

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 188

UD 032 248

AUTHOR Syropoulos, Mike
 TITLE Evaluation of the 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. Area E.
 INSTITUTION Research and Evaluation Specialists, Inc.
 SPONS AGENCY Detroit Public Schools, MI. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Testing.
 PUB DATE 1997-10-00
 NOTE 207p.; Some pages printed on colored paper.
 PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attitude Change; *Dropout Prevention; *Grade 9; High School Students; High Schools; Principals; Program Evaluation; *School Restructuring; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods; *Urban Schools; Urban Youth
 IDENTIFIERS *Detroit Public Schools MI

ABSTRACT

The Ninth Grade Restructuring Program of the Detroit (Michigan) public schools was designed to restructure the ninth grade in ways that improve academic performance, develop positive attitudes toward learning, improve the school environment, reduce the dropout rate, and increase the graduation rate of students. Features of the program were instructional and direct noninstructional services, such as social work services, counseling and psychological services; tutoring by student assistants with teacher supervision; and parent participation in instructional and noninstructional activities. This report presents findings from the second year evaluation in Area E of the Detroit schools. Three principals completed a survey and indicated the clear belief that the program boosted student achievement. Students who completed questionnaires (n=125) were highly satisfied with the program and thought it helped them academically and socially. Teachers (n=27) generally thought (81 to 100%) that the program raised student achievement. Three ninth grade administrators who responded also generally thought that the program raised achievement. Teachers and both groups of administrators identified areas in which improvements could be made and made recommendations for its continuation. These included the fostering of a school-within-a-school environment, continuing block scheduling, continuing to create clusters of students, and continuing to sensitize teachers to the special needs of ninth graders. One of the chief findings is that the rate at which students discontinued their educations declined in 1996-97 as it had in 1995-96. In Grade 10, however, the discontinuation rate increased, suggesting that the program should be extended to grade 10. Twelve appendixes provide information about students affected by the program, including information on dropouts and transfers. (Contains 60 tables and 56 references.) (SLD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *



EVALUATION
OF THE
1996-97 NINTH GRADE
RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM
AREA E

Submitted to:

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Detroit Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
 This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Moore
DPS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Submitted by:

Dr. Mike Syropoulos, Project Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Specialists, Inc.

October, 1997

Secretarial Services Were Provided

by

Deidra Thornton

**HIGHLIGHTS
OF THE
NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM
Area E**

Submitted to:

The Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment
Detroit Public Schools

Submitted by:

Dr. Mike Syropoulos, Project Evaluator
Research and Evaluation Specialists, Inc.

October, 1997

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM AREA E

This is the second year evaluation of the program. Data were collected from principals, Ninth Grade Administrators, teachers, students and the district's AS400 information system.

Three (3) principals commented on twelve (12) statements dealing with the total program. One hundred percent (100%) of the principals responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to ten (10) of the statements. The mean average of all the statements is eighty-nine percent (89%).

Organizational changes which occurred, as indicated by the principals, are as follows: school-within-a-school, team teaching, block scheduling and flexible scheduling.

Major concerns as indicated by the principals are as follows: provide new and different modes of instruction, remind teachers that students have different styles of learning, and teachers must vary their teaching methods.

Changes that would improve implementation as indicated by principals are as follows: more parental involvement, improving academic achievement, and identify at-risk students.

Twenty-seven (27) teachers from three (3) schools commented on nineteen (19) statements dealing with the total program. Eighty-one to one hundred percent (81% to 100%) of the staff responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to ten (10) of the statements. The mean average of all the statements is eighty-two (82%).

Organizational changes which occurred, as indicated by the teachers, are as follows: block-scheduling, flexible scheduling, team teaching, and school-within-a school.

Major concerns as indicated by the teachers are as follows: textbooks are too difficult, lack of students' reading skills, student attendance, and class size is too large.

Changes that would improve implementation as indicated by teachers are as follows: smaller class size, more parental involvement and have common prep periods.

One hundred twenty-five (125) students from two (2) schools commented on twenty (20) statements dealing with the total program. Seventy to eighty-four percent (70% to 84%) of the students responded "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" to sixteen (16) of the statements. "Attended school regularly" received 62 percent favorable responses; "the program helped us to get along with adults" received 74 percent favorable responses; and "developed better self-discipline" received 66 percent favorable responses. The mean average of all the statements is seventy-five percent (75%).

Things that were liked best about the program as indicated by the students are as follows: learn more new things, it helped me get along with other people, and helped student work cooperatively with others.

Things that were liked least about the program as indicated by the students are as follows: were not enough activities, some teachers did not cooperate, and some counselors did not cooperate.

Three (3) Ninth Grade Administrators commented on twelve (12) statements dealing with the total program. One hundred percent (100%) of the Ninth Grade Administrators responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to eleven (11) of the statements. The one statement with less than a 100 percent favorable response rate was: "encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning" received 67 percent. The mean average of all the statements is ninety-seven percent (97%).

Organizational changes which occurred, as indicated by Ninth Grade Administrators, are as follows: block scheduling, school-within-a-school concept, team teaching and flexible scheduling.

Major concerns as indicated by the Ninth Grade Administrators are as follows: student absenteeism, lack of parental support, and student academic differences.

Changes that would improve implementation as indicated by the Ninth Grade Administrators are as follows: staff development, block scheduling, and full-time attendance officer.

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 1898 Area E incoming 9th grade students enrolled during the 1994-95 school year (Before the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Six hundred sixty-three (663) students (34.93%) left school during the school year. Two hundred fifty-five (255) of these students (13.44%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and four hundred eight (408) students (21.49%) discontinued their education.

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 1855 Area E incoming 9th grade students enrolled during the 1995-96 school year (First Year with the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Three hundred twenty-three (323) students (17.41%) left school during the school year. One hundred ten (110) of these students (5.92%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and two hundred thirteen (213) students (11.48%) discontinued their education.

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 1606 Area E incoming 9th grade students enrolled during the 1996-97 school year (Second Year with Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). One hundred twenty-two (122) students (7.59%) left school during the year. Seventy-five (75) of these students (4.67%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and forty-seven (47) students (2.92%) discontinued their education.

In summary, among incoming Grade 9 students, transferring students decreased from 13.44% (1995), to 5.92% (1996), to 4.67% (1997); students discontinuing their education decreased from 21.49% (1995), to 11.48% (1996) to 2.92% (1997).

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 878 Area E ninth grade students who were repeating courses during the 1994-95 school year (Before the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Six hundred thirty (634) students (72.20%) left school during the school year. One hundred ninety (190) of these students (21.64%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and four hundred forty-four (444) students (50.56%) discontinued their education.

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 1036 Area E ninth grade students who were repeating courses during the 1995-96 school year (First Year with the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Five hundred thirty-one (531) students (51.26%) left school during the school year. One hundred sixty-four (164) of these students (15.83%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and three hundred sixty-seven (367) students (35.43%) discontinued their education.

Ninth grade data indicate that there were 881 Area E ninth grade students who were repeating courses during the 1996-97 school year (Second Year with Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). One hundred forty-nine (149) students (16.91%) left school during the year. Seventy-nine (79) students of these students (8.97%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and seventy (70) students (7.94%) discontinued their education.

In summary, among Grade 9 students repeating courses, transferring students decreased from 21.64% (1995), to 15.83% (1996), to 8.97% (1997); students discontinuing their education decreased from 50.56% (1995), to 35.43% (1996) to 7.94% (1997).

An attempt was made to compare the tenth grade students who were involved with the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program with the students who were not exposed in the program.

Tenth grade data indicate that there were 1043 Area E tenth grade students enrolled during the 1995-96 school year (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Sixty-eight (68) students (6.52%) left school during the school year. Forty-three (43) of these students (4.12%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and twenty-five (25) students (2.40%) discontinued their education.

Tenth grade data indicate that there were 1104 Area E tenth grade students enrolled during the 1996-97 school year (Exposed to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Sixty-eight (68) students (6.16%) left school during the school year. Forty-one (41) of these students (3.71%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and twenty-seven (27) students (2.45%) discontinued their education.

In summary, among newly promoted Grade 10 students, transferring students decreased from 4.12% (1996) to 3.71% (1997); students discontinuing their education increased from 2.40% (1996) to 2.45% (1997).

Tenth grade data indicated that there were 461 Area E tenth grade students who were repeating courses during the 1995-96 school year (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). One hundred six (106) students (22.99%) left school during the school year. Forty-five (45) of these students (9.76%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and sixty-one (61) students (13.23%) discontinued their education.

Tenth grade data indicated that there were 426 Area E tenth grade students who were repeating courses during the 1996-97 school year (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program). Sixty-one (61) students (14.32%) left school during the school year. Thirty-two (32) of these students (7.51%) transferred to another school system or attended night school and twenty-nine (29) students (6.81%) discontinued their education.

In summary, among Grade 10 students repeating courses, transferring students decreased from 9.76% (1996) to 7.51% (1997); students discontinued their education decreased from 13.23% (1996) to 6.81% (1997). While none of these students was exposed to the program, the data is presented for future reference.

The product variables were measured for the ninth grade students for June, 1995 (Without the Program), and the ninth grade students for June, 1996 and June, 1997 (With the Program). The results are based on all Area E schools having ninth grade students:

| | 6/1996 Compared to 6/95 | 6/1997 Compared to 6/95 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. Grade Point Averages | - Remained the same | Remained the same |
| b. Student Daily Attendance | - Decreased | Decreased |
| c. Credit Hours Attempted | - Increased | Increased |
| d. Credit Hours Earned | - Increased | Increased |
| e. MAT Reading | - Remained the same | Decreased |
| f. MAT Mathematics | - Increased | Increased |
| g. Educational Status* | - Decreased** | Decreased** |

Four out of seven variables showed improvement, two remained the same and one declined for 1995 vs. 1996. Four out of seven variables showed improvement, one remained the same and two declined for 1995 vs. 1997.

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It shows improvement.

The product variables were measured for the tenth grade students for June, 1996 (Without the Program), and the tenth grade students of June, 1997 (With the Program). The results are based on all Area E schools having tenth grade students:

6/1997
Compared to 6/96

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|
| a. Grade Point Averages | - | Decreased |
| b. Student Daily Attendance | - | Remained the same |
| c. Credit Hours Attempted | - | Increased |
| d. Credit Hours Earned | - | Increased |
| e. MAT Reading | - | Decreased |
| f. MAT Mathematics | - | Increased |
| g. Educational Status* | - | Increased** |

Three out of seven variables showed improvement, one variable remained the same and three declined for 1996 vs. 1997.

Recommendations include: create a school-within-a-school environment, expand the homeroom teacher concept, institute two-hour block scheduling, create a cluster of students to remain together for several classes, sensitize teachers to 9th grade students, offer special programs, provide district-wide forums for Ninth Grade Administrators, increase support staff, improve parental involvement and extend Grade 9 Restructuring Programs into Grade 10.

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It does not show improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| I. PROGRAM FACTS | i |
| II. EVALUATION OF THE 1996-97 NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM, Executive Summary..... | iv |
| III. BACKGROUND INFORMATION/NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING..... | 1 |
| IV. LITERATURE REVIEW | 6 |
| V. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION..... | 6 |
| VI. METHODOLOGY | 6 |
| Process Evaluation..... | 6 |
| Product Evaluation..... | 6 |
| VII. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PROCESS DATA | 8 |
| Principals' Perceptions of the Program | 8 |
| Teachers' Perceptions of the Program | 13 |
| Students' Perceptions of the Program | 25 |
| Ninth Grade Administrators' Perceptions of the Program..... | 31 |
| Academic and Support Programs | 37 |
| VIII. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA NINTH GRADE..... | 44 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Grade Point Average/1994-95..... | 44 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 2.0+ Grade Point Average/1994-95 | 45 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Grade Point Average/1995-96..... | 46 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 2.0+ Grade Point Average/1995-96 | 47 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Grade Point Average/1996-97..... | 48 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 2.0+ Grade Point Average/1996-97 | 49 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

| | Page |
|---|------|
| VIII. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA | |
| NINTH GRADE (Cont'd) | |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with Student Daily Attendance/1994-95 | 50 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 92% + Student Daily Attendance/1994-95 | 51 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Student Daily Attendance/1995-96..... | 52 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 92% + Student Daily Attendance/1995-96..... | 53 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Student Daily Attendance/1996-97..... | 54 |
| Area E Schools Ninth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 92% + Student Daily Attendance/1996-97..... | 55 |
| | |
| Area E Schools Credit Hours Attempted and Earned/ Ninth Grade/June, 1995..... | 56 |
| Area E Schools Credit Hours Attempted and Earned/ Ninth Grade/June, 1996..... | 57 |
| Area E Schools Credit Hours Attempted and Earned/ Ninth Grade/June, 1997..... | 58 |
| | |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Reading) April, 1995 | 59 |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Mathematics) April, 1995 | 60 |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Reading) March, 1996..... | 61 |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Mathematics) April, 1996..... | 62 |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Reading) April, 1997 | 63 |
| Area E Schools/Ninth Grade/MAT (Mathematics) April, 1996-97..... | 64 |
| | |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/June, 1995 | 65 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/June, 1996 | 66 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/June, 1997 | 67 |
| | |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) | |
| Leaving School/District/June, 1995..... | 68 |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) | |
| Leaving School/District/June, 1996..... | 69 |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) | |
| Leaving School/District/June, 1996-97..... | 70 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

| | Page |
|--|-----------|
| VIII. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA | |
| NINTH GRADE (Cont'd) | |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/ Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1995 | 71 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/ Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1996 | 72 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Ninth Grade Students/ Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1997 | 73 |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1995 | 74 |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1996 | 75 |
| Area E Schools with Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1997 | 76 |
| IX. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA | |
| TENTH GRADE..... | 77 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Grade Point Average/1995-96 | 77 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 2.0+ Grade Point Average/1995-96 | 78 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Grade Point Average/1996-97 | 79 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 2.0+ Grade Point Average/1996-97 | 80 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with Student Daily Attendance/1995-96..... | 81 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 92% + Student Daily Attendance/1995-96..... | 82 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with Student Daily Attendance/1996-97..... | 83 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Number and Percent of Students with 92% + Student Daily Attendance/1996-97..... | 84 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Credit Hours Attempted and Earned/ June, 1996 | 85 |
| Area E Schools Tenth Grade/Credit Hours Attempted and Earned/ June, 1997 | 86 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

| | Page |
|--|---------|
| IX. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA TENTH GRADE (Cont'd) | |
| Area E Schools/Tenth Grade/MAT (Reading) April, 1996 | 87 |
| Area E Schools/Tenth Grade/MAT (Mathematics) April, 1996..... | 88 |
| Area E Schools/Tenth Grade/MAT (Reading) April, 1997 | 89 |
| Area E Schools/Tenth Grade/MAT (Mathematics) April, 1997..... | 90 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Tenth Grade Students Leaving School/ District/June, 1996..... | 91 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Tenth Grade Students Leaving School/ District/June, 1997..... | 92 |
| Area E Schools with Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/District/June, 1996..... | 93 |
| Area E Schools with Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/District/June, 1997..... | 94 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Tenth Grade Students/ Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1996 | 95 |
| Area E Schools with Incoming Tenth Grade Students/ Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1997 | 96 |
| Area E Schools with Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1996 | 97 |
| Area E Schools with Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Reasons for Leaving School/District/June, 1997 | 98 |
| X. CONCLUSIONS..... | 99 |
| XI. RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 109 |
| XII. APPENDICES | 112 |
| A. High School Allocations 1996-97 by Area..... | 113 |
| B. Ninth Grade Incoming Students Leaving School/District for June, 1995..... | 115 |
| C. Ninth Grade Incoming Students Leaving School/District for June, 1996..... | 118 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

| | Page |
|---|------|
| D. Ninth Grade Incoming Students Leaving School/District for June, 1997..... | 121 |
| E. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/ District for June, 1995..... | 124 |
| F. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/ District for June, 1996..... | 127 |
| G. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/ District for June, 1997..... | 130 |
| H. Tenth Grade Incoming Students Leaving School/District for June, 1996..... | 133 |
| I. Tenth Grade Incoming Students Leaving School/District for June, 1997..... | 136 |
| J. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/ District for June, 1996..... | 139 |
| K. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School/ District for June, 1997..... | 142 |
| L. Literature Review and Bibliography Sources..... | 145 |

PROGRAM FACTS

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Name of Program | : | 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program - Area E |
| Funding Year | : | 1996-97 |
| Purpose of Program | : | The purpose of the program is to restructure ninth grade in ways which improve academic performance; develop positive attitudes toward learning; improve the school environment to promote learning and self-respect, caring and respect for the individuality and rights of others; reduce the dropout rate and increase the graduation rate of students. |
| Features of Program | : | Instructional and direct non-instructional services, such as social worker, counseling and psychological services; tutorial methods with student assistants working under the supervision of a certified teacher; parents' involvement in instructional and non-instructional activities with their children. |
| Funding Source | : | 31a State funds and Title 1 (See Appendix A) |
| Funding Level | : | \$3,177,244 - 31a and Title 1 9th Grade Restructuring Allocation |
| Ninth Grade Enrollment | : | 2,487 students during the 1996-97 school year |
| Number and Level of Participants | : | <u>Area E, 1994-95 Grade 9 Students (Before the Program)</u> 1. Ninth Grade incoming students during the school year 1,898 (68%) 2. Ninth Grade students repeating courses during the school year 878 (32%) Total 2,776 (100%) <u>Area E, 1995-96 Grade 9 Students (First Year Program)</u> 1. Ninth Grade incoming students during the school year 1,855 (64%) 2. Ninth Grade students repeating courses during the school year 1,036 (36%) Total 2,891 (100%) |

Area E, 1996-97 Grade 9 Students (Second Year Program)

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Ninth Grade incoming students during the school year | 1,606 (65%) |
| 2. Ninth Grade students repeating courses during the school year | 881 (35%) |
| Total | 2,487 (100%) |

Area E, 1995-96 Grade 10 Students (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

| | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Tenth Grade incoming students during the school year | 1,043 (69%) |
| 2. Tenth Grade students repeating courses during the school year | 461 (31%) |
| Total | 1,504 (100%) |

Area E, 1996-97 Grade 10 Students

| | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Tenth Grade incoming students during the school year (Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program) | 1,104 (72%) |
| 2. Tenth Grade students repeating courses during the school year (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program) | 426 (28%) |
| Total | 1,530 (100%) |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Number and Level of Schools in Program | : | Area E: Davis Aerospace Technical H.S., Kettering H.S., Osborn H.S. and Pershing H.S. |
| Staffing Pattern | : | Teachers, administrators and support staff from the regular school |
| Instructional Time | : | Regular hours - six hours per day |
| Equipment and Materials | : | Same equipment and materials used during the regular school year. |
| First Year Funded | : | 1995-96 |

**EVALUATION
OF THE
1996-97 NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM AREA E
Executive Summary**

Purpose and Features of the Program

The purpose of the program is to restructure ninth grade in ways which improve academic performance; develop positive attitudes toward learning; improve the school environment to promote learning and self-respect, caring and respect for the individuality and rights of others; reduce the number of students leaving school and increase the graduation rate of students.

