. W., & Davis, G. A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jacob, B., & Lefgren, L. (2007). *The effect of grade retention on high school completion*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

Jimerson, S., Carlson, E., Rotert, M., Egeland, B., & Sroufe, L. A. (1997). A prospective, longitudinal study of the correlates and consequences of early grade retention. *Journal of School Psychology*, *35*(1), 3–25.

Jimerson, S., Egeland, B., Sroufe, L. A., & Carlson, B. (2000). A prospective longitudinal study of high school dropouts examining multiple predictors across development. *Journal of School Psychology*, *38*(6), 525–549.

Jimerson, S. R. (1999). On the Failure of Failure: Examining the Association between Early Grade Retention and Education and Employment Outcomes During Late Adolescence. *Journal of School Psychology*, *37*(3), 243–72.

Jimerson, S. R. (2001). Meta-analysis of grade retention research: Implications for practice in the 21st century. *School Psychology Review*, *30*(3), 420–438.

Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E., & Whipple, A. D. (2002). Winning the battle and losing the war: Examining the relation between grade retention and dropping out of high school. *Psychology in the Schools*, *39*(4), 441–457.

Jimerson, S. R., & Kaufman, A. M. (2003). Reading, Writing, and Retention: A Primer on Grade Retention Research. *Reading Teacher*, *56*(7), 622–35.

Kamii, C. K., & Weikart, D. P. (1963). Marks, achievements, and intelligence of seventh graders who were retained (non-promoted) once in elementary school. *Journal of Education Research*, *56*, 452–459.

Katz, M. S. (1976). *A history of compulsory education laws*. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, *33*(1), 33–42.

Leech, D., & Fulton, C. R. (2008). Faculty perceptions of shared deision making and the principals' leadership behaviors in secondary schools in alarge urban district. *Education*, *128*(4), 630–644.

Light, H. W. (2006). *Light's Retention Scale: 2006 edition*. Novata, CA: Academic Therapy Publications.

Lloyd, D. (1978). Prediction of school failure from third-grade data. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *38*, 1193–1200.

Luopa, P. E. (2010). *Heading toward the finish line: Effects of PLATORTM online courses on credit recovery* (Ph.D.). Capella University, United States -- Minnesota.

Making a difference in high poverty middle schools. (2005). Retrieved from http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/news/home05/jan05/middle.html

Mann, H. (1848). Report No. 12 of the Massachusetts School Board (1848). *The America Information Web*.

McCallumore, K. M., & Sparapani, E. F. (2010). The Importance of the Ninth Grade on High School Graduation Rates and Student Success in High School. *Education*, *130*(3), 447–456.

McGregor, D., & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. (2006). *The human side of enterprise: Annotated edition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miller, M., Frazier, C. C., & Richey, D. D. (1980). Student non-promotion and teacher attitude. *Contemporary Education*, *51*, 155–157.

Nason, B. (1991). Retaining children: Is it the right decision? *Childhood Education*, *67*, 300–304.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.

Neild, R. C., Stoner-Eby, S., & Furstenberg, J. (2001). Connecting Entrance and Departure: The Transition to Ninth Grade and High School Dropout. *eScholarship*.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, § 1822 (2002).

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Ledership Theory and Practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peterson, M. (2010). KIPP: Learning a lesson from big business. *Bloomberg Businessweek*.

Pierson, L., & Connell, J. (1992). Effect of grade retention on self-systen processes, school engagement, and academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *84*(3), 300–307.

Pollack, L. (2010, December). *Examining the effectiveness of drouput prevention practices and their implications for intervention with public schools*. The University of Southern Mississippi.

Pomplun, M. (1988). Retention: the earlier, the better? *Journal of Educational Research*, *81*(5), 281–287.

Powell, P. J. (2005). *The effects of grade retention: Life histories of adults who were retained as children* (Ed.D.). Northern Arizona University, United States -- Arizona.

Ramaswami, S. (1993). *Accelerating the Learning of At-Risk Students: An Evaluation of Project ACCEL* (p. 132). New Jersey: Newark Board of Education.