Schools were to design and implement programs to improve the academic achievement of the at-risk students. Schools could use instructional and direct non-instructional services, such as social workers, counseling and psychological services; tutorial methods with student assistants working under the supervision of a certified teacher; and/or involve parents in instructional and non-instructional activities with their children.

Methodology

Process Evaluation - The Evaluation of the 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was designed to assess the success of the program as perceived by the principals ninth grade administrators, teachers and students. Four surveys were developed containing statements related to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. The principals', the Ninth Grade administrators', the teachers' and the students' surveys contained both forced-choice and open-ended questions. The forced-choice questions accompanied by a Likert-type scale upon which the responses were marked. The four surveys were administered by the Project Evaluator.

Product Evaluation - Data on grade point averages, attendance, credit hours, academic achievement and the educational status* of students were collected for 1994-95 (Before the Program), 1995-96 (First Year Program), and 1996-97 (Second Year Program) ninth grade students. Also, the same data were collected for the 1995-96 (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program) and 1996-97 (Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program) tenth grade students. Post data for grade point averages, attendance and credit hours were received from the district's AS400 information system. The educational status of students came from the district's AS400 information system. Data from the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading and Mathematics) (MAT7, Form S, Level S1, Psychological Corporation, 1993 administered spring 1996 and 1997) came from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. The evaluator of the Ninth Grade Restructuring was responsible for collecting and analyzing all product data.

- *Students leaving school:
- a. Discontinued their education
 - b. Continued their education in night school or another school system

Separate reports will be prepared for each Area and one consolidated report of all areas. Also, a report of programs suggested by the Ninth Grade Administrators as being successful will be prepared for distribution to all schools having 9th grade students.

Findings

A. Principals' Perceptions of the Program

Three (3) principals commented on twelve (12) statements dealing with the total program. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive (agree and strongly agree) answers. The statements were grouped into ten (10) categories for purposes of this narrative report and are presented below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the mean positive response by the principals for the items in each category. There were eight (8) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited. Respondents indicated that the program was successful in:

- raising students' achievement in mathematics and science (67%)
- raising students' achievement in reading (100%)
- raising 9th Grade students' awareness of high school requirements (100%)
- developing students' ability to work independently (100%)
- encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning (100%)
- preventing students from dropping out of school (100%)
- helping students develop worthwhile priorities (100%)
- helping students attend school regularly (33%)
- raising students' awareness of high expectations (100%)
- developing self-discipline, and responsibility for one's own actions and developing students' ability to work cooperatively with others. (100%)

One hundred percent (100%) of the principals responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to nine (9) of the statements.

Thirty-three to sixty-seven percent (33% to 67%) of the principals responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the other three (3) of the statements.

The mean average of all the statements' "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" is eighty-nine percent (89%).

Open-Ended Questions

In the first question, the principals were asked to indicate *how they prepared their staff for the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. Their responses follow:

- staff development was used
- staff were in-serviced by two staff members
- staff set goals for the 1996-97 school year
- extensive discussion revolved around parental involvement

In the next question, the principals were asked to state *the teaching strategies would be found in the Ninth Grade Restructuring classroom*. They responded as follows:

- cooperative learning (3)
- student-centered instruction
- essential elements of effective instruction
- integration of curriculum
- peer tutoring
- re-enforcement of concepts

The next question asked, *if any organizational change(s) occurred in your school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

- flexible scheduling
- team teaching (2)
- school-within-a-school

In the next question, the principals were asked, *"what if any, were your major concerns about the delivery of instruction by your teachers of Grade 9 students?"* Their responses follow:

- getting the staff to have high expectations of their students
- support of multi-intelligence learning activities
- lack of support of students with high needs
- teachers are hesitant to apply any 'new knowledge' that they have learned
- reading must receive special attention

The principals were asked to indicate *the reactions of the different stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. Following are some of their responses:

Students:

- liked cooperative learning, teacher's concern for students gave them a definite support system
- program was an asset and especially beneficial to them during the first year of their high school

-v-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teachers:

- majority of teachers are supportive
- very supportive
- all teachers agree that the ninth graders need special attention

Parents:

- involved parents are supportive
- very supportive
- understand the need for support at the beginning of high school

In the next question, the principals were asked, *"what changes would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?"* They responded as follows:

- adequate support to administer program
- administrative and/or task force to monitor, support and advice program
- staff in-service for 9th grade teams
- more and better parental involvement
- make summer school program mandatory for selected students
- identify at-risk students
- on-going staff development and training component
- an extensive reading component
- extending the program for two years (9th and 10th grade)
- providing scheduling so that all ninth grade teachers can have a common period

Principals were asked, *"for you, what have been the major challenges of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?"* Their responses follow:

- trying to maintain staff morale
- difficulty in identifying at-risk students and social promotion from middle school
- getting parents involves (2)
- financial support
- lack of support personnel
- lack of support at area and central levels
- getting staff to have high expectations regardless of gender and race
- student attendance and academic performance
- lack of time for teacher preparation and staff development
- lack of total staff commitment

Finally, the principals were asked, *"what, if any, have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?"* They responded as follows:

- getting parents actively involved in the process
- next to lack of support staff, parental involvement was my biggest problem
- work schedule and lack of transportation were reasons for non-participation
- parents must be a vital part of the decision making process for the high school years

B. Teachers' Perceptions of the Program

Twenty-seven (27) teachers from three (3) schools commented on nineteen (19) statements dealing with the total program. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive (agree and strongly agree) answers. The statements were grouped into thirteen (13) categories for purposes of this narrative report and are presented below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the mean positive response by the teachers for individual items. There were seven (7) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited.

- I received sufficient information regarding the program (74%)
- the program was successful in raising student achievement
 - a. reading (67%)
 - b. mathematics (74%)
 - c. science (74%)
- the program was successful in raising student awareness
 - a. high school requirements (92%)
 - b. high school expectations (92%)
- the program was successful in developing students'
 - a. ability to work cooperatively with others (84%)
 - b. self-discipline and responsibility for one's own actions (60%)
 - c. the ability to work independently (77%)
 - d. worthwhile priorities (77%)
- the program was successful in encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning (73%)

- parents received sufficient advance notification about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program (85%)
- teachers received sufficient information for the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program (74%)
- ninth grade students attended school regularly (96%)
- the program was successful in preventing students from dropping out of school (92%)
- I feel the program will result in improved achievement (96%)
- teachers feel the program will result in improved achievement (81%)
- I am supportive of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program (100%)
- teachers seem to be supportive of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program (89%)

Eighty-one to one hundred percent (81% to 100%) of the teachers "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to ten (10) of the statements.

Sixty to seventy-seven percent (60% to 77%) of the teachers "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" to the other nine (9) statements.

The mean average of all the statements "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" is eighty-two percent (82%).

Open-Ended Questions

In the first question, the teachers were asked to indicate *the strategies that would be found in the Ninth Grade classrooms in their school.* They responded as follows:

- cooperative learning (10)
- peer tutoring
- student-centered instruction (3)
- hands-on individualized instruction
- authentic methods of instruction
- group work
- discovery learning

In the next question, the teachers were asked to indicate *any organizational change(s) that occurred in their school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

- team teaching (4)
- block scheduling (4)
- flexible scheduling (3)
- school-within-a-school

Teachers were asked, *what, if any, are your major concerns about the delivery of instruction to the ninth graders*. They responded as follows:

- reading problems with most students
- textbook is too difficult
- attendance and tardiness
- class size and mobility
- far too little emphasis is placed on mastery skills
- far too much time is required to deal with classroom management
- lack of motivation to excel or even succeed

The teachers were asked to indicate *the reactions of the stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

Students:

- many strive for excellence despite obvious barriers
- positive support from counselor and social worker
- students support the Ninth Grade Restructuring
- students are receptive
- students' attitude about school and learning have been positive

Teachers:

- teachers support the Ninth Grade Restructuring
- teachers are supportive of the motives
- teachers show enthusiasm for the program
- teachers are cooperative
- teachers are supportive
- teachers motivate students to learn and accept responsibility

Parents:

- parents are very supportive
- parents seem aware of Ninth Grade Restructuring
- parents who are involved in the school are supportive
- parents are informed about their child's academic success

Administrators:

- demonstrated support for the program
- are enthusiastic about the program
- are very supportive
- positive attitude

Teachers were asked to indicate *the changes that would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

- continue with the existing program
- have smaller class size
- disseminate program information to all teachers
- have same common prep period for 9th grade teachers
- improve closer contacts with parents
- demand higher standards for academic achievement
- involve teachers in the planning

In the next question, the teachers were asked to indicate *what have been the major challenges of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. Their responses follow:

- dealing with the emotional and social growth
- keeping the students in school
- including staff in planning the program
- improving attendance and parental involvement
- trying to motivate students to attend classes
- motivating students to accept responsibility for learning behavior
- improving attendance, punctuality and academic achievement

In the final question, the teachers were asked to indicate *what, if any, have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

- lack of parental involvement (3)
- accommodating work schedules of parents
- trying to stay in touch with parents
- getting more parents involved (4)

-x-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. Students' Perceptions of the Program

One hundred twenty-five (125) students from two (2) schools commented on twenty (20) statements dealing with the total program. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive (agree and strongly agree) answers. The statements were grouped into eleven (11) categories for purposes of this narrative report and are presented below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the mean positive response by the students for individual items. There were two (2) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited.

- satisfied with the services received from the program (84%)
- teachers appeared to be sincerely concerned about me (76%)
- was given homework daily in most of my classes (64%)
- received help from my teachers when I needed it (84%)
- services offered by the counselor were very helpful (72%)
- administrator appeared to be sincerely concerned about me (72%)

- the program was successful in improving students'
 - a. work habits (78%)
 - b. attitudes toward learning (82%)
 - c. reading skills (70%)
 - d. mathematics skills (68%)
 - e. science skills (74%)
 - f. ability to work cooperatively with others (78%)

- completed assigned tasks (80%)
- raised awareness of high school requirements (82%)
- developed better self-discipline (66%)

- the program helped us to
 - a. get along with other students (75%)
 - b. get along better with adults (74%)
 - c. feel better about ourselves (83%)
 - d. feel better about school (76%)
 - e. attend school regularly (62%)

Seventy to eighty-four percent (70% to 84%) of the students "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to sixteen (16) of the statements.

Sixty-two to sixty-eight percent (62% to 68%) of the students "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to the other four (4) statements.

The mean average of the "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" responses is seventy-five percent (75%).

Open-Ended Questions

In the first question, the students were asked to indicate *what they liked best about the program*. They responded as follows:

- learned many new things
- teachers taking out time to help students
- showed us people cared about our education
- awards for doing good work
- program helped the ones who needed help
- teachers were very helpful
- improved my math skills
- having fun and doing good work
- designed to help students like me
- all the nice people I got to know teachers and students
- felt better and learned more in high school
- liked all my classes and my teachers
- all my teachers were concerned about me
- it helped people get along with each other

In the second question, the students were asked to indicate *what they liked least about the program*. They responded as follows:

- there were not enough activities
- some teachers did not cooperate
- getting up early in the morning
- counselors weren't very cooperative

D. Ninth Grade Administrators' Perceptions of the Program

Three (3) Ninth Grade Administrators commented on twelve (12) different statements dealing with the total program. The statements were grouped into nine (9) categories for purposes of this narrative report and are presented below. The numbers in parentheses indicate the mean positive response by the Ninth Grade Administrators for each item in the category. There were nine (9) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited. Respondents indicated that the program was successful in:

- raising students' achievement in reading (100%)
- raising students' achievement in mathematics (100%)
- raising students' achievement in science (100%)
- raising 9th Grade students' awareness of high school requirements (100%)
- developing students' ability to work cooperatively with others (100%)
- encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning (67%)
- preventing students from dropping out of school (100%)
- helping students to develop worthwhile priorities and attend the school regularly (100%)
- developing self-discipline and responsibility for one's own actions and developing students' ability to work cooperatively with others (100%)

One hundred percent (100%) of the Ninth Grade Administrators responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to eleven (11) of the statements.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the Ninth Grade Administrators responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the other one (1) of the statements.

The mean average of all the positive statements is ninety-seven percent (97%).

Open-Ended Questions

In the first question, the Ninth Grade administrators were asked to indicate *how they prepared their staff for the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. Their responses follow:

- department head and teachers' meeting discussions
- reviewed goals, objectives, accomplishments and student achievements
- identified areas of improvement
- set goals for the incoming year
- staff were involved in in-service workshops
- staff were involved in the Ninth Grade Restructuring

In the next question, the Ninth Grade administrators were asked to indicate *the teaching strategies that would be found in the Ninth Grade classrooms in their schools*. They responded as follows:

- cooperative learning
- student-centered instruction
- brain-based environmental concepts
- exploration
- essential elements of effective instruction
- project driven instruction

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked to state *if any organizational change(s) occurred in their school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. They responded as follows:

- team teaching (2)
- block scheduling (2)

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked *if they were going to do anything different for the 1996-97 Grade 9 students when they are in the 10th grade in 1997-98*. Their responses follow:

- have monthly meetings with them throughout the year
- celebrate their attendance and academic achievement
- have formal assemblies for all 10th graders
- monitor student attendance and GPA's from grade level reports

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked to state *if they had any concerns about the delivery of instruction of their Ninth Grade teachers*. They responded as follows:

- time to plan and collaborate with other 9th grade teachers
- staff development and training for all of our teachers
- loss of teachers created crowded classrooms
- inconsistency in the delivery of instruction to students

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked to state *the reactions of the following stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program*. Their responses follow:

Students:

- Ninth Grade Restructuring was an asset to them
- program assisted them

Teachers:

- teachers were positive about the program
- teachers felt the program was supportive and effective

Parents:

- parents were positive about the program
- parents were appreciative about the referrals and direct assistance given to them in dealing with their child
- parents appreciated the firmness and dedication. The staff members exhibit in dealing with the students.

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked to state *the changes that would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.* They responded as follows:

- full-time attendance officer
- more time for meeting and planning with 9th grade teachers
- staff development component
- teacher of reading component
- extend the restructuring program for two years
- creation of remedial labs for math and reading
- implementation of block scheduling
- continuation of the 8th grade assessment of all students

The Ninth Grade administrators were asked to indicate *what has been the major challenge for them of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.* They responded as follows:

- student absenteeism (2)
- lack of parental support (2)
- encourage students to maximize their academic potential
- address the needs of our students that involve the nuclear family
- student academic deficiencies and no service available to them

Finally, the Ninth Grade administrators were asked to state *what have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.* Their responses follow:

- lack of parental responses and participation
- increase parental involvement in our program
- increase parent visitation to our school
- increase parental involvement in extra-curricular activities
- increase parental involvement in community projects

NINTH GRADE DATA*

E. 1. Grade Point Averages (1995)

- Schools' grade point average ranged from 1.2 to 1.9
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

2. Grade Point Averages (1996)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.2 to 1.9
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

3. Grade Point Averages (1997)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.1 to 1.8
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

F. 1. Student Daily Attendance (1995)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 70% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 73%
- District's daily attendance average is 77%

2. Student Daily Attendance (1996)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 66% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 71%
- District's daily attendance average is 77%

3. Student Daily Attendance (1997)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 68% to 92%
- Area's daily attendance average is 72%
- District's daily attendance average is 78%

*The 1995 data (Without the Program) compared to 1996 and 1997 data (With the Program).

G. 1. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1995)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 46.9 to 64.1
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 27.0 to 56.7
- Area's average of credit hours attempted is 48.3
- Area's average of credit hours earned is 31.8
- District's average credit hours attempted is 48.5
- District's average credit hours earned is 32.8

2. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1996)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 49.1 to 66.8
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 29.3 to 57.0
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 51.3
- Area's average credit hours earned is 32.5
- District's average credit hours attempted is 49.7
- District's average credit hours earned is 34.4

3. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1997)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 45.5 to 67.4
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 43.4 to 66.0
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 49.0
- Area's average credit hours earned is 45.8
- District's average credit hours attempted is 49.7
- District's average credit hours earned is 46.9

H. 1. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1995)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.3 to 8.4
- Area's GME average is 6.6
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

2. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1995)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 4.7 to 8.1
- Area's GME average is 6.1
- District's GME average is 7.5
- National GME average is 9.7

3. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.5 to 8.1
- Area's GME average is 6.6
- District's GME average is 7.7
- National GME average is 9.7

4. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.6 to 7.6
- Area's GME average is 6.7
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

5. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.2 to 7.7
- Area's GME average is 6.5
- District's GME average is 7.1
- National GME average is 9.7

6. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.6 to 8.8
- Area's GME average is 6.7
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

I. 1. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1995)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.44% to 25.99%
- Area's discontinued rate is 21.49%
- District's discontinued rate is 18.28%

2. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1996)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 4.25% to 15.51%
- Area's discontinued rate is 11.48%
- District's discontinued rate is 11.70%

3. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1997)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.10% to 4.29%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.92%
- District's discontinued rate is 5.14%

4. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1995)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 42.77% to 100%
- Area's discontinued rate is 50.56%
- District's discontinued rate is 42.79%

5. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1996)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 27.71% to 46.59%
- Area's discontinued rate is 35.43%
- District's discontinued rate is 34.72%

6. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1997)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.24% to 11.22%
- Area's discontinued rate is 7.94%
- District's discontinued rate is 16.44%

The product variables were measured for the ninth grade students for June, 1995 (Without the Program), and the ninth grade students for June, 1996 and June, 1997 (With the Program). The results are based on all Area E schools having ninth grade students:

| | | 6/1996 | 6/1997 |
|----|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | | Compared to 6/95 | Compared to 6/95 |
| a. | Grade Point Averages | - Remained the same | Remained the same |
| b. | Student Daily Attendance | - Decreased | Decreased |
| c. | Credit Hours Attempted | - Increased | Increased |
| d. | Credit Hours Earned | - Increased | Increased |
| e. | MAT Reading | - Remained the same | Decreased |
| f. | MAT Mathematics | - Increased | Increased |
| g. | Educational Status* | - Decreased** | Decreased** |

Four out of seven variables showed improvement, two remained the same, and one declined for 1995 vs. 1996. Four out of seven variables showed improvement, one remained the same, and two declined for 1995 vs. 1997.

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It shows improvement.

TENTH GRADE DATA

E. 1. Grade Point Averages (1996)

- Schools' grade point average ranged from 1.5 to 2.2
- Area's grade point average is 1.8
- District's grade point average is 1.8

2. Grade Point Averages (1997)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.5 to 2.1
- Area's grade point average is 1.7
- District's grade point average is 1.8

F. 1. Student Daily Attendance (1996)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 70% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 76%
- District's daily attendance average is 80%

2. Student Daily Attendance (1997)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 72% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 76%
- District's daily attendance average is 80%

G. 1. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1996)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 46.8 to 66.7
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 45.3 to 65.6
- Area's average of credit hours attempted is 51.1
- Area's average of credit hours earned is 49.3
- District's average credit hours attempted is 51.8
- District's average credit hours earned is 48.7

2. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1997)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 50.3 to 69.2
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 50.5 to 68.3
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 55.3
- Area's average credit hours earned is 52.9
- District's average credit hours attempted is 53.6
- District's average credit hours earned is 51.5

-XX-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

H. 1. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.8 to 9.3
- Area's GME average is 7.9
- District's GME average is 8.8
- National GME average is 10.7

2. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.8 to 9.8
- Area's GME average is 7.3
- District's GME average is 8.5
- National GME average is 10.7

3. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 7.3 to 9.2
- Area's GME average is 7.7
- District's GME average is 8.9
- National GME average is 10.7

4. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 7.6 to 8.7
- Area's GME average is 7.6
- District's GME average is 8.6
- National GME average is 10.7

I. 1. Incoming 10th Grade Students Leaving School* (1996) (Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 0.00% to 3.74%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.40%
- District's discontinued rate is 3.18%

2. Incoming 10th Grade Students Leaving School* (1997) (Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.25% to 2.84%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.45%
- District's discontinued rate is 3.98%

3. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1996)
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.39% to 17.86%
- Area's discontinued rate is 13.23%
- District's discontinued rate is 16.22%

4. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1997)
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.92% to 9.27%
- Area's discontinued rate is 6.18%
- District's discontinued rate is 15.87%

The product variables were measured for the tenth grade students for June, 1996 (Without the Program), and the tenth grade students for June, 1997 (With the Program). The results are based on all Area E schools having tenth grade students:

6/1997
Compared to 6/96

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|
| a. Grade Point Averages | - | Decreased |
| b. Student Daily Attendance | - | Remained the same |
| c. Credit Hours Attempted | - | Increased |
| d. Credit Hours Earned | - | Increased |
| e. MAT Reading | - | Decreased |
| f. MAT Mathematics | - | Increased |
| g. Educational Status* | - | Increased** |

Three out of seven variables showed improvement, one remained the same, and three declined for 1996 vs. 1997.

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It does not show improvement.

-xxii-

Recommendations

Schools can help retain at-risk ninth graders through a variety of policies and practices. The following recommendations should be considered to help all ninth graders begin successful high school careers:

- Continue to decrease alienation in the high school by breaking the school down into small, stable units to increase personal attention from the staff. Examples of this strategy include:
 - create a school within-a-school environment
 - expanding the role of a homeroom teacher to include mentor and personal guide;
 - extending class to two periods (block scheduling) to limit the need for students to move from class to class;
 - creating clusters of students who remain together for several classes and thus can offer each other support;
 - creating alternative schools and mini-schools that offer disaffected students compensatory programs and more personalized attention.
- Continue to sensitize teachers to the problems of ninth graders so that the teachers can be helpful; assign more experienced teachers to this grade.
- Continue to offer special programs to orient middle school students to ninth grade, thus helping to smooth the passage. Such programs include:
 - schedule visits to the high schools by small groups of incoming students.
 - assign a high school student to mentor each new student.
 - have a middle school student shadow a high school student to learn what a high school day is like.

- schedule orientation activities, preferably for small groups of ninth graders, that range from a single session on the first day in school to an ongoing program lasting up to a full semester. During these orientations, rules and expectations are discussed, courses of study are described, and human awareness issues like multicultural relations and drug use are explored.
- have orientation activities for parents that cover much of the same ground as those for the new ninth graders.

All of the suggestions for easing the transition to ninth grade presented above have been successfully tested in school districts around the country. The experience of these school districts suggests that schools can make a real difference for students by giving special attention to the ninth grade as a pivotal year in a student's education. The experiences in Detroit, as documented in this report, add additional evidences that these approaches can yield success for Grade 9 students.

The following recommendations were made based on interviews with administrators and teachers and the surveys which solicited information regarding the program from principals, ninth grade administrators, teachers and students.

- All the ninth grade administrators indicated a district wide forum - such as a day-long conference - where they could get together to discuss, disseminate and critique and/or study options for improving the success of the ninth grade restructuring initiative.
- In order for a school to be successful in carrying out their goals for restructuring, all personnel should be in place on time.
- Almost all of the administrators interviewed indicated they would like to have a school within-a-school concept. Although some of them indicated they have space problems, they should try to solve them so that all ninth grade students can be scheduled on one floor or a certain part of the building.
- Increase time for planning and developing integrated learning materials that initiate active student centered learning in the classroom.
- A full-time social worker, attendance agent and a counselor should be added to the program to deal with the problems of at-risk students.
- Development of a 'reading resource lab' coordinated by a reading specialist to assist at-risk students and the teachers of at-risk students in improving reading deficiencies.

- Research has shown that constructions strategies (student-centered, and active participation) improved student learning and retention. In-service should be provided to assist teachers in planning constructive activities because classroom visits reveal that teachers still rely heavily on traditional teacher-centered practices such as lecturing and paper-pencil participation activities.
- Seek ways to involve more parents in the school programs and activities.
- Most educators now recognize that it is imperative for schools to find better ways to increase parental and family involvement in children's education. The results of a study indicated that parental involvement is essential in helping children achieve optimum success in school, both academically and behaviorly. The results suggest that parental involvement should be encouraged in the classroom and at home for a number of reasons, including: (1) parental involvement sends a positive message to children about the importance of their education, (2) parental involvement keeps the parent informed of the child's performance and (3) parental involvement helps the school accomplish more.
- Continue to have block scheduling, team teaching, and continue to provide group and individual counseling with the 10th grade students. Counselors and teachers should collaborate to assure that the services to these students will not be drastically changed.
- Provide students with more opportunities to be actively involved in learning experiences. More effective, alternative discipline strategies need to be employed. Students need to be motivated to attend classes, accept responsibility for their own behavior, and to achieve academic success.
- Efforts should be made to continue the Ninth Grade Restructuring efforts into the 10th grade.

1996-97 NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION¹

The Ninth Grade Restructuring Task Force recommended to the Detroit Board of Education that a district-wide restructuring plan be initiated that would have impact on every ninth grade student in the District. The unique characteristics of the age group, the typical difficulties with all transition, and the high failure rate in certain key subjects prompted the recommendation that all members of this target population be exposed to at least one of three recommended restructuring options.

The purpose for this district-wide restructuring effort is to enable the provision of programs, resources and services that more readily meet the unique needs of ninth graders. The anticipated results include a substantially lower school dropout rate for the District's ninth graders and assurance that every student who enters the ninth grade graduates from high school.

The specific Task Force recommendations to the Board were as follows:
The District adopt, by the 1995-96 school year, all of the following options which provide more than one avenue for restructuring the ninth grade:

- **Pilot ninth grade in middle schools**
- **Create new, and embellish existing, ninth grade programs for all students (school-within-a-school, accelerated programs, dropout prevention, theme schools, Tech Prep, etc.)**
- **Establish ninth grade academies for students who are seriously at-risk of dropping out**

Upon accepting the Task Force's recommendations, the Board enjoined each Area to adopt either some or all of the reorganization strategies and to commence immediately with the formulation of implementation plans for restructuring.

The Ninth Grade Restructuring Task Force developed a set of **Guiding Principles** to lend direction to the development of Area plans and assure that they impact all ninth graders. The Task Force recommended all Area plans be developed in the spirit of the Guiding Principles regardless of the chosen option(s). A timeline for the completion of all plans was also determined.

¹**Ninth Grade Restructuring Task Force, Spring, 1995**

The Guiding Principles included the following categories that were to be addressed in the Areas' restructuring plans:

- target population
- school environment
- student discipline
- staff and instruction
- curriculum
- parents
- life role expectancy
- technology
- physical and mental health and
- continuance

The Task Force was also sub-divided into **Technical Assistance Teams** that would stand ready throughout the development of the Area restructuring plans to troubleshoot, provide resources and assistance. These teams were as follows:

- funding
- planning program design
- support services
- parental involvement
- awareness and dissemination
- curriculum/technology
- staff development and
- evaluation

The membership of the Technical Assistance Teams was expanded to include other individuals in the organization who could lend additional expertise and information. In particular, the *Funding Team* explored funding options and identified those areas in the recommendations that could be addressed with Section 31a at-risk funds. High schools then utilized their school improvement plans to identify uses for Section 31a funds to address at-risk ninth grade students. Each high school was to receive a Section 31a allocation to help implement part of their ninth grade restructuring plan.

In response to the Board's charge, each Area convened a planning team to undertake the task of developing a ninth grade restructuring plan.

The **target population** was defined by the Task Force to include all ninth graders and/or "students who are fourteen or more years of age who are classified as ninth graders or less."

While the planning logistics varied somewhat from Area to Area, the common charge from the Board, commonly agreed upon process criteria and goals, yielded a set of Area plans that together represent a cohesive, **District-wide Ninth Grade Restructuring Plan**.

Detroit's Ensuing Ninth Grade Restructuring Plan (1995-96)

While three restructuring options were possible, all Areas chose the same option:

- **Create new, and embellish existing, ninth grade programs for all students (school-within-a-school, accelerated programs, dropout prevention, theme schools, Tech. Prep., etc.)**

Formation of Planning Teams

Each Area convened a meeting with representatives from each of its high schools to participate in the planning. Some areas included middle school representation, parents, vocational technical centers and other stakeholders.

Formation of Mission, Vision and Goals

Based on the District's Strategic Plan, each Area developed a mission statement. The mission statements were supported by vision and goal statements that clearly set directions to the components of the plans. All plans contained specific enabling objectives or activities that would be carried out in order to achieve the stated goals.

Identification and Assessment

All plans contained provision for the **identification** of members of the target population who are **most at-risk** of dropping out of school and most in need of intervention programs and activities, particularly before they enter high school.

Identification included eighth grade assessment of students who were to enter Grade 9 in fall, 1995. All plans included the development of **Individual Learning Plans (ILP)** for students based on the results of this assessment.

Restructuring Strategies

All plans detailed specific restructuring strategies for more readily meeting the unique needs of the target population. The plans reflected the review of literature, informed practice and developed knowledge about instructional practices and restructuring models.

Restructuring efforts are to range from creating a distinct school-within-a-school, to facilitating block scheduling, common teacher prep periods and planning time, from distinct dismissal and arrival times, to separate locations, reorganization of course offerings and smaller learning units.

Curriculum is to be augmented to include Tech Prep and School-to-Work components such as job shadowing, hands on, practicums, etc.

All new ninth graders are to be exposed to an intensive orientation prior to entering ninth grade or during the first few weeks of school.

Support Services

The middle school and ninth grade assessment instruments also provide information as to the type of support services necessary to accomplish the missions and goals as defined. All plans contain an array of options and support services ranging from mentors, tutorial programs, and peer support programs, to career counseling, social work services, health services, etc.

Parents

Avenues for the meaningful involvement, support and participation of parents are an intricate part of each plan.

Identification of Staff Requirements

All plans contain reorganization descriptions that address the need to provide the target population with sufficient, well-trained teachers and other support staff. Nearly all high schools will add one additional assistant principal whose sole administrative responsibility will be the ninth grade school-within-a-school.

All high schools have articulated the need for additional teachers. Some will add social workers, counselors, psychiatrists, attendance officers, teacher coordinators, instructional specialists, educational technicians and others.

Staff at all schools are to participate in professional development and other training as identified by individual planning teams. Most staff training will focus on upgrading the instructional skills of staff. Many plans include training that will equip all involved staff with strategies and information that will enable them to become effective, knowledgeable and caring adults.

Identification of Renovations or Facility Needs

Some plans include the renovation of certain areas of buildings to accommodate the school-within-a-school and smaller learning units. All plans include the provision to infuse technology into the learning process which automatically will require facility renovations and upgrades.

Technology

Many plans include extensive utilization of technology ranging from personal computers for each student to enable distance learning and other computer assisted activities, to technology wings that will facilitate hands on experiences in technology careers as well as daily learning.

All plans include provision for Vocational and Technical Education as well as experiences that will relate education to the real world of work. Such programs as School-to-Work and Tech Prep are integral parts of some plans.

Evaluation and Assessment

All plans use the student achievement criteria articulated in the Strategic Plan. The goals for MAT, attendance, dropout rate, etc., set forth in this document will be a part of all evaluations.

Leadership

All plans are under the leadership of the respective Area Superintendents who are to assure that implementation efforts address the goal to maintain ninth grade students in school until graduation.

Allowable Costs

Costs payable with Section 31a funds are limited to the following:

- salaries and benefits for instructional staff
- salaries and benefits for staff providing direct non-instructional services such as: medical, counseling, social work services
- purchased services, supplies and materials for instructional and direct non-instructional services
- operation, maintenance, and pupil transportation costs for programs provided outside of the regular school day or year; (transportation for field trips is allowable.)
- capital outlay necessary for the provision of instructional and direct non-instructional services such as computers and other non-instructional equipment
- procedures for involving parents in direct instructional and non-instructional activities with their children

The following pages present a review of the literature related to school restructuring at the high school level. After the literature review, an evaluation of the 1995-96 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program based on staff and student perceptions is presented. This report represents

just one part of the total project evaluation. Additional reports in this series are available from the Office of Research, Evaluation and Testing.

LITERATURE REVIEW²

A literature review was conducted as part of the 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program evaluation. The purpose of the literature review is to identify characteristics of effective dropout prevention programs. The Literature Review is located in the Appendix L.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The emphasis currently being placed on the development of dropout prevention programs for young people and the concomitant installation of such programs in schools, makes it crucial for educators to examine the effects of such programs. Examination must be made of such variables as the time spent on the program, net effects on grade point averages, attendance, test scores, and other in-school academic and non-academic behaviors. As with all programs in the early stages of implementation, process data, such as the perceptions held by the various interest groups of the program, are crucial. Such perceptions often assist in making program adjustments and often provide telling data about the program. Results of this evaluation are to be used by central, area and school staff members for purpose of program planning.

METHODOLOGY

Process Evaluation

The Evaluation of the 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was designed to assess the success of the program as perceived by the principals and the teaching staff. Four surveys were developed containing statements related to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. The principals', the Ninth Grade administrators', the teachers' and the students' surveys contained both forced-choice and open-ended questions. The forced-choice questions accompanied by a Likert-type scale upon which the responses were marked. The four surveys were administered by the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Product Evaluation

Data on grade point averages, attendance, credit hours, academic achievement and dropouts were collected for 1994-95, 1995-96, and 1996-97 ninth grade students and 1995-96 and 1996-97 tenth grade students. Post for grade point averages, attendance and credit hours were received from the district's AS400 information system. The educational status of students came

²See Bibliography Sources in Appendix L. ERIC search abstracts were used for some of the data.

from the district's AS400 information system. Data from the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading and Mathematics) (MAT7, Form S, Level S1, Psychological Corporation, 1993 administered spring 1995, 1996, and 1997) came from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment. The evaluator of the Ninth Grade Restructuring was responsible for collecting and analyzing all product data.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PROCESS DATA

AREA E. PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

There were three (3) surveys returned by the principals who were involved in the 1995-96 School Restructuring Program. They rated twelve (12) different statements dealing with the total program. The forced-choice items were accompanied by a Likert-type rating upon which responses were marked. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive responses. ("Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses were considered "positive"). There were also nine (9) open-ended questions for which his opinions were solicited.

TABLE 1
PRINCIPALS' SURVEY OF THE 1996-97
NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM

| Statements | Number of Responses | | Percent of Positive Responses |
|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| | Total | Positive | |
| The Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was successful in: | | | |
| a. raising students' achievement in reading. | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| b. raising students' achievement in mathematics. | 3 | 2 | 67 |
| c. raising students' achievement in science. | 3 | 2 | 67 |
| d. raising incoming 9th Grade students' awareness of high school requirements. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| e. raising students' awareness of high expectations. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| f. developing self-discipline and responsibility for one's own actions and accomplishments. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| g. developing students' ability to work cooperatively with others. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| h. encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| i. helping students attend school regularly. | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| j. helping students develop worthwhile priorities. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| k. developing students' ability to work independently. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| l. preventing students from dropping out of school. | 3 | 3 | 100 |

One hundred percent (100%) of the principals responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to nine (9) of the statements.

Thirty-three to sixty-seven percent (33% to 67%) of the principals responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the other three (3) of the statements.