Ream, R. K., & Rumberger, R. W. (2008). Student Engagement, Peer Social Capital, and School Dropout among Mexican American and Non-Latino White Students. *Sociology of Education*, *81*(2), 109–139.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2002). Age 21 Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Title I Chicago Child-Parent Centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *24*(4), 267–303.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J., & McCoy, A. (1997). Grade retention doesn't work. *Education Week*, *17*(3), 36.

Roderick, M. (1994). Grade retention and school dropout: Investigating the association. *American Educational Research Journal*, *31*, 729–759.

Russell, D. H., Alexander, R., Shellhammer, T. A., & Smitter, F. (1952). The influence of repetition of a grade and of regular promotion on the attitudes of parents and children toward school. *California Journal of Elementary Education*, *21*, 29–41.

Sandoval, J., & Fitzgerald, P. (1985). A high school follow-up of children who were nonpromoted or attended a junior first grade. *Psychology in the Schools*, *22*(2), 164–70.

Schuyler, N. B. (1985). *Does retention help? Perspectives after three years*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Il.

Smith, M., & Shepard, L. (1987). What doesn't work: Explaining policies of retention in the early grades. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *69*(2), 129–134.

Smith, M., & Shepard, L. (1988). Kindergarten readiness and retention: a qualitative study of teachers' beliefs and practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, *25*(3), 307–333.

Standerfer, L. (2006). Before NCLB: The history of ESEA. *Principal Leadership (High Sch Ed)*, *6*(8).

State of Texas Student Success Initiative (SSI), § 28.021 (1999).

Stock Knoll, N. (2003). *The impact of elementary school retention on school-related variables: A longitutinal study*. University of Albany, State University of New York.

Stroup, A., & Robins, L. (1972). Elementary school predictors of high school dropout among black males. *Sociology of Education*, *45*, 212–222.

Student success initiative manual: Grade advancement requirements. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/

Tanner, C. K., & Combs, F. E. (1993). Student Retention Policy: The Gap Between Research and Practice. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *8*(1), 69–77.

Texas Education Agency. (2010). *Glossary for the Academic Excellence Indicator System: 2009-2010 report*. Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/2010/glossary.pdf

Texas Education Agency. (2014). Retrieved from http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/index.html

Texas Education Code, § 29.083 (1995).

Tomchin, E. M., & Impara, J. C. (1992). Unraveling teachers' beliefs about grade retention. *American Educational Research Journal*, *29*(1), 199–223.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *The Condition of Education 2014 (NCES 2014-083)*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_coj.asp

Vail, J. A. (2002). *The effects of early in-grade retention on the achievement of fifth-grade students* (Ed.D.). Sam Houston State University, United States -- Texas.

Vollmer, J. (2010). *Schools Cannot Do It Alone*. Fairfield, IN: Elightenment Press.

Watson, J., & Gemin, B. (2008). *Using Online Learning for At-Risk Students and Credit Recovery. Promising Practices in Online Learning*. North American Council for Online Learning.

Words and Numbers Research Inc. (1991). *Evaluation of the Bridge Program* (p. 95). Torrington, CT.

Xia, C., & Glennie, E. (2005). Grade retention: A three part series. *Washington DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement*.

Zimny, J. L. A. (2003). *Effects of grade level retained, and other variables on student progress following retention* (Ed.D.). Texas A&M University - Commerce, United States -- Texas.

Appendix A

C.A.R.E. Academy Parent Letter

C.A.R.E. Academy Student Interview Questions

C.A.R.E. Academy Teacher Evaluation Form

C.A.R.E. Academy Evaluation Rubric

Date

Dear Parents/Guardians:

Your child is eligible to participate in the Course Acceleration, Remediation, and Enrichment (CARE) Academy program. This is an accelerated program which allows students to master necessary seventh/eighth grade curriculum and move on to high school after their 7th grade year.

With the goal of attending high school in mind, it is necessary to review all information on eligible students. Below is a list of criteria that will be evaluated to determine if your student will participate in CARE Academy.