Mean average of the statements "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" is eighty-nine percent (89%).

Open-Ended Questions

The principals were asked, *how did you prepare your staff for the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

"Staff development was used to develop the plan and to prepare the staff for implementation."

"Staff were in-serviced by two members of our staff (Judy Jones and Dana Payne) that attended National Seminars Relevant to Restructuring.. In addition, a consultant from Wayne County Regional Educational Service Agency conducted a seminar. Two additional staff members (counselor and department head) attended National Conference Relevant to Restructuring. They will address staff in August."

"Our staff spent time reviewing the 1995-96 Annual Report (i.e., goals objective, accomplishment, student achievement, etc.). We identified areas of improvement, shared the 'Student evaluation' instrument and set goals for the 1996-97 school year. We made a complete review of all components needed for our students to be successful. An extensive discussion revolved around parental involvement."

In the next question the principals were asked, *what teaching strategies would you find in Ninth Grade classrooms in your school?* They responded as follows:

"Cooperative learning was used in mathematics and English. Due to the absence of an English and social studies department head it was difficult to properly supervise the development and implementation of strategies."

"Several teaching strategies have been introduced to staff. They include the following: cooperative learning, peer tutoring, integration of curriculum, re-enforcement of concepts, theories and principles in all classes."

"We looked very carefully at the student profile of our incoming students. Our restructuring component is also a part of the school improvement plan. All staff members are aware of programs through department and staff committee meetings. I have observed a variety of teaching strategies including: cooperative learning, student-centered instruction, team teaching, and the use of the essential elements of effective instruction."

Principals were asked, *did any organizational change(s) occur in your school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

“Several organizational changes were made within departments. Flexible scheduling (flight training), team teaching (geometry, drafting, mathematics, electronics, social studies, technical writing, vocational and English).”

“Team teaching in the Special Education Department has been implemented at this school for sometime. Our ninth grade teachers did some team teaching in English, social studies, math and science.”

The principals were asked, *are you going to do anything different for the 1996-97 Grade 9 students when they are in the 10th grade in 1997-98?* Their responses follow:

“Restructuring will be expanded to the 10th grade using the goals from 9th grade restructuring. My problem area is staff stability.”

“Staff will be encouraged to integrate more hands-on activities in all classes. Activities relevant to improvement of higher order thinking skills and problem solving skills.”

“We have several changes planned for the current ninth graders next year: bimonthly meeting with them throughout the year, inclusion of 10th graders in our incentive programs for ninth graders, and programs to celebrate their academic and attendance achievements through formal assemblies throughout the year. of 1997-98.”

Principals were asked, *what, if any, are your major concerns about the delivery of instruction by your teachers of Grade 9 students?* Their responses follow:

“My staff development funds were ‘impounded’ which prevented me from helping my teachers enhance their delivery of instruction. I planned to expand cooperative teaming, team teaching, and alternative assessments.”

“Getting staff to have high expectations of all students, regardless of gender or race. Support for multi-intelligence learning activities, lack of support for students with special needs, lack of methods of teaching by large percentage of technical staff (non-teaching certified).”

“Teachers were involved in staff development and training workshops involving multiple intelligence’s, brain theory, student assessment and learning theories. Teachers are somewhat hesitant to apply any ‘new knowledge’ that they have learned. Reading, however, must receive special attention.”

The principals were asked, *what are the reactions of the following stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

a. students:

“Cooperative learning, teacher’s concern for students, and field trips.”

“It gives them a definite support system.”

“Almost all student agree or strongly agree that the program was an asset and especially beneficial to them during their first year of high school.”

b. teachers:

“Majority of certified teachers are supportive.”

“Very supportive”

“All teachers agree that ninth graders need special attention. They vary in their perspective on implementation.”

c. parents:

“Involved parents are supportive.”

“Very supportive”

“They understand the need for support at the beginning of high school.”

In the next question, the principals were asked, *what changes would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

- “Adequate support to administer program
- Administrative and/or task force to monitor, support and advise program”

“Staff in-service for 9th grade teams, more and better parental involvement, less disruption from ‘reorganizations’, make summer program mandatory for selected students, and identify at-risk students.”

“Major changes needed are:

- on-going staff development and training component
- an extensive reading component
- extending the program for two years (9th and 10th graders)

- providing scheduling so that all ninth grade teachers can have a common preparation period”

Principals were asked, *for you, what have been the major challenges of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

“Trying to maintain staff morale, difficulty in identifying at-risk students, social promotions from middle schools, and getting parents involved.”

“Financial support, parental involvement, lack of support personnel, lack of support at area and central level, and getting staff to have high expectations of students regardless of gender or race.”

“Our greatest challenges have been student attendance and academic performance. There is a lack of time for teacher preparation and staff development. Also, there is a lack of total staff commitment.”

Finally, the principals were asked, *what, if any, have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

“The major problem has been getting parents actively involved in the process. Our response for orientation has been very poor.”

“Next to the lack of support staff to serve the students, parental involvement was my biggest problem. Work schedule and lack of transportation were reasons for non-participation. Rumors of assaults, gangs and drugs brought parents out in large numbers.”

“Our parental component was not as strong this year. Parents must see educational excellence as a PRIORITY! They must expect and pay attention to homework, academic progress and especially monitor attendance. Parents ‘tend’ to think that high school is the time when the student makes most of the decisions about his education. It is the time when parents must be a vital part of the decision making process for the high school years.”

AREA E. TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

There were twenty-seven (27) surveys returned by the teachers who taught in the 1996-97 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. They rated nineteen (19) different statements dealing with the total program. The forced-choice items were accompanied by a Likert-type rating upon which responses were marked. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive responses. ("Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses were considered "positive"). There were also seven (7) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited.

**TABLE 2
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE
1996-97 NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM**

| | Statements | Number of Responses | | Percent of Positive Responses |
|----|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| | | Total | Positive | |
| 1. | I received sufficient information about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. | 27 | 20 | 74% |
| 2. | Teachers in this school seem to feel that they received sufficient information for the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. | 27 | 20 | 74 |
| 3. | The Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was successful in: | | | |
| | a. raising students' achievement in reading. | 27 | 18 | 67 |
| | b. raising students' achievement in mathematics. | 27 | 20 | 74 |
| | c. raising students' achievement in science. | 27 | 20 | 74 |
| | d. raising students' awareness of high school requirements. | 26 | 24 | 92 |
| | e. raising students' awareness of high school expectations. | 26 | 24 | 92 |
| | f. developing students' ability to work independently. | 26 | 20 | 77 |
| | g. developing students' ability of students to work cooperatively with others. | 25 | 21 | 84 |
| | h. developing self-discipline and responsibility for one's own actions and accomplishments. | 25 | 15 | 60 |
| | i. encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning. | 26 | 19 | 73 |

**TABLE 2 (CONT'D)
TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS
OF THE
1996-97 NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM**

| | Statements | Number of Responses | | Percent of Positive Responses |
|----|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| | | Total | Positive | |
| j. | helping students develop worth-while priorities. | 26 | 20 | 77% |
| k. | helping students to attend school regularly. | 25 | 24 | 96 |
| l. | preventing students from dropping out of school. | 25 | 23 | 92 |
| 4. | I feel that Ninth Grade Restructuring Program will result in improved achievement. | 27 | 26 | 96 |
| 5. | Teachers feel that Ninth Grade Restructuring Program will result in improved achievement. | 27 | 22 | 81 |
| 6. | I am supportive of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. | 27 | 27 | 100 |
| 7. | Teachers in the building seem to be supportive of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. | 27 | 24 | 89 |
| 8. | Parents received sufficient advance notification about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. | 27 | 23 | 85 |

Eighty-one to one hundred percent (81% to 100%) of the teachers "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to ten (10) of the statements.

Sixty to seventy-seven percent (60% to 77%) of the teachers "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to the other nine (9) statements.

The mean average of all the statements "Agreed" or "Strongly agreed" is eighty-two percent (82%).

Open-Ended Questions

The teachers were asked, *what teaching strategies would I find in Ninth Grade classrooms in your school?* They responded as follows:

"I use cooperative learning for many of the assignments. There have been numerous cooperative group assignments that led to group presentations."

"Peer-tutoring and cooperative learning"

“Cooperative learning and guided practice”

“Cooperative learning, authentic method of instruction, student-center instruction, and hands-on individualized instruction.”

“Cooperative learning – students working together in small groups, and student-centered instructions.”

“In my room you would find some aspects of discovery learning, student-centered instruction, and a lot of group work.”

“I’m not sure, but based on our student population and socio-economic factors, I believe students need a program that fosters strong discipline, writing and oral communications skills in (Language Arts), addresses conditions in our society and responses to them, and is Afro-centric.”

“In our school you would find the following teaching strategies being used: cooperative learning, block scheduling with large classes, and team teaching.”

Cooperative learning (10)

“Cooperative learning – students working together in the classroom in groups of 2 or 3.”

“Students working cooperatively on group projects or on a group project final exam. Students experiencing a writing workshop English classroom.”

“The following teaching strategies were utilized: cooperative learning – students were grouped according to common interests and encouraged to discuss different topics introduced by the teacher. I also used directed group guidance – motivational activities, student seminars and resource persons were a regular part of instruction.”

- **“Know, Want to Know and Learned (KWL)**
- **Question Answer Relationship (QAR)**
- **Demonstration/Performance**
- **Cooperative learning**
- **Student-centered instruction”**

“Group work, teaching students to interact to achieve a common goal.”

“Cooperative learning and other group work.”

“Cooperative learning and using technology”

"I try to combine both authentic methods of instruction as well as cooperative learning methods in the classroom."

In the next question the teachers were asked, *did any organizational change(s) occur in your school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

"There was an attempt to have 9th grade classes be purely for 9th graders, unfortunately, upper classmen still got assigned to these classes. The behavior of each other didn't mesh well and level of subject matter became harder to focus on."

"Team teaching and block scheduling."

"Team teaching (special education and regular education) has been in place for 9 years."

"Some teachers visited a school in Monroe to observe block scheduling. Groups are presently working on flexible scheduling."

"Ninth grade classes were held in the same area."

"Occasional team teaching occurred when 3 teachers got classes together for a lesson such as sex education."

"The organizational changes that occurred were flexible scheduling and team teaching. Students were allowed to make changes in their schedules if these changes were based on improvement in academic achievement, behavior and attitude."

"Summer orientation (school) program. To get students started in the transition to high school."

"Inter-disciplinary teaching"

Teachers were asked, *what, if any, are your major concerns about the delivery of instruction to your Grade 9 students?* Their responses follow:

"Ninth graders seem to want to run the class as soon as they enroll, but when given the challenge of making group presentations they shy away. They don't want to do assignments, but then worry about their grade at report card time. More time is needed to sit down individually with each 9th grader and chart their progress."

"Many have reading problems. The textbooks are too difficult for many students, and concepts are difficult to get across."

“Low skills upon entering. A lot of remediation is needed in addition to trying to cover new material.”

“I find their poor attendance patterns difficult to teach around. In addition, many of my 9th graders are gang affiliated.”

“You can’t put fancy titles on things (cooperative learning, restructuring), but there’s a difference between cleaning up and merely moving the mess around. Without strong building leadership, any program is destined for failure.”

“Student Code of Conduct manual not clear to students (i.e., attendance, dress code, classroom behavior, rights and responsibilities).”

“The two major concerns are student attendance and tardiness. Students do not get the full effect of instruction if they are absent or tardy.”

“I could use more outside information sources in the classroom, textbooks, materials and the internet with a printer for the computer.”

“Students should be expected to learn to a higher standard across the school district. Administrators should help remove or counsel disruptive students so behavior and classroom environment improve.”

“All students should be taught using current topics to teach. Current topics/trends should be discussed. Things that students know something about.”

“Even though I am constantly searching for ways to improve my delivery of instruction by making the material, fun and interesting, I am concerned that many of our students do not receive ‘brain based’ instruction. Brain based strategies give students unique opportunities for learning such as allowing them to drink water during class, eat peppermints during an exam, and playing baroque music as students enter the classroom. These strategies would stimulate brain cells and help students achieve.”

“The biggest problem is class size and mobility. If we are going to make a writing program that focuses on peer editing and inter-cognitive writing, we need fewer students in class with less mid-semester transfers in and out.”

“Too much time is required to deal with classroom management problems and too little emphasis is placed on mastery of skills. Moreover, that this is a situation imposed on teachers by supervisors and administrators directed by boards of education and superintendents.”

“Lack of motivation to excel or even succeed.”

“Interest of student, motivating students to be reasonable for processing instruction, avoiding student emotional conflicts, and instilling in students that the instructor is responsible for planning and delivering instruction.”

“Ninth graders need to be concerned of the importance of their ‘job’ as students.”

“Delivery of instruction is hampered in the morning by absences and tardiness.”

“My major concern about the delivery of instruction to the students is how much information are they getting from the class. Room instruction that is presented to them on a daily bases.”

The teachers were asked, *what are the reactions of the following stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

a. students:

“Many strive for excellence despite obvious barriers.”

“Positive support from counselor and social worker.”

“Students support the Ninth Grade Restructuring. They are glad they have staff to go to with problems and concerns.”

“They like the individualized attention.”

“Students are receptive.”

“Excited”

“Students have the most to gain from this program.”

“Positive”

“Their attitudes about school and learning have been positive. There has been an improvement in self-understanding, self-confidence, decision making skills and goal setting.”

“Must be willing to assume responsibility of their education – not circumventing the process.”

“Students may not be aware of restructuring activities.”

b. teachers:

“Dividing the ninth grade population helps control the behavioral problems and better manage the teaching techniques of the staff.”

“Feel they do the work but often get blamed for things they do not control.”

“More help is needed with counseling of students who have attendance problems.”

“Teachers support the Ninth Grade Restructuring and they believe that the extra staff has helped the ninth graders.”

“They are very supportive of the motives. They feel that standards may be lowered.”

“The teachers show enthusiasm for the program.”

“Students are improving.”

“Teachers that have ninth grade are better off if they teach ninth grade only.”

“Teachers want more in-put and communication.”

“Overall, teachers view the program as an invaluable tool which assists ninth graders in the transition from middle to high school. Without the program, many students would not progress academically and graduation from high school wouldn't be realistic.”

“Teachers are cooperative.”

“Supportive”

“Motivate students to learn and accept responsibility.”

c. parents:

“Do not do their job, high absenteeism of students, little follow-up at home, economic, language, social ambition, desire to achieve, pregnancy, and drugs are often on wrong side.”

“Supportive”

“Parents are very supportive.”

“Have questions regarding ninth grade program.”

“Most parents seem aware of restructuring goals and contact with parents is important.”

“Parents who are active in the school are aware and supportive.”

“Positive”

“Ninth grade parents are extremely supportive of the program. They appreciate the time and ‘extra attention’ given to their children. Many believe it is a firm foundation to build their high school careers and lives.”

“Parents were informed about their child’s academic success, attendance problems, etc.”

d. administrators:

“Make much effort to try and correct an enormous problem it has taken generations to create.”

“Positive”

“Like teachers, they are not sure how to handle it.”

“Administrators are enthusiastic about the program.”

“Positive attitude”

“Administrators understand the reasons for ninth grade restructuring.”

“Administrators push the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.”

“Supportive”

“The administration has demonstrated support and belief in the program by providing resources for field trips, guest speakers, and other community involvement which targets ‘at-risk’ youth. They work as a team with the program to ensure every student’s success.”

“Deal with classroom conflicts, disruptive behaviors, and insubordination.”

“Available money to successfully structure ninth grade program.”

Teachers were asked, *what changes would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

“I feel that the ninth grade restructuring teachers and administrators should have at least a once a month Wednesday meeting to discuss our concerns of enrollment, class size, academics, attendance, behavior, motivation, etc.”

“No changes, just continue with the existing program.”

“Smaller class size, regular attendance of all students, materials other than textbooks, mentors and computers.”

“Disseminate program information to all teachers, consistency in areas of truancy, tardiness, etc. (in dealings with students), and I don’t think ninth graders needed seven classes because it made the school day too long.”

“Moving ninth graders in a wing of the school to themselves. Allowing all teachers of ninth graders to have the same prep period.”

“Focus more on the good side, not the bad. I really appreciate the pure ninth grade math course.”

“There should be more time for collaboration with other teachers.”

“Making everyone aware of what’s going on.”

“We need leadership that reduces in-school truancy and incidents of serious disrespect and insubordination of staff. Without those, a discussion of programs is moot.”

“Require parents to attend the student’s classes to get a feel for the environment. Perhaps, an ‘Open-House’ night, so parents can talk to all teachers.”

“Money for trips”

“Improve closer contacts with parents regarding student behavior, academic achievement, and attendance.”

“Demand higher standards of department academic achievement.”

“Hold students accountable.”

“We need a restructuring administrator.”

“Set aside an hour a day for staff meetings. Involve the teachers more in planning, communication, and in innovative programs. Teachers should meet periodically with administrators to discuss concerns.”

“Doing things that would lead to class identity, part of a group, activities for ninth graders only social and educational.”

“Kettering has an excellent Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. We are fortunate to have a ninth grade assistant principal who understands the needs of the students and strives to educate ninth graders holistically through academics, social skills and affective domains.”

The teachers were asked, *for you, what have been the major challenges of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

“Dealing with their emotional and social growth that sometimes leads to discipline problems in the classroom. Sometimes boys can’t stand the girls and vice versa then later those concerns are simply gone. Also getting them to realize that it takes a lot of good hard work to achieve a high academic grade.”

“Keeping the students in school.”

“Never included in planning goals.”

“Taking students out of any classes for functions.”

“The attendance for the ninth graders has shown some improvement, however, there is still room for more improvement. The parents have not been as supportive as they should and communication could be better.”

“What has been restructured? For whom? Who controls the definition of Restructuring, and what does it mean?”

“Attending assemblies”

“Attendance and parental involvement”

“Trying to motivate students to attend class and stay up with the class work.”

“Motivating students to accept responsibility for learning behaviors and team-work.”

“Feeling that it doesn’t involve me personally very much, nor ask for my in-put on a day-to-day, or periodic basis.”

"I'm still concerned about out-of-class student performance. The classroom experience can be the best possible, but it will make little difference in the student's lives if they don't work outside of the class."

"The major challenge of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program is putting it in place."

"The major challenges have been attendance, punctuality and academic achievement. The students had to be taught that regular attendance is a key component for a successful ninth grade year. Punctuality problems decreased as the students realized that tardiness to class shortchanged their education."

In the next question the teachers were asked, *what, if any, have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

"I think if we had more of the award ceremonies for the ninth graders after school hours, then maybe more of their parents would be able to attend. Maybe parents should be polled as to when is the best time for such events should take place, so that the majority of them can attend."

"The student brings his home life to school. This year 1 parent was murdered, 5 girls who could have been excellent students left to stay home with new babies, 2 students went to lock-up, 2 were hit by cars, and many (1/3) just disappeared, where is the parental component?"

"I'm not aware that parents are involved."

"Lack of parental involvement."

"The biggest challenges are the lack of parental support and communication."

"Accommodating work schedules of parents."

"Trying to stay in touch with parents if their children are having behavior or academic problems in class."

Communication is often difficult because of lack of phones or disconnected numbers. Parents often have either never been involved, or are overwhelmed by problems of the teenage years."

"Getting parents more involved with their children's education."

"Non-involvement"

“Home support for any program is lacking for up to 50 percent of the students.”

“The challenge is getting parents involved generally in the school.”

“Parents can do more to ensure that their students are fulfilling the out-of-class responsibilities as mentioned in number 6 (especially homework). Parents can set aside a two (or one) hour block of time at home for students to do their daily assignments or additional learning (reading, working on computer, etc.).”

AREA E. STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

There were one hundred twenty-five (125) surveys returned by the students who were enrolled in the 1995-96 Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. They rated twenty (20) different statements dealing with the total program. The forced-choice items were accompanied by a Likert-type rating upon which responses were marked. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive responses. ("Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses were considered "positive"). There were also two (2) open-ended questions for which their opinion were solicited.

TABLE 3
STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE 1996-97 NINTH GRADE
RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM

| Statements | Number of Responses Total | Positive | Percent of Positive Responses |
|---|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The Ninth Grade Restructuring Program has helped my classmates to: | | | |
| a. get along with other students. | 125 | 94 | 75% |
| b. get along better with adults. | 125 | 92 | 74 |
| c. feel better about themselves. | 125 | 104 | 83 |
| d. feel better about school. | 125 | 95 | 76 |
| e. improve their attitudes toward learning. | 125 | 102 | 82 |
| f. develop better self-discipline. | 125 | 83 | 66 |
| g. improve their work habits. | 125 | 98 | 78 |
| h. improve their reading skills. | 125 | 88 | 70 |
| i. improve their math skills. | 125 | 85 | 68 |
| j. improve their science skills. | 125 | 93 | 74 |
| k. attend school regularly. | 125 | 78 | 62 |
| l. improve their ability to work cooperatively with others. | 125 | 98 | 78 |
| m. to complete assigned tasks. | 125 | 100 | 80 |
| n. to raise their awareness of high school requirements. | 125 | 103 | 82 |

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

**STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE 1996-97 NINTH GRADE
RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM**

| | Statements | Number of Responses | | Percent of Positive Responses |
|----|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| | | Total | Positive | |
| 2. | I am satisfied with the services I have received from the program. | 125 | 105 | 84 % |
| 3. | The teachers of this program appeared to be sincerely concerned about me. | 125 | 95 | 76 |
| 4. | I was given homework daily in most of my classes. | 125 | 80 | 64 |
| 5. | I received help from my teachers when I was having problems with my class work. | 125 | 105 | 84 |
| 6. | The services offered by the counselor have been very helpful. | 125 | 90 | 72 |
| 7. | The administrators of this program appeared to be sincerely concerned about me. | 125 | 90 | 72 |

Seventy to eighty-four percent (70% to 84%) of the students "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to sixteen (16) of the statements.

Sixty-two to sixty-eight percent (62% to 68%) of the students "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" to the other four (4) statements.

The mean average of the statements "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" is seventy-five percent (75%).

Open-Ended Questions

In the first question, the students were asked to indicate what they liked best about the program. They responded as follows:

"I personally enjoyed the experience I got toward drafting."

"I like the different trips we got to take. We learned many new things on the trips."

"The things I liked best about this program were the trips and the cooperative learning."

“How teachers took out time to help students identify the work they didn’t understand.”

“I liked best about this program that it showed us people cared about our education.”

“I like that the program tried to help me understand about Kettering H.S. better and what it will take to get my diploma.”

“The different program the different things I was exposed.”

“What I like best about this program is the awards you received for doing good work. It gives me the ambition to do better than before.”

“I liked how the teachers were there to help you when you need help with your work.”

“Well I like that I do get to go to other classes and meet more people and learn different things.”

“What I liked best about the program was that it opened me up. I started to understand more about the classes I took.”

“What I liked about this program is that they have this program to help the ones that needs help and for the ones who want to help themselves.”

“I like best about this program is that it is free also it is only three classes and the teacher’s are very helpful in teaching. We also go on trips.’

“It can help me improve in my math skills.”

“This program gave me the chance to advance to the 10th grade and bring my grade point average up so that I can play football for Pershing High School.”

“Having fun and doing work and staying out of troubles and having activities.”

“This program allows me so become more active in my school work and it allows me to work hard and only strive for the best in whatever I do.”

“That I would get all my credit back so I could move to the 10th grade with my other friends.”

“The fact that it was designed to help students such as myself.”

“The best thing I like about the program is the nice people and got to know a lot of people.”

“That you can meet new people, be introduced to new teachers and administrators.”

“I liked that I felt better in high school than middle school and I learned more.”

“What I liked best was the way the teachers made it fun to learn about math, science, English, etc. I can honestly say that I learned more this summer at this program than I’ve learned in a whole school year, and I enjoyed it.”

“I like mostly everything there are good teachers they help you a lot good students.”

“I liked the work best. The work have helped me to be able to know the things that I have learned in the program when the fall comes.”

“I liked going on the computers best because it gives us a chance to interact with other people from a round the world and it was a lot of fun.”

“I like all the classes and the teachers because when their teaching they always teach with understanding.”

“The ability to work on the computers and learn how to use them.”

“What I like about this program is that most of the work was fun and so was the trips.”

“What I like best about this program is that I learned about responsibility, self-respect, and respect for others. We went on trips and I had fun at all of them.”

“How all the teachers were so concerned about everybody.”

“The best thing I like were to meet other people and make new friends.”

“What I like best about this program is that the teachers help you a lot in doing your best.”

“I liked this program because I got to get vital help in math. My math skills weren’t very sharp, but by attending this program it helped my a lot.”

“I liked the teachers the best about this program and some of the students.”

“I liked learning more about what I didn’t know and know next year when they teach math or English I’ll know what to do.”

“I could learn about things I never thought I could achieve. When I get off track of work all of my teachers back track and help me catch up to reality.”

“What I like best about this program is that any problem that you have the teachers are written to help you no matter what it is and that’s why I am attending this school next year.”

“What I liked best about this program was it helped people get along and learn how to be respectful to all people.”

“This program helped me to make friends and it helped me to get more comfortable with the school. I am at ease or you can say I have a piece of mind.”

“The program helped students become familiar with the school and some of it’s teachers, and helped students to become more prepared for high school.”

“The thing that I like best about this program is that I get to know the school, the teachers, and the students better.”

“I like the teachers and the students in this program.”

“One thing I like a lot was that I meet a lot of new friends and now I know my way around the building.”

“The thing I like best about this program the things I did not know how to do I now know how to do.”

“I was very interested in how the students and staff were very down to earth and I really liked how the students got the chance to tell the teacher what they expected from them.”

“I liked the way that the teachers took time to explain the work that we were receiving/ They cared about rather we received a failing grade or not and if we did receive a failing grade they’d take time to go back over the lesson to make sure we understood.”

“The students and the administrators.”

“The students and some teacher.”

“The discipline that they teach us. The way the teachers help when they see you’re not successful in that certain study.”

In the second question, the students were asked to indicate what they liked least about the program. Some of their comments follow:

“I hate that there wasn’t enough activities.”

“Some teachers did not cooperate with the program.”

“Some of the teachers’ attitudes.”

“Getting up so early in the morning for the program and the long hours of school.”

“What I least liked about this program is that we have to get up early in the morning and the classes is to long.”

“What didn’t like was how long it takes for one class to get out, and it interferes with my football practice.”

“That counselors weren’t very cooperative. They always pushed students away.”

“I didn’t like the hard work.”

“What I like least about this program was that I hated getting up early in the morning, getting myself dressed and still be late.”

“Most of the people that were supposed to be listening were not.”

“Some teachers didn’t not give the students a realistic view of what’s to come in high school.”

“The class periods and the class work.”

“The class hour is too long.”

AREA E. NINTH GRADE ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTIONS*

There were three (3) surveys returned by the Ninth Grade Administrators who were involved in the 1996-97 School Restructuring Program. They rated twelve (12) different statements dealing with the total program. The forced-choice items were accompanied by a Likert-type rating upon which responses were marked. The responses were analyzed for the percent of positive responses. ("Strongly Agree" and "Agree" responses were considered "positive"). There were also nine (9) open-ended questions for which their opinions were solicited.

TABLE 4

**NINTH GRADE ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY OF THE 1996-97
NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING PROGRAM**

| Statements | Number of Responses | | Percent of Positive Responses |
|---|---------------------|----------|-------------------------------------|
| | Total | Positive | |
| The Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was successful in: | | | |
| a. raising students' achievement in reading. | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| b. raising students' achievement in mathematics. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| c. raising students' achievement in science. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| d. raising incoming 9th Grade students' awareness of high school requirements. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| e. raising students' awareness of high expectations. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| f. developing self-discipline and responsibility for one's own actions and accomplishments. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| g. developing students' ability to work cooperatively with others. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| h. encouraging parents to be involved in their child's learning. | 3 | 2 | 67 |
| i. helping students attend school regularly. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| j. helping students develop worthwhile priorities. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| k. developing students' ability to work independently. | 3 | 3 | 100 |
| l. preventing students from dropping out of school. | 3 | 3 | 100 |

*Most of the Ninth Grade Administrators were assistant principals who served in that administrative position. In some schools department heads served in that position.

One hundred percent (100%) of the Ninth Grade Administrators responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to eleven (11) of the statements.

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the Ninth Grade Administrators responded "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to the other one (1) of the statements.

The mean average of all the positive statements is ninety-seven percent (97%).

Open-Ended Questions

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *how did you prepare your staff for the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

"The principal and I discussed the program with staff at department head meetings and teachers meetings. We also held regular meetings with 9th grade teachers. Results of the program were shared with the entire staff."

"Our restructuring staff spent time reviewing the 1995-96 annual report which included:

- goals, objectives, accomplishments, student achievement
- identified areas of improvement
- shared the student evaluation instrument
- set goals for 1996-97 school years (A complete review of components needed by students to be successful.) Extensive discussion about parent involvement."

"Every staff member received a general orientation to the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program."

"Ninth Grade teachers participated in the following in-services:

Image is everything, Four three hour planning workshops, English, math, science in-service per area curriculum specialist (monthly), and a Brain Based Strategy Workshop."

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *what teaching strategy would you find in Ninth Grade classrooms in your school?* They responded as follows:

"Cooperative learning, student center instruction, and brain-based environmental concepts were introduced to teachers."

"I have observed a variety of teaching strategies being used in 9th grade classrooms including: Cooperative learning; student center instruction; exploration; and essential elements of effective instructions."

"Ninth grade teachers participated in the following in-services: 'Image is Everything', four three hour planning workshops, English, math, science in-service per area curriculum specialist (monthly), and a brain based strategy workshops.

"The following teaching strategies can be found in ninth grade classrooms:

Cooperative Learning. Several 'Restructuring' classrooms have been created. These classrooms have tables and chairs. They do not have the traditional desk set up in individual rows. This type of room arrangement allows the students to work in teams cooperatively.

Project Driven Classes. These are classes where teachers and students select a project for the semester and all of the teaching is focused on the implementation of this class project. The teacher incorporates various teaching strategies (cooperative and reciprocal learning team building etc.)."

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *did any organizational change(s) occur in your school as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

"Team teaching was already being implemented in our school, however, we meet with the teachers of our 9th grade restructuring program frequently to improve services to our students."

"Team teaching through the creation of interdisciplinary units for the English, math and science teachers was implemented as a result of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program."

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *are you going to do anything different for the 1996-97 Grade 9 students when they are in the 10th grade in 1997-98?* Their responses follow:

"We will continue an aware and reward system to encourage the 10th graders."

"We have several changes planned for the current 9th graders next year.

- To have a monthly meeting with them through the year.
- To include the 10th graders in our incentive programs for 9th graders.
- To celebrate their academic and attendance achievements through formal assemblies throughout the year (1997-98)."

"During the 1997-98 school year we will continue to monitor student attendance and GPA from grade level reports. The only thing that will be done differently is that we will use tenth graders as 'Big Brothers and Sisters' for the new ninth graders."

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *what, if any, are your major concerns about the delivery of instruction by your teachers of Grade 9 students?* Their responses follow:

“I would like to see more planning and time to collaborate with other 9th grade teachers.”

“Our major concern has been staff development and training for all of our teachers, especially our 9th grade teachers. Additionally, we recommend teachers of reading component to our Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.”

“This year the major concern has been the loss of ninth grade teachers due to cutbacks. The loss of teachers created over crowded classrooms and inconsistency in the delivery of instruction to students.”

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *what are the reactions of the following stakeholders about the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

a. students:

“Almost all the students agreed or strongly agreed that the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program was an asset to them during their first year of high school.”

“Students feel that the program has assisted them in bridging the gap between middle school and high school.”

b. teachers:

“All the 9th grade teachers were positive about our over-all impact on our 9th graders.”

“Teachers feel that the program is effective in supporting the students and themselves as it relates to classroom issues and providing additional resources.”

c. parents:

“Our parents are positive about our Ninth Grade Restructuring Program. Although they raise many questions about what will happen to 10th graders.”

“Parents appear to appreciate the fairness, firmness and dedication that the staff members exhibit in dealing with students. They also appreciate the referrals and direct assistance given to them in dealing with their child.”

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *what changes would improve the implementation of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* They responded as follows:

“A full-time 9th grade attendance office would be a tremendous help. More time for meeting and planning with 9th grade teachers.”

“The addition of a Staff Development and Training Component; Teacher of Reading Component; extend the restructuring program for two years, increase the budget for student incentives; and add a Parent Educational Development Component (with incentives).”

- “The continuation of the 8th grade assessment form from middle school.
- The creation of remedial labs for reading and math.
- Implementation of block scheduling.
- Administration and teachers who are in a ‘restructuring mind set’ and are open to change.”

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *for you what have been the major challenges of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

“Student absenteeism. Lack of parental support, even after numerous efforts to involve them.”

“Encouraging students to improve their attendance; encourage students to maximize their academic potentials; helping students to effectively deal with the influence of peer pressure, gangs, community forces, etc.; and to address the needs of our students that involve the nuclear family.”

- “Parental involvement.
- Student academic deficiencies and no services available for these students.
- Loss of ninth grade teachers through district cutbacks.”

Finally the Ninth Grade Administrators were asked, *what, if any, have been the challenges with the parental component of the Ninth Grade Restructuring Program?* Their responses follow:

“Lack of parental responses and participation. A very small percentage came to our parenting meetings. It was extremely successful for the parents that did participate.”

- “Increase over all parent involvement in our Ninth Grade Restructuring Program.
- Increase parent involvement on our Ninth Grade Parent Advisory Committee.
- Increase parent visitation to our school.

- Increase parent involvement in student activities.
- Increase parent involvement in extra-curricular activities .
- Increase parent involvement in community projects that support our school.”

“The issue of parental involvement is paramount. Parents were invited to a number of activities during the school year such as orientations, parental conferences, honor assemblies etc. The attendance was average at most of the activities.”

A. Area E Ninth Grade Restructuring Personnel*

| | Number of FTE's 1995-96 | Number of FTE's 1996-97 |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| • Ninth grade administrators | 3 | 3 |
| • Counselors | 3 | 3 |
| • Social workers | 3 | 3 |
| • Teachers | 3 | 3 |
| | 1995-96 | 1996-97 |
| B. Total number of teachers teaching only Ninth Grade students | * 35 | 33 |
| C. Total number of teachers teaching some Ninth Grade students | * 117 | 95 |
| D. Number of students served as part of Ninth Grade Restructuring | *2,891 | 2,487 |

*These numbers are based on the returned surveys of the Ninth Grade Administrators. Some did not respond to all items of the survey.

The ninth grade administrators were also asked to indicate with "Yes" or "No" if the programs listed below were operational in their schools. Their responses follow:

| <u>Academic Programs</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>No Response</u> |
|--|------------|-----------|------------------------|
| a. <u>Organizational Change</u> e.g. School-Within-A-School, flexible scheduling, block-time for a core curriculum area, etc. | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| b. <u>Summer Preparation</u> e.g. orientation to high school, study skills, etc. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| c. <u>Before/During/After School Tutorial Programs</u> e.g. indicate if tutors are students, teachers, parents, etc.; what materials are used; what training was involved. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| d. <u>New Experimental Course Offerings</u> e.g. courses offered for the first time in your school, description of courses, etc. | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| e. <u>Improve Quality of Instruction</u> e.g. hands-on-activities, cooperative and/or collaborative learning, increased time on task, greater use of test results to modify instruction. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| f. <u>Technology</u> e.g. description of hardware and software used in your school; who is using them; how it is used, etc. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Support Programs</u> | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>No Response</u> |
| a. <u>Attendance Program</u> e.g. attendance services that go beyond the services now provided addition of an attendance agent, etc. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| b. <u>Counseling Program</u> e.g. counseling services that go beyond the traditional services, of scheduling, discipline and career exploration. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| c. <u>Health Services</u> e.g. addition of a nurse, establishment of health clinic, etc. | 0 | 3 | 0 |

ACADEMIC AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS

The Ninth Grade Administrators were asked to select an academic or support program which they found to be successful in their school. Three of the programs follow:

A. Parenting Program/After School Tutoring

Need

Describe the needs which substantiate the use of this program.