- Reading and Math State Assessment scores (5th grade)
- Reading and Math State Assessment scores (6th grade)
- Attendance
- Behavior/discipline concerns
- Course grades
- Written Interview
- Oral Interview

Please review and sign the XXXX-XXXX CARE contract if you are interested in your student participating in the CARE Academy program. After the contract is returned, all of the above data will be evaluated, students will participate in an interview, and a decision will be made to determine whether your student will participate in the CARE Academy or receive the regular seventh grade curriculum.

The saying, "Unto whom much is given, much is expected," describes commitment to and participation in the CARE Academy program for our staff, our students, and our parents.

You have received two copies of this letter. Please sign one letter and have your child return it along with the signed contract to (Name), (Date). Keep the second letter at home for your reference. Please feel free to contact me at (Phone Number) if you have any questions regarding the CARE Academy program.

Sincerely,

Name
CARE Academy Administrator

Student Name (Print): _____ Date ____/____/____

My child and I understand these expectations. I will support my child in this opportunity.

Parent/Guardian's Signature: _____ Date____/____/____

CARE Academy Student Interview Form

NAME _____ DATE _____

1.   What do you like most about school?

    _____

    _____

    _____

2.   What do you like least about school?

    _____

    _____

    _____

3.   What do you think is your strongest subject? Why?

    _____

    _____

    _____

4.   What do you think is your weakest subject? Why?

    _____

    _____

    _____

5.   Why do you want to be in the CARE Academy program?

    _____

    _____

    _____

6.   How do you make sure that you use your time in class wisely?

    _____

    _____

    _____

7. Self-discipline is defined as the ability to control one's feelings and overcome one's weaknesses; the ability to pursue what one thinks is right despite the temptations to abandon it. Give an example of your use of self-discipline.

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. How do you react if you have difficulty with a subject?

   _____

   _____

   _____

9. How well can you work individually as well as with others?

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. What kind of help do you think you might need in the CARE Academy program?

   _____

   _____

   _____

11. Do you have any questions you would like to ask us about the CARE Academy?

   _____

   _____

   _____

12. Do you have any comments that you would like to make about your candidacy that you have not yet been given the opportunity to tell us about?

   _____

   _____

   _____

C.A.R.E. Academy Teacher Evaluation Form

You currently teach the following student who is qualified for CARE Academy during the XXXX-XXXX school year. Please provide us with a little information about each student.

Student Name:_____   Student ID: _____

Please rank the student's ability on a 1-5 scale (1 = worst, 5 = best) and provide us with your recommendation for the student. Feel free to add any additional comments.

Criteria		Best ------- Average ----- Worst				
P **Prompt**	• Inside classroom and ready to learn before bell rings • Turns in assignments on or before due dates	5	4	3	2	1
O **Organized**	• Brings all required materials • Keeps binder/folder neat and orderly	5	4	3	2	1
W **Wise Choices**	• Follows classroom/school-wide expectations • Always completes work • Uses appropriate language and quiet voice • Stays on task.	5	4	3	2	1
E **Effort**	• Always participates in classroom activities • Gives personal best • Offers assistance when needed	5	4	3	2	1
R **Respect**	• Stops, looks, and listens when others speak • Positivity toward others • Treats everyone with courtesy	5	4	3	2	1

I would recommend this student for CARE Academy next year. Check one box.

☐ YES   ☐ NO

Additional Comments

C.A.R.E. Academy Selection Rubric

Student Name: _____ ID #: _____

DOB: mm/dd/yy

2 years overage (X/XX/XXXX)
1 year overage (X/XX/XXXX)

Overaged Reason: _____

Retained in grade(s) - _____
Started school late because _____

TOTAL POINTS EARNED: 0

Avg. Lexile score:
700+
600-700
Below 600 (not recommended for CARE)

Other Information: _____

Special Programs: (circle one)