To help parents face the difficult task of raising self-disciplined and responsible teenagers.

There is a need to provide professional tutoring and homework assistance.

Objective(s)

State the objective(s) in terms of the amount of improvement for each need.

Parents are reminded of this immense influence they have with their teenagers, that they are their most important role models. Parents will be counseled in how to foster responsibility in their teenagers.

Provide on an ongoing basis professional tutoring and homework assistance.

Program Description

Please clearly describe the operation of this program. Please emphasize what will be different for the students and teachers.

This is a ten-week parenting workshop with weekly meetings. Parents are educated, counseled and are allowed time for questions and discussion. Also referrals are made for services outside the school environment.

Tutoring and homework assistance is offered in math, science and English on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. weekly.

Staffing

Please indicate the number and classification of the staff needed to implement this program, e.g., teachers, counselors, educational technicians, student assistants, etc.

Parenting program: school social worker

Tutoring programs: administrator (1)
counselor (1)
secretary (1)
classroom teachers (3)

Evaluation

Please describe what data you will use to determine whether or not your objective(s) have been met.

- Ongoing student records
- Follow-up conferences
- Student surveys
- Improved GPA and test scores

B. After School Tutorial Program

Need

Describe the needs which substantiate the use of this program.

- Students low reading and mathematics scores from middle school who need assistance.
- Students who fall behind in their academic work because of poor time-management skills.
- Students who fall behind in their academic work because of their attendance.
- Students who fall behind in their work because of school code violations.

Objective(s)

State the objective(s) in terms of the amount of improvement for each need.

- To provide an opportunity for students to improve reading and mathematics test scores by at least one (1) grade level during the year.
- To provide an opportunity for students to obtain assistance in reading/writing, mathematics, and science.
- Provide an opportunity for students to receive academic assistance when they are away from school for an extended period of time.
- Provide an opportunity for students to share with other students their academic, social, and psychological development.

Program Description

Please clearly describe the operation of this program. Please emphasize what will be different for the students and teachers.

The After School Tutorial Program will give students an opportunity to receive assistance in their academic development. Tutorial assistance will be offered in the following academic areas: mathematics, English, reading and science. The after school program will begin at 3:35 p.m. and will end at 5:00 p.m. Students will participate in the after school program in a number of ways:

- volunteer
- parent referral
- teacher referral
- administrative assignments

Teachers will be assigned to these tutorial centers along with students who will assist in the tutorial progress. Additionally, parents have an opportunity to attend the tutorial session with the student. This will enable the parent to assist in the tutorial process beyond school.

Staffing

Please indicate the number and classification of the staff needed to implement this program, e.g., teachers, counselors, educational technicians, student assistants, etc.

Three teachers – mathematics, English, social studies
Along with peer tutors (volunteers)

Evaluation

Please describe what data you will use to determine whether or not your objective(s) have been met.

The following barometers will be used to measure the effectiveness of our program.

- Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT)
- Earned academic credit
- Grade Point Average (GPA)
- Attendance
- Parent Involvement
- Internal Evaluation Instrument

Professional Development

Please describe the in-service training you provided in terms of content, time to be allotted, and if know, the trainers.

Critical Thinking Skills
Learning Theory In-Service
Framing The Future
Building Leadership Skills
Assessment Alignment with High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)
Improving Your Teaching Strategies In Mathematics
Staff Development

Dr. Julia R. Davis
Dr. Joan Neurott

Ms. Ada Badger

Mr. Marvin Weingarden
Administrative Organizational
Plan

C. Attendance Patrol

Need

Describe the needs which substantiate the use of this program.

The needs to substantiate the attendance patrol program became evident after the first card marking. The report cards indicated that one hundred and twelve (112) students had severe academic and attendance problems; 20 days or more absence and had failed three or more classes. A plan was developed so that their attendance and grades would be monitored on a daily basis by the teachers, a parent/volunteer, and an attendance agent.

Objective

State the objective(s) in terms of the amount of improvement for each need.

Student attendance and grades will improve by 25 percent.

Program Description

Please clearly describe the operation of this program. Please emphasize what will be different for the students and teachers.

The attendance patrol program is designed to provide continuous monitoring of twenty-five students during a ten-week cycle. Students who have been identified as a At-Risk must complete the following activities:

- Student and parents are invited in for a parental conference regarding attendance and grades. A plan of action is developed at this time.
- Students are placed in group counseling for ten-weeks with the social worker and counselor.
- During these ten-weeks classes are being monitored on an hourly basis.
- Every Friday students who have gone to all classes for that week a 'Good News' phone call is made to the students home in the classroom.
- Students must attend after school tutoring for ten-weeks. The difference for students and teachers is that this program requires monitoring on an hourly basis with daily communication to the student's home.

Staffing

Please indicate the number and classification of the staff needed to implement this program, e.g., teachers, counselors, educational technicians, student assistants, etc.

| | |
|---------------------|------|
| Teachers | (28) |
| Counselors | (2) |
| Parent volunteer | (1) |
| Assistant principal | (1) |
| Attendance agent | (1) |

Evaluation

Please describe what data you will use to determine whether or not your objective(s) have been met.

Students attendance and grades are used to determine whether or not the objective was met.

Professional Development

Please describe the in-service training you provided in terms of content, time to be allotted, and, if known, the trainers.

The following in-services were provided:

Academic innovations

Images is Everything

Brain Based Strategies

Math, science and English in-service via area curriculum specialist

Critical thinking that empowers us to choose non-violent life skills.

Project Driven Classes

Writing Across the curriculum

Julia Davis, Trainer
School Craft College
Area E

**PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA
GRADE 9**

There are seven (7) product variables presented in this section:

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|
| a. | Grade Point Averages (GPA's) (1) | 6/1995, 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| b. | Daily Attendance (1) | 6/1995, 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| c. | Credit hours attempted and earned (2) | 6/1995, 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| d. | Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading and Mathematics) (2) | 4/1995, 4/1996 and 4/1997 |
| e. | Educational Status of Students (1) | 6/1995, 6/1996 and 6/1997 |

The results are as follows:

**NINTH GRADE/
GRADE POINT AVERAGES
June, 1995
(Before the Program)**

Table 5 shows that the GPA for Davis Aerospace Technical High School (1.9) is above the Area (1.4) and the District GPA's (1.5); Kettering High School (1.4) is the same as the Area and below the District GPA's (1.5); Pershing High School (1.5) is above the Area (1.4) but equal to the District GPA's; Osborn High School has (1.2) GPA which is below the Area (1.4) and the District GPA's (1.5).

TABLE 5

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1994-95**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 59* | 1.9 | 2980* | 1.4 | 19,484* | 1.5 |
| Kettering High School | 634* | 1.4 | 2980* | 1.4 | 19,484* | 1.5 |
| Osborn High School | 1020* | 1.2 | 2980* | 1.4 | 19,484* | 1.5 |
| Pershing High School | 1030* | 1.5 | 2980* | 1.4 | 19,484* | 1.5 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 6 shows that Davis Technical H.S. has a higher percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ (47%), than the Area (32%) and the District (35%). Kettering H.S. (29%) and Osborn H.S. (27%) have lower percents of students with GPA's of 2.0+ than the Area (32%) and the District (35%). Pershing H.S. (33%) has a higher percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (32%) but lower than the District (35%).

TABLE 6
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 2.0+ GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1994-95

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 28* | 47% | 968* | 32% | 6832* | 35% |
| Kettering High School | 186* | 29% | 968* | 32% | 6832* | 35% |
| Osborn High School | 297* | 27% | 968* | 32% | 6832* | 35% |
| Pershing High School | 345* | 33% | 968* | 32% | 6832* | 35% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

NINTH GRADE/GRADE POINT AVERAGES
June, 1996
(First Year of Program)

Table 7 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (1.9) is above the Area (1.4) and the District (1.5) GPA's. Kettering H.S. and Osborn H.S. (1.2) are below the Area (1.4) and the District (1.5) GPA's. Pershing H.S. (1.4) is the same as the Area (1.4) but below the District (1.5) GPA's.

TABLE 7

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
 GRADE POINT AVERAGES
 1995-96**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 97* | 1.9 | 3231* | 1.4 | 18,332* | 1.5 |
| Kettering High School | 775* | 1.2 | 3231* | 1.4 | 18,332* | 1.5 |
| Osborn High School | 1152* | 1.2 | 3231* | 1.4 | 18,332* | 1.5 |
| Pershing High School | 1030* | 1.4 | 3231* | 1.4 | 18,332* | 1.5 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 8 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (46%) has a higher percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (31%) and the District (36%). Kettering H.S. (26%) and Osborn H.S. (24%) have lower percents of students with GPA's of 2.0+ than the Area (31%) and the District (36%). Pershing H.S. (32%) has a higher percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (31%) and lower than the District (35%).

TABLE 8
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 2.0+ GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1995-96

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 45* | 46% | 987* | 31% | 6684* | 36% |
| Kettering High School | 205* | 26% | 987* | 31% | 6684* | 36% |
| Osborn High School | 277* | 24% | 987* | 31% | 6684* | 36% |
| Pershing High School | 331* | 32% | 987* | 31% | 6684* | 36% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

NINTH GRADE/GRADE POINT AVERAGES
June, 1997
(Second Year of Program)

Table 9 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (1.8) is above the Area (1.4) and the District (1.5) GPA's. Osborn H.S. (1.1) is below the Area (1.4) and the District (1.5) GPA's. Kettering H.S. (1.4) and Pershing H.S. (1.4) are the same as the Area (1.4) but are below the District (1.5) GPA's.

TABLE 9

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
 GRADE POINT AVERAGES
 1996-97**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 83* | 1.8 | 3059* | 1.4 | 17,553* | 1.5 |
| Kettering High School | 673* | 1.4 | 3059* | 1.4 | 17,553* | 1.5 |
| Osborn High School | 1089* | 1.1 | 3059* | 1.4 | 17,553* | 1.5 |
| Pershing High School | 986* | 1.4 | 3059* | 1.4 | 17,553* | 1.5 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 10 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (45%) has a higher percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (32%) and the District (38%). Osborn H.S. (23%) has lower percents of students with GPA's of 2.0+ than the Area (32%) and the District (38%). Kettering H.S. (32%) and Pershing H.S. (32%) have the same percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (32%) and lower than the District (38%).

TABLE 10
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 2.0+ GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1996-97

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 37* | 45% | 981* | 32% | 6271* | 38% |
| Kettering High School | 218* | 32% | 981* | 32% | 6271* | 38% |
| Osborn High School | 252* | 23% | 981* | 32% | 6271* | 38% |
| Pershing High School | 317* | 32% | 981* | 32% | 6271* | 38% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

NINTH GRADE/STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
June, 1995
(Before the Program)

Table 11 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (91%) have better student daily attendance than the Area (73%) and the District (77%). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (70%), Osborn High School (72%) and Pershing H.S. (72%) have lower student daily attendance than the Area (73%) and the District (77%).

TABLE 11
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1994-95

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 59* | 91% | 2980* | 73% | 19,484* | 77% |
| Kettering High School | 634* | 70% | 2980* | 73% | 19,484* | 77% |
| Osborn High School | 1120* | 72% | 2980* | 73% | 19,484* | 77% |
| Pershing High School | 1030* | 72% | 2980* | 73% | 19,484* | 77% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 12 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. has a higher percent of students with daily average attendance of 92% + than the Area (16%) and the District (26%). Kettering H.S. and Pershing H.S. have lower percents of students with daily average attendance of 92% + than the Area (16%) and the District (26%); Osborn H.S. (17%) has a higher percent of students with daily average attendance of 92% + than the Area (16%) but lower than the District (26%).

TABLE 12

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 92%+ STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1994-95**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 39* | 66% | 472* | 16% | 5124* | 26% |
| Kettering High School | 53* | 08% | 472* | 16% | 5124* | 26% |
| Osborn High School | 189* | 17% | 472* | 16% | 5124* | 26% |
| Pershing High School | 117* | 11% | 472* | 16% | 5124* | 26% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

NINTH GRADE/STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
June, 1996
(First Year of Program)

Table 13 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (91%) has better student daily attendance than the Area (71%) and the District (77%); Kettering H.S. has lower student daily attendance than the Area (71%) and the District (77%); Osborn H.S. (71%) and Pershing H.S. have the same students daily attendance as the Area (71%) but lower than the District (77%).

TABLE 13
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1995-96

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 97* | 91% | 3231* | 71% | 18332* | 77% |
| Kettering High School | 775* | 66% | 3231* | 71% | 18332* | 77% |
| Osborn High School | 1152* | 71% | 3231* | 71% | 18332* | 77% |
| Pershing High School | 1030* | 71% | 3231* | 71% | 18332* | 77% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 14 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical High School (60%) has a higher percent of students with daily attendance than the Area (14%) and the District (27%). The remaining three high schools Kettering H.S. (7%), Osborn H.S. (12%), and Pershing H.S. (10%) have lower percents of students with daily attendance of 92%+ than the Area (14%) and the District (27%).

TABLE 14

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 92%+ STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1995-96**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 58* | 60% | 451* | 14% | 5015* | 27% |
| Kettering High School | 58* | 7% | 451* | 14% | 5015* | 27% |
| Osborn High School | 141* | 12% | 451* | 14% | 5015* | 27% |
| Pershing High School | 101* | 10% | 451* | 14% | 5015* | 27% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

NINTH GRADE/STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
June, 1997
(Second Year of Program)

Table 15 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (92%) has better student daily attendance than the Area (72%) and the District (78%). Kettering H.S. (68%), Osborn H.S. (71%) and Pershing H.S. (71%) have lower student daily attendance than the Area (72%) and the District (78%).

TABLE 15
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1996-97

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 83* | 92% | 3059* | 72% | 17,553* | 78% |
| Kettering High School | 673* | 68% | 3059* | 72% | 17,553* | 78% |
| Osborn High School | 1089* | 71% | 3059* | 72% | 17,553* | 78% |
| Pershing High School | 986* | 71% | 3059* | 72% | 17,553* | 78% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 16 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical High School (63%) has a higher percent of students with daily attendance than the Area (14%) and the District (29%). The remaining three high schools Kettering H.S. (9%), Osborn H.S. (11%), and Pershing H.S. (11%) have lower percents of students with daily attendance of 92%+ than the Area (14%) and the District (29%).

TABLE 16
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 92%+ STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1996-97

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 52* | 63% | 443* | 14% | 5024* | 29% |
| Kettering High School | 58* | 9% | 443* | 14% | 5024* | 29% |
| Osborn High School | 122* | 11% | 443* | 14% | 5024* | 29% |
| Pershing High School | 105* | 11% | 443* | 14% | 5024* | 29% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
June, 1995
(Before the Program)

Data in Table 17 show that the Area E schools' attempted credit hours average is 48.3 and the earned Area E credit hours average is 31.8 a difference of 16.5 credit hours. Davis Aerospace Technical High School is higher than the Area and the District averages for attempted and earned credit hours. Kettering H.S. is below the Area and the District for both attempted and earned credit hours. Osborn H.S. is above Area and the District for attempted but below for earned credit hours. Pershing H.S. is below Area and the District for attempted but above in credit hours earned.

TABLE 17

AREA E SCHOOLS CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
NINTH GRADE
June, 1995

| Name of School | School Average Credit Hours | | | Area Average Credit Hours | | | District Average Credit Hours | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 59* | 64.1 | 56.7 | 3098* | 48.3 | 31.8 | 20622* | 48.5 | 32.8 |
| Kettering High School | 748* | 47.8 | 27.9 | 3098* | 48.3 | 31.8 | 20622* | 48.5 | 32.8 |
| Osborn High School | 1230* | 49.2 | 27.0 | 3098* | 48.3 | 31.8 | 20622* | 48.5 | 32.8 |
| Pershing High School | 1061* | 46.9 | 33.2 | 3098* | 48.3 | 31.8 | 20622* | 48.5 | 32.8 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals includes all the 9th grade students in the school, the Area and the District.

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
June, 1996
(Second Year of Program)

Data in Table 18 show that the Area E schools' attempted credit hours average is 51.3 and the earned credit hours average is 32.5 a difference of 18.8 credit hours. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. is higher than Area and the District in both attempted and earned credit hours. Kettering H.S. and Pershing H.S. are higher than the Area and the District in attempted credit hours but below the Area earned credit hours. Osborn H.S. is below the Area in both attempted and earned credit hours.

TABLE 18
AREA E SCHOOLS CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED/
NINTH GRADE
June, 1996

| Name of School | School Average Credit Hours | | | Area Average Credit Hours | | | District Average Credit Hours | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 98* | 66.8 | 57.0 | 3173* | 51.3 | 32.5 | 19,227* | 49.7 | 34.4 |
| Kettering High School | 815* | 51.6 | 29.3 | 3173* | 51.3 | 32.5 | 19,227* | 49.7 | 34.4 |
| Osborn High School | 1211* | 49.1 | 29.8 | 3173* | 51.3 | 32.5 | 19,227* | 49.7 | 34.4 |
| Pershing High School | 1049* | 52.3 | 35.6 | 3173* | 51.3 | 32.5 | 19,227* | 49.7 | 34.4 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals includes all the 9 grade students in the school, the Area and the District.

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
June, 1997
(Second Year of Program)

Data in Table 19 show that the Area E schools' attempted credit hours average is 49.0 and the earned credit hours average is 45.8 a difference of 3.2 credit hours. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. is higher than Area and the District in both attempted and earned credit hours. Pershing H.S. is higher than the Area and the District in attempted and earned credit hours. Kettering H.S. and Osborn H.S. are below the Area and the District in both attempted and earned credit hours.

TABLE 19
**AREA E SCHOOLS CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED/
 NINTH GRADE**
June, 1997

| Name of School | School Average Credit Hours | | | Area Average Credit Hours | | | District Average Credit Hours | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 83* | 67.4 | 66.0 | 3059* | 49.0 | 45.8 | 17,272* | 49.7 | 46.9 |
| Kettering High School | 673* | 45.5 | 43.4 | 3059* | 49.0 | 45.8 | 17,272* | 49.7 | 46.9 |
| Osborn High School | 1089* | 48.2 | 44.6 | 3059* | 49.0 | 45.8 | 17,272* | 49.7 | 46.9 |
| Pershing High School | 986* | 55.8 | 51.7 | 3059* | 49.0 | 45.8 | 17,272* | 49.7 | 46.9 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals includes all the 9 grade students in the school, the Area and the District.

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
April, 1995
(Before the Program)

Data in Table 20 show that the Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE (Normal Curve Equivalent) for reading is (40.8) which is above the Area mean NCE (30.1) and the District mean NCE (36.5) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (28.1), Osborn H.S. (30.8) and Pershing H.S. (32.0) are below both the District mean (36.5) and the National mean (50.0). However, Osborn H.S. (30.8) and Pershing H.S. (32.0) are above the Area mean NCE (30.1) but Kettering H.S. (28.1) is below the Area mean NCE (30.1).

TABLE 20
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (READING)
April, 1995

| | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|----------|--------|-------------|------|
| Area | 1142** | 30.1 | 6.6 |
| District | 9066** | 36.5 | 7.6 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| Name of School | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 50** | 40.8 | 8.4 |
| Kettering High School | 252** | 28.1 | 6.3 |
| Osborn High School | 436** | 30.8 | 6.6 |
| Pershing High School | 404** | 32.0 | 6.7 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Data in Table 21 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for mathematics is (43.7) which is above the Area mean NCE (30.8) and the District mean NCE (39.2) and below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (32.7), Osborn H.S. (26.0) and Pershing H.S. (31.5) are below the District mean NCE (39.2) and the National mean NCE (50.0). Two of the high schools Kettering H.S. (32.7) and Pershing H.S. (31.5) are above the Area (30.8), however, Osborn H.S. (26.0) is below the Area mean NCE (30.8).

TABLE 21
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MATHEMATICS)
April, 1995

| | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|----------|--------|-------------|------|
| Area | 983** | 30.8 | 6.1 |
| District | 9009** | 39.2 | 7.5 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| Name of School | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 50** | 43.7 | 8.1 |
| Kettering High School | 251** | 32.7 | 6.6 |
| Osborn High School | 291** | 26.0 | 4.7 |
| Pershing High School | 391** | 31.5 | 6.5 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

April, 1996

(First Year of Program)

Data in Table 22 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (39.8) which is above the District mean NCE (36.9) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (32.7), Osborn H.S. (30.1) and Pershing H.S. (29.7) are below both the District mean (36.9) and the National mean (50.0). Kettering H.S. (32.7) is higher than the Area (31.2), the other two high schools Osborn H.S. (30.1) and Pershing H.S. (29.7) are below the Area (31.2).

TABLE 22

**AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (READING)
March, 1996**

| | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|----------|--------|-------------|------|
| Area | 1237** | 31.2 | 6.6 |
| District | 9003** | 36.9 | 7.7 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| Name of School | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 92** | 39.8 | 8.1 |
| Kettering High School | 251** | 32.7 | 6.6 |
| Osborn High School | 458** | 30.1 | 6.5 |
| Pershing High School | 436** | 29.7 | 6.5 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Data in Table 23 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for mathematics is (40.3) which is above the District's mean NCE (40.1) and below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other two high schools Kettering H.S. (34.4) and Pershing H.S. (34.1) are above the Area mean NCE (34.0) but below the District mean NCE (40.1) and the National mean NCE (50.0). Osborn H.S. (32.3) is below the Area mean NCE (34.0), the District's mean NCE (40.1) and the National mean NCE (50.0).

TABLE 23
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MATHEMATICS)
April, 1996

| | | Mean | |
|----------|--------|------|------|
| | N | NCE | GME* |
| Area | 1244** | 34.0 | 6.7 |
| District | 8971** | 40.1 | 7.6 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| | | Mean | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| Name of School | N | NCE | GME* |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 93** | 40.3 | 7.6 |
| Kettering High School | 281** | 34.4 | 6.7 |
| Osborn High School | 461** | 32.3 | 6.6 |
| Pershing High School | 409** | 34.1 | 6.7 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent
 ** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
April, 1997
(Second Year of Program)

Data in Table 24 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (37.7) which is above the District mean NCE (35.6) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (27.4), Osborn H.S. (30.1) and Pershing H.S. (28.5) are below both the District mean (35.6) and the National mean (50.0). Osborn H.S. (30.1) is higher than the Area (29.5), the other two high schools Kettering H.S. (27.4) and Pershing H.S. (28.5) are below the Area (29.5).

TABLE 24
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (READING)
April, 1997

| | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|----------|--------|-------------|------|
| Area | 1061** | 29.5 | 6.5 |
| District | 8613** | 35.6 | 7.1 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| Name of School | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 77** | 37.7 | 7.7 |
| Kettering High School | 637** | 27.4 | 6.2 |
| Osborn High School | 378** | 30.1 | 6.5 |
| Pershing High School | 366** | 28.5 | 6.3 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Data in Table 25 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (47.4) which is above the District mean NCE (40.0) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (32.4), Osborn H.S. (33.8) and Pershing H.S. (33.5) are below the Area mean (34.4), District mean (40.0) and the National mean (50.0).

TABLE 25
AREA E SCHOOLS NINTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MATHEMATICS)
April, 1996-97

| | | Mean | |
|----------|--------|------|------|
| | N | NCE | GME* |
| Area | 1052** | 34.4 | 6.7 |
| District | 8648** | 40.0 | 7.6 |
| National | | 50.0 | 9.7 |

| | | Mean | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| Name of School | N | NCE | GME* |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 75** | 47.4 | 8.8 |
| Kettering High School | 221** | 32.4 | 6.6 |
| Osborn High School | 390** | 33.8 | 6.7 |
| Pershing High School | 364** | 33.5 | 6.7 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

NINTH GRADE STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1995
(Before the Program)

Table 26 shows the number and percent of incoming 9th grade students leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (8.61) has lower percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (34.93) and the District (27.15). Kettering H.S. (37.23) and Pershing H.S. (39.03) have higher percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (34.93) and the District (27.15). Osborn H.S. (31.64) has lower percent of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (34.93) but higher than the District (27.15).

TABLE 26

AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1995

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 159 | 427 | 37.23 | 663 | 1898 | 34.93 | 3411 | 12,565 | 27.15 |
| Osborn High School | 225 | 711 | 31.64 | 663 | 1898 | 34.93 | 3411 | 12,565 | 27.15 |
| Pershing High School | 274 | 702 | 39.03 | 663 | 1898 | 34.93 | 3411 | 12,565 | 27.15 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 5 | 58 | 8.61 | 663 | 1898 | 34.93 | 3411 | 12,565 | 27.15 |

*Students leaving school/District refers to the students who left the school or district. There are two categories of these students: a. Students who continued their education in another school system or attended night school. b. Students who discontinued their schooling. The reasons stated are as follow:

- a. Continued Education: night school, transferred to another public school and transferred to other states/countries.
- b. Discontinued Education: non-return, lost to institutions, suspended, moved/cannot locate, overage and other (voluntary).

***Number Left" includes all students who left school as indicated in the (a) and (b) categories above.
 See Appendices B-G - Reasons for leaving school listed by school (1995-97)

NINTH GRADE STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1996
(First Year of Program)

Table 27 shows the number and percent of incoming 9th grade students leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (8.51) and Osborn H.S. (16.07) have lower percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (17.41) and the District (17.34). Kettering H.S. (19.57) and Pershing H.S. (18.81) have higher percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (17.41) and the District (17.34).

TABLE 27

AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1996

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 77 | 393 | 19.57 | 323 | 1855 | 17.41 | 2110 | 12,167 | 17.34 |
| Osborn High School | 114 | 709 | 16.07 | 323 | 1855 | 17.41 | 2110 | 12,167 | 17.34 |
| Pershing High School | 124 | 659 | 18.81 | 323 | 1855 | 17.41 | 2110 | 12,167 | 17.34 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 8 | 94 | 8.51 | 323 | 1855 | 17.41 | 2110 | 12,167 | 17.34 |

*See Appendix C for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1996)

NINTH GRADE STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1997
(Second Year of Program)

Table 28 shows the number and percent of incoming 9th grade students leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (2.50), Kettering H.S. (4.12) and Pershing H.S. (7.16) have lower percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (7.60) and the District (8.78). Osborn H.S. (10.78) has higher percents of incoming 9th grade students leaving school than the Area (7.60) and the District (8.78).

TABLE 28
AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1997

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 15 | 364 | 4.12 | 122 | 1606 | 7.60 | 994 | 11,324 | 8.78 |
| Osborn High School | 65 | 603 | 10.78 | 122 | 1606 | 7.60 | 994 | 11,324 | 8.78 |
| Pershing High School | 40 | 559 | 7.16 | 122 | 1606 | 7.60 | 994 | 1,324 | 8.78 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 2 | 80 | 2.50 | 122 | 1606 | 7.60 | 994 | 11,324 | 8.78 |

*See Appendix D for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1997)

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES) LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1995
(Before the Program)**

Table 29 shows the number and percent of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school. Pershing H.S. (70.49) and Osborn H.S. (68.21) have lower percents of 9th grade students leaving school (repeating courses) than the Area (72.20) but higher than the District (57.85). Kettering H.S. (80.25) and Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (100.00) have higher percents of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (72.20) and the District (57.85).

TABLE 29

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1995**

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 187 | 233 | 80.25 | 634 | 878 | 72.20 | 3204 | 5538 | 57.85 |
| Osborn High School | 236 | 346 | 68.21 | 634 | 878 | 72.20 | 3204 | 5538 | 57.85 |
| Pershing High School | 210 | 298 | 70.49 | 634 | 878 | 72.20 | 3204 | 5538 | 57.85 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 1 | 1 | 100.00 | 634 | 878 | 72.20 | 3204 | 5538 | 57.85 |

*See Appendix E for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1995)

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES) LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1996
(Second Year of Program)**

Table 30 shows the number and percent of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (0.00) and Pershing H.S. (44.60) have lower percents of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (51.6) and the District (45.92). Kettering H.S. (58.15) has higher percents of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (51.06) and the District (45.92). Osborn H.S. (50.67) has lower percent than the Area (51.06) but higher than the District (45.92).

**TABLE 30
AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1996**

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left** | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 171 | 294 | 58.15 | 529 | 1036 | 51.06 | 2575 | 5607 | 45.92 |
| Osborn High School | 226 | 446 | 50.67 | 529 | 1036 | 51.06 | 2575 | 5607 | 45.92 |
| Pershing High School | 132 | 296 | 44.60 | 529 | 1036 | 51.06 | 2575 | 5607 | 45.92 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 529 | 1036 | 51.06 | 2575 | 5607 | 45.92 |

*See Appendix F for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1996)

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES) LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1997
(Second Year of Program)**

Table 31 shows the number and percent of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (0.00) and Kettering H.S. (8.10) have lower percents of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (16.91) and the District (22.92). Pershing H.S. (17.62) and Osborn H.S. (20.55) have higher percents of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (16.91) but lower than the District (22.92).

TABLE 31

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1997**

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 15 | 185 | 8.10 | 149 | 881 | 16.91 | 1136 | 4957 | 22.92 |
| Osborn High School | 79 | 384 | 20.55 | 149 | 881 | 16.91 | 1136 | 4957 | 22.92 |
| Pershing High School | 55 | 312 | 17.62 | 149 | 881 | 16.91 | 1136 | 4957 | 22.92 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 149 | 881 | 16.91 | 1136 | 4957 | 22.92 |

*See Appendix G for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1997)

TABLE 32**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*****June, 1995
(Before the Program)**

Table 32 shows that there were 1898 students who were enrolled in Area E schools during the 1994-95 school year. Six hundred sixty-three (663) students (34.93%) left school during the school year. Two hundred fifty-five (255) students (13.44%) continued their education in night school or in another school system. Four hundred eight (408) students (21.49%) discontinued their education during the 1994-95 school year which is higher than the district (18.28%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 91 | 1898 | 4.81 | 275 | 12,565 | 2.18 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 117 | 1898 | 6.16 | 600 | 12,565 | 4.77 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 47 | 1898 | 2.47 | 235 | 12,565 | 1.87 |
| Subtotal | 255 | | 13.44 | 1110 | | 8.82 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 148 | 1898 | 7.79 | 824 | 12,565 | 6.55 |
| e. Suspended | 4 | 1898 | 0.21 | 71 | 12,565 | 0.56 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 4 | 1898 | 0.21 | 50 | 12,565 | 0.40 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 121 | 1898 | 6.38 | 669 | 12,565 | 5.32 |
| h. Overage | 89 | 1898 | 4.69 | 388 | 12,565 | 3.08 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 42 | 1898 | 2.21 | 299 | 12,565 | 2.39 |
| Subtotal | 408 | | 21.49 | 2301 | | 18.28 |
| Grand Total | 663 | | 34.93 | 3411 | | 27.10 |

*See Appendix B for individual schools (1995)

TABLE 33

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

**June, 1996
(First Year of Program)**

Table 33 shows that there were 1855 students who were enrolled in Area E schools during the 1995-96 school year. Three hundred twenty-three (323) students (17.41%) left school during the school year. One hundred ten (110) students (5.92%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Two hundred thirteen (213) students (11.48%) discontinued their education during the 1995-96 school year which is lower than the district (11.70%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 31 | 1855 | 1.67 | 117 | 12,167 | 0.96 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 61 | 1855 | 3.28 | 425 | 12,167 | 3.49 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 18 | 1855 | 0.97 | 145 | 12,167 | 1.19 |
| Subtotal | 110 | | 5.92 | 687 | | 5.64 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 138 | 1855 | 7.44 | 729 | 12,167 | 5.99 |
| e. Suspended | 0 | 1855 | 0.00 | 23 | 12,167 | 0.19 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 0 | 1855 | 0.00 | 4 | 12,167 | 0.03 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 37 | 1855 | 1.99 | 378 | 12,167 | 3.11 |
| h. Overage | 23 | 1855 | 1.24 | 124 | 12,167 | 1.02 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 15 | 1855 | 0.81 | 165 | 12,167 | 1.36 |
| Subtotal | 213 | | 11.48 | 1423 | | 11.70 |
| Grand Total | 323 | | 17.70 | 2110 | | 17.34 |

*See Appendix C for individual schools (1996)

TABLE 34

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

**June, 1997
(Second Year of Program)**

Table 34 shows that there were 1606 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 10th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. One hundred twenty-two (122) students (7.59%) left school during the school year. Seventy-five (75) students (4.67%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Forty-seven (47) students (2.92%) discontinued their education during the 1996-97 school year which is lower than the district (5.14%) However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 17 | 1606 | 1.06 | 40 | 11,324 | 0.35 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 39 | 1606 | 2.43 | 279 | 11,324 | 2.47 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 19 | 1606 | 1.18 | 93 | 11,324 | 0.82 |
| Subtotal | 75 | | 4.67 | 412 | | 3.64 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 5 | 1606 | 0.31 | 164 | 11,324 | 1.45 |
| e. Suspended | 0 | 1606 | 0.00 | 4 | 11,324 | 0.03 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 2 | 1606 | 0.12 | 7 | 11,324 | 0.06 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 15 | 1606 | 0.93 | 274 | 11,324 | 2.42 |
| h. Overage | 15 | 1606 | 0.93 | 60 | 11,324 | 0.53 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 10 | 1606 | 0.63 | 73 | 11,324 | 0.65 |
| Subtotal | 47 | | 2.92 | 582 | | 5.14 |
| Grand Total | 122 | | 7.59 | 994 | | 8.78 |

*See Appendix D for individual schools (1997)

TABLE 35

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

**June, 1995
(Before the Program)**

Table 35 shows that there were 878 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 10th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. Six hundred thirty-four (634) students (72.20%) left school during the school year. One hundred ninety (190) students (21.64%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Four hundred forty-four (444) students (50.56%) discontinued their education during the 1994-95 school year which is higher than the district (42.79%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 136 | 878 | 15.49 | 488 | 5538 | 8.81 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 39 | 878 | 4.44 | 269 | 5538 | 4.86 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 15 | 878 | 1.71 | 77 | 5538 | 1.39 |
| Subtotal | 190 | | 21.64 | 834 | | 15.06 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 102 | 878 | 11.62 | 567 | 5538 | 10.24 |
| e. Suspended | 8 | 878 | 0.91 | 111 | 5538 | 2.00 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 1 | 878 | 0.11 | 27 | 5538 | 0.49 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 145 | 878 | 16.51 | 710 | 5538 | 12.82 |
| h. Overage | 168 | 878 | 19.13 | 701 | 5538 | 12.65 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 20 | 878 | 2.28 | 254 | 5538 | 4.59 |
| Subtotal | 444 | | 50.56 | 2370 | | 42.79 |
| Grand Total | 634 | | 72.20 | 3204 | | 57.85 |

*See Appendix E for individual schools (1995)

TABLE 36

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

**June, 1996
(Second Year of Program)**

Table 36 shows that there were 1036 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 10th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. Five hundred thirty-one (531) students (51.26%) left school during the school year. One hundred sixty-four (164) students (15.83%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Three hundred sixty-seven (367) students (35.43%) discontinued their education during the 1995-96 school year which is higher than the district (34.72%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 117 | 1036 | 11.29 | 304 | 5625 | 5.42 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 32 | 1036 | 3.09 | 273 | 5625 | 4.87 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 15 | 1036 | 1.45 | 51 | 5625 | 0.91 |
| Subtotal | 164 | | 15.83 | 628 | | 11.20 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 195 | 1036 | 18.82 | 826 | 5625 | 14.73 |
| e. Suspended | 1 | 1036 | 0.10 | 20 | 5625 | 0.36 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 4 | 1036 | 0.39 | 11 | 5625 | 0.20 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 85 | 1036 | 8.20 | 545 | 5625 | 9.72 |
| h. Overage | 61 | 1036 | 5.89 | 370 | 5625 | 6.60 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 21 | 1036 | 2.03 | 175 | 5625 | 3.12 |
| Subtotal | 367 | | 35.43 | 1947 | | 34.72 |
| Grand Total | 531 | | 51.26 | 2575 | | 45.92 |

*See Appendix F for individual schools (1996)

TABLE 37

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH NINTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

June, 1997

(Second Year of Program)

Table 37 shows that there were 881 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 10th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. One hundred forty-nine (149) students (16.91%) left school during the school year. Seventy-nine (79) students (8.97%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Seventy (70) students (7.94%) discontinued their education during the 1996-97 school year which is lower than the district (16.44%) However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 43 | 881 | 4.88 | 110 | 4957 | 2.22 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 25 | 881 | 2.84 | 169 | 4957 | 3.41 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 11 | 881 | 1.25 | 42 | 4957 | 0.85 |
| Subtotal | 79 | | 8.97 | 321 | | 6.48 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 9 | 881 | 1.02 | 223 | 4957 | 4.50 |
| e. Suspended | 1 | 881 | 0.11 | 6 | 4957 | 0.12 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 3 | 881 | 0.34 | 9 | 4957 | 0.18 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 14 | 881 | 1.59 | 339 | 4957 | 6.84 |
| h. Overage | 37 | 881 | 4.20 | 158 | 4957 | 3.19 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 6 | 881 | 0.68 | 80 | 4957 | 1.61 |
| Subtotal | 70 | | 7.94 | 815 | | 16.44 |
| Grand Total | 149 | | 16.91 | 1136 | | 22.92 |

*See Appendix G for individual schools (1997)

**PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF PRODUCT DATA
GRADE 10**

There are seven (7) product variables presented in this section:

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------------|
| a. | Grade Point Averages (GPA's) (1) | 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| b. | Daily Attendance (1) | 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| c. | Credit hours attempted and earned (2) | 6/1996 and 6/1997 |
| d. | Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Reading and Mathematics) (2) | 4/1996 and 4/1997 |
| e. | Educational Status of Students (1) | 6/1996 and 6/1997 |

The results are as follows:

**TENTH GRADE/GRADE POINT AVERAGES
June, 1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)**

Table 38 shows that the GPA for Davis Aerospace Technical High School (2.2) is above the Area (1.8) and the District GPA's (1.8). Osborn High School (1.8) is the same as the Area (1.8) and the District GPA's (1.8). Pershing High School (1.9) is above the Area (1.8) and the District GPA's (1.8). Kettering High School has (1.5) GPA which is below the Area (1.8) and the District GPA's (1.8).