SPED (not removal)	yes	no
Dyslexia	yes	no
ESL	yes	no
504	yes	no

TAKS/STAAR

MATH	Value	10-11	11-12
Commended	15		
Passed	10		
Failed	0		

READING	Value	10-11	11-12
Commended	15		
Passed	10		
Failed	0		

ATTENDANCE

	Value	11-12
Good (1-4)	10	
Average (4-9)	5	
Poor (10+)	0	

DISCIPLINE CONCERNS

	Value	11-12
None	10	
Minor	5	
Major	0	

GRADES

LA	Value	10-11	11-12
90-100	10		
75-89	5		
70-74	2		
Below 70	0		

READING	Value	10-11	11-12
90-100	10		
75-89	5		
70-74	2		
Below 70	0		

MATH	Value	10-11	11-12
90-100	10		
75-89	5		
70-74	2		
Below 70	0		

SCIENCE	Value	10-11	11-12
90-100	10		
75-89	5		
70-74	2		
Below 70	0		

SOCIAL STUDIES	Value	10-11	11-12
90-100	10		
75-89	5		
70-74	2		
Below 70	0		

INTERVIEW WRITTEN

	Value	11-12
Great	10	
Average	5	
Below Average	2	

INTERVIEW ORAL

	Value	11-12
Great	10	
Average	5	
Below Average	2	

LISTENING & APPROPRIATE RESPONSES

	Value	11-12
Attentive	10	
Fair	5	
Inattentive	2	

Appendix B

Approval from the University of Houston Human Subject Research Committee

UNIVERSITY of **HOUSTON**

DIVISION OF RESEARCH

July 28, 2014

Ms. Melissa Bradley
c/o Dr. Robert C. Borneman
Dean, Education

Dear Ms. Melissa Bradley,

Based upon your request for exempt status, an administrative review of your research proposal entitled "The Effects of Middle School Dropout Prevention on the Academic Achievement of At-risk Students: Implications for School Leaders" was conducted on June 25, 2014.

At that time, your request for exemption under **Category 4** was approved pending modification of your proposed procedures/documents.

The changes you have made adequately respond to the identified contingencies. As long as you continue using procedures described in this project, you do not have to reapply for review. * Any modification of this approved protocol will require review and further approval. Please contact me to ascertain the appropriate mechanism.

If you have any questions, please contact Nettie Martinez at 714-743-9211.

Sincerely yours,

Kirstin Rochford, MPH, CIP, CPIA
Director, Research Compliance

*Approvals for exempt protocols will be valid for 5 years beyond the approval date. Approval for this project will expire **July 27, 2019**. If the project is completed prior to this date, a final report should be filed to close the protocol. If the project will continue after this date, you will need to reapply for approval if you wish to avoid an interruption of your data collection.

Protocol Number: 14457-EX

Appendix C

ISD Consent to Participate in Research Form

Independent School District

Department of School Improvement and Accountability

██████████

Research Specialist

To: Melissa Bradley

From: ██████████

Date: August 7, 2014

Re: Approval of Application to Conduct Research in ████████ ISD

Your request to conduct the following research project in ████████ ISD has been approved: *The Effects of Middle School Dropout Prevention on the Academic Achievement of At-Risk Students: Implications for School Leaders.*

As you pursue this project, please refer to the conditions listed below:

◉ Keep ████████████████████ informed of all activities involved with the project.

◉ You are approved to conduct your research only on the following campuses: ████████ ████████████████

◉ An information services request has been submitted to obtain the following information for *only* the 588 C.A.R.E. Academy program students the research applicant identified:

- # of participating 7th grade students,

- % passing 7th grade math, ELA, math state assessment, reading state assessment

- % passing 9th grade Algebra I, English I, math state assessment, reading state assessment, % meeting graduation criteria, % graduating.

    ○ Once the information has been received the student data will be forwarded to you.

◉ No additional data may be collected beyond the archival data provided by Information Services.

◉ Practice confidentiality while conducting the various steps necessary to complete the project.

◉ Use a random code system to record and report data collected. Never use actual names, ID, or social security numbers.

◉ Use a pseudonym instead of the actual district or campus name in your research.