TABLE 38

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1995-96**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 58* | 2.2 | 1674* | 1.8 | 11,286* | 1.8 |
| Kettering High School | 396* | 1.5 | 1674* | 1.8 | 11,286* | 1.8 |
| Osborn High School | 622* | 1.8 | 1674* | 1.8 | 11,286* | 1.8 |
| Pershing High School | 559* | 1.9 | 1674* | 1.8 | 11,286* | 1.8 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 39 shows that Davis Technical H.S. (59%) and Pershing H.S. (50%) have higher percents of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (46%) and the District (49%). Kettering H.S. (37%) has a lower percent of students with GPA's of 2.0+ than the Area (46%) and the District (49%). Osborn H.S. (46%) has the same percent of students with a GPA of 2.0+ as the Area (46%) but lower than the District (49%).

TABLE 39
**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 2.0+ GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1995-96**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 34* | 59% | 774* | 46% | 5477* | 49% |
| Kettering High School | 147* | 37% | 774* | 46% | 5477* | 49% |
| Osborn High School | 286* | 46% | 774* | 46% | 5477* | 49% |
| Pershing High School | 277* | 50% | 774* | 46% | 5477* | 49% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

TENTH GRADE/GRADE POINT AVERAGES
June, 1997
(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 40 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (2.1) is above the Area (1.7) and the District (1.8) GPA's. Osborn H.S. (1.5) is below the Area (1.7) and the District (1.8) GPA's. Kettering H.S. (1.7) is the same as the Area (1.7) but lower than the District (1.8) GPA's. Pershing H.S. (1.8) is the same as the District (1.8) but higher than the Area (1.7) GPA's.

TABLE 40

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
 GRADE POINT AVERAGES
 1996-97**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| | N | GPA | N | GPA | N | GPA |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 77* | 2.1 | 1668* | 1.7 | 11,013* | 1.8 |
| Kettering High School | 375* | 1.7 | 1668* | 1.7 | 11,013* | 1.8 |
| Osborn High School | 637* | 1.5 | 1668* | 1.7 | 11,013* | 1.8 |
| Pershing High School | 535* | 1.8 | 1668* | 1.7 | 11,013* | 1.8 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 41 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (48%), Kettering H.S. (45%) and Pershing H.S. (45%) have higher percents of students with a GPA of 2.0+ than the Area (42%) but lower than the District (49%). Osborn H.S. (36%) has a lower percent of students with GPA's of 2.0+ than the Area (42%) and the District (49%).

TABLE 41

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 2.0+ GRADE POINT AVERAGES
1996-97**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 37* | 48% | 704* | 42% | 5420* | 49% |
| Kettering High School | 169* | 45% | 704* | 42% | 5420* | 49% |
| Osborn High School | 228* | 36% | 704* | 42% | 5420* | 49% |
| Pershing High School | 242* | 45% | 704* | 42% | 5420* | 49% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

TENTH GRADE/STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
June, 1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 42 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (91%) has better student daily attendance than the Area (76%) and the District (80%). Kettering H.S. (70%) has lower student daily attendance than the Area (76%) and the District (80%). Pershing H.S. (76%) have the same students daily attendance as the Area (76%) but lower than the District (80%). Osborn H.S. (78%) is higher than the Area (76%) but lower than the District (80%).

TABLE 42
AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1995-96

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 58* | 91% | 1674* | 76% | 11,286* | 80% |
| Kettering High School | 396* | 70% | 1674* | 76% | 11,286* | 80% |
| Osborn High School | 622* | 78% | 1674* | 76% | 11,286* | 80% |
| Pershing High School | 559* | 76% | 1674* | 76% | 11,286* | 80% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 43 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical High School (60%) has a higher percent of students with daily attendance than the Area (18%) and the District (29%). Osborn H.S. (19%) has a higher percent of students with daily attendance than the Area (18%) but lower than the District (29%). The remaining two high schools Kettering H.S. (11%) and Pershing H.S. (13%) have lower percents of students with daily attendance of 92%+ than the Area (18%) and the District (29%).

TABLE 43

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 92%+ STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1995-96**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 35* | 60% | 293* | 18% | 3267* | 29% |
| Kettering High School | 44* | 11% | 293* | 18% | 3267* | 29% |
| Osborn High School | 117* | 19% | 293* | 18% | 3267* | 29% |
| Pershing High School | 74* | 13% | 293* | 18% | 3267* | 29% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

TENTH GRADE/STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
June, 1997
(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 44 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (91%) has better student daily attendance than the Area (76%) and the District (80%). Kettering H.S.(72%) and Pershing H.S. (75%) have lower student daily attendance than the Area (76%) and the District (80%). Osborn H.S. (76%) has the same students daily attendance as the Area (76%) but lower than the District (80%).

TABLE 44
AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1996-97

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 77* | 91% | 1668* | 76% | 11,013* | 80% |
| Kettering High School | 375* | 72% | 1668* | 76% | 11,013* | 80% |
| Osborn High School | 637* | 76% | 1668* | 76% | 11,013* | 80% |
| Pershing High School | 535* | 75% | 1668* | 76% | 11,013* | 80% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

Table 45 shows that Davis Aerospace Technical High School (52%) has a higher percent of students with daily attendance than the Area (15%) and the District (29%). Osborn H.S. (15%) has the same percent of students with daily attendance as the Area (15%) but lower than the District (29%). The remaining two high schools Kettering H.S. (10%) and Pershing H.S. (12%) have lower percents of students with daily attendance of 92%+ than the Area (15%) and the District (29%).

TABLE 45

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF STUDENTS WITH 92%+ STUDENT DAILY ATTENDANCE
1996-97**

| Name of School | School Average | | Area Average | | District Average | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 40* | 52% | 255* | 15% | 3207* | 29% |
| Kettering High School | 37* | 10% | 255* | 15% | 3207* | 29% |
| Osborn High School | 93* | 15% | 255* | 15% | 3207* | 29% |
| Pershing High School | 64* | 12% | 255* | 15% | 3207* | 29% |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals are as reported in the disaggregated data program.

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
June, 1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Data in Table 46 show that the Area E schools' attempted credit hours average is 51.1 and the earned credit hours average is 49.3 a difference of 1.8 credit hours. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. and Pershing H.S. are higher than Area and the District in both attempted and earned credit hours. Kettering H.S. is the same as Area but lower than the District in attempted credit hours and it is below the Area earned and District earned credit hours. Osborn H.S. is below the Area in both attempted and earned credit hours.

TABLE 46

**AREA E SCHOOLS CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED/
TENTH GRADE**
June, 1995-96

| Name of School | School Average Credit Hours | | | Area Average Credit Hours | | | District Average Credit Hours | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 58* | 66.7 | 65.6 | 1700* | 51.1 | 49.3 | 11,326* | 51.8 | 48.7 |
| Kettering High School | 396* | 51.1 | 48.9 | 1700* | 51.1 | 49.3 | 11,326* | 51.8 | 48.7 |
| Osborn High School | 630* | 46.8 | 45.3 | 1700* | 51.1 | 49.3 | 11,326* | 51.8 | 48.7 |
| Pershing High School | 577* | 55.9 | 53.8 | 1700* | 51.1 | 49.3 | 11,326* | 51.8 | 48.7 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals includes all the 9 grade students in the school, the Area and the District.

CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED
June, 1997
(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Data in Table 47 show that the Area E schools' attempted credit hours average is 55.3 and the earned credit hours average is 52.9 a difference of 2.4 credit hours. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. and Pershing H.S. are higher than Area and the District in both attempted and earned credit hours. Kettering H.S. and Osborn H.S. are lower than the Area and the District in attempted credit hours but below the Area earned credit hours.

TABLE 47
**AREA E SCHOOLS CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED/
TENTH GRADE**
June, 1997

| Name of School | School Average Credit Hours | | | Area Average Credit Hours | | | District Average Credit Hours | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------|---------------------------|-----------|--------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned | N | Attempted | Earned |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 77* | 69.2 | 68.3 | 1624* | 55.3 | 52.9 | 10,882* | 53.6 | 51.5 |
| Kettering High School | 375* | 52.2 | 50.5 | 1624* | 55.3 | 52.9 | 10,882* | 53.6 | 51.5 |
| Osborn High School | 637* | 50.3 | 47.6 | 1624* | 55.3 | 52.9 | 10,882* | 53.6 | 51.5 |
| Pershing High School | 535* | 61.5 | 58.4 | 1624* | 55.3 | 52.9 | 10,882* | 53.6 | 51.5 |

*All numbers provided are from the district's data base; differences in totals includes all the 9 grade students in the school, the Area and the District.

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
April, 1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Data in Table 48 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (38.1) which is above the Area (30.5) and the District mean NCE (34.6) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). Pershing H.S. (34.1) is higher than the Area (30.5) but below the District (34.6). The other two high schools Kettering H.S. (25.1) and Osborn H.S. (29.5) are below the Area mean (30.5), the District mean (34.6), and the National mean (50.0).

TABLE 48
AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (READING)
April, 1996

| | | Mean | |
|----------|--------|------|------|
| | N | NCE | GME* |
| Area | 1064** | 30.5 | 7.9 |
| District | 7280** | 34.6 | 8.8 |
| National | | 50.0 | 10.7 |

| | | Mean | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| Name of School | N | NCE | GME* |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 51** | 38.1 | 9.3 |
| Kettering High School | 244** | 25.1 | 6.8 |
| Osborn High School | 404** | 29.5 | 7.8 |
| Pershing High School | 365** | 34.1 | 8.8 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Data in Table 49 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for mathematics is (39.4) which is above the Area (29.5) but below the District's mean NCE (40.1) and below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other two high schools Kettering H.S. (28.2) and Osborn H.S. (26.3) are below the Area mean NCE (29.5) but above the District mean NCE (35.7) and the National mean NCE (50.0). Pershing H.S. (32.7) is above the Area mean NCE (29.5), but above the District's mean NCE (35.7) and the National mean NCE (50.0).

TABLE 49
**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MATHEMATICS)**
April, 1996

| | | Mean | |
|----------|--------|------|------|
| | N | NCE | GME* |
| Area | 1040** | 29.5 | 7.3 |
| District | 7227** | 35.7 | 8.5 |
| National | | 50.0 | 10.7 |

| | | Mean | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| Name of School | N | NCE | GME* |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 51** | 39.4 | 9.8 |
| Kettering High School | 243** | 28.2 | 7.0 |
| Osborn High School | 404** | 26.3 | 6.8 |
| Pershing High School | 342** | 32.7 | 7.8 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

April, 1997

(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Data in Table 50 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (36.6) which is above the District mean NCE (34.7) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (28.3), Osborn H.S. (28.2) and Pershing H.S. (27.5) are below the Area mean (28.6), the District mean (34.7) and the National mean (50.0).

TABLE 50

**AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (READING)
April, 1997**

| | | Mean | |
|----------|--------|------|------|
| | N | NCE | GME* |
| Area | 974** | 28.6 | 7.7 |
| District | 6976** | 34.7 | 8.9 |
| National | | 50.0 | 10.7 |

| | | Mean | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|------|
| Name of School | N | NCE | GME* |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 71** | 36.6 | 9.2 |
| Kettering High School | 228** | 28.3 | 7.7 |
| Osborn High School | 368** | 28.2 | 7.6 |
| Pershing High School | 307** | 27.5 | 7.3 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

Data in Table 51 show that Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. students' mean NCE for reading is (37.3) which is above the Area (31.1) and the District mean NCE (36.4) but below the National mean NCE (50.0). The other three high schools Kettering H.S. (30.3), Osborn H.S. (30.7) and Pershing H.S. (30.7) are below the Area mean (31.1), the District mean (36.4) and the National mean (50.0).

TABLE 51
AREA E SCHOOLS TENTH GRADE/
METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MATHEMATICS)
April, 1997

| | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|----------|--------|-------------|------|
| Area | 947** | 31.1 | 7.6 |
| District | 6960** | 36.4 | 8.6 |
| National | | 50.0 | 10.7 |

| Name of School | N | Mean NCE | GME* |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------------|------|
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 71** | 37.3 | 8.7 |
| Kettering High School | 199** | 30.3 | 7.6 |
| Osborn High School | 370** | 30.7 | 7.6 |
| Pershing High School | 307** | 30.7 | 7.6 |

* GME = Grade Mean Equivalent

** All numbers provided are from the files of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment.

TENTH GRADE STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 52 shows the number and percent of incoming 10th grade students leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (1.96), Kettering H.S. (5.61) and Pershing H.S. (4.49) have lower percents of incoming 10th grade students leaving school than the Area (6.52) and the District (6.74). Osborn H.S. (9.03) has higher percent of incoming 10th grade students leaving school than the Area (6.52) and the District (6.74).

TABLE 52
AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING NINTH GRADE STUDENTS
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1995-96

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left** | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 12 | 214 | 5.61 | 68 | 1043 | 6.52 | 517 | 7667 | 6.74 |
| Osborn High School | 40 | 443 | 9.03 | 68 | 1043 | 6.52 | 517 | 7667 | 6.74 |
| Pershing High School | 15 | 335 | 4.49 | 68 | 1043 | 6.52 | 517 | 7667 | 6.74 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 1 | 51 | 1.96 | 68 | 1043 | 6.52 | 517 | 7667 | 6.74 |

*Students leaving school/District refers to the students who left the school or district. There are two categories of these students: a. Students who continued their education in another school system or attended night school. b. Students who discontinued their schooling. The reasons stated are as follow:

- a. Continued Education: night school, transferred to another public school and transferred to other states/countries.
- b. Discontinued Education: non-return, lost to institutions, suspended, moved/cannot locate, overage and other (voluntary).

**"Number Left" includes all students who left school as indicated in the (a) and (b) categories above.
 See Appendices H-K - Reasons for leaving school listed by school (1995-97)

TENTH GRADE STUDENTS LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1997
(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 53 shows the number and percent of incoming 10th grade students leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (5.00), Pershing H.S. (5.97) and Kettering H.S. (4.76) have lower percents of incoming 10th grade students leaving school than the Area (6.16) and the District (6.60). Osborn H.S. (7.40) has higher percent of incoming 10th grade students leaving school than the Area (6.16) and the District (6.60).

TABLE 53
AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING TENTH GRADE STUDENTS
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1996-97

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 12 | 253 | 4.76 | 68 | 1104 | 6.16 | 502 | 7602 | 6.60 |
| Osborn High School | 31 | 419 | 7.40 | 68 | 1104 | 6.16 | 502 | 7602 | 6.60 |
| Pershing High School | 21 | 352 | 5.97 | 68 | 1104 | 6.16 | 502 | 7602 | 6.60 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 4 | 80 | 5.00 | 68 | 1104 | 6.16 | 502 | 7602 | 6.60 |

*See Appendix I for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1997)

**TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES) LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1996
(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)**

Table 54 shows the number and percent of 10th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (0.00), Kettering H.S. (16.79) and Pershing H.S. (13.16) have lower percents of 10th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (22.99) and the District (24.17). Osborn H.S. (42.13) has higher percent of 10th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (22.99) and the District (24.17).

**TABLE 54
AREA E SCHOOLS WITH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1996-97**

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 22 | 131 | 16.79 | 106 | 461 | 22.99 | 705 | 2917 | 24.17 |
| Osborn High School | 59 | 140 | 42.13 | 106 | 461 | 22.99 | 705 | 2917 | 24.17 |
| Pershing High School | 25 | 190 | 13.16 | 106 | 461 | 22.99 | 705 | 2917 | 24.17 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 106 | 461 | 22.99 | 705 | 2917 | 24.17 |

*See Appendix J for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1996)

**TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES) LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
1997
(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)**

Table 55 shows the number and percent of 9th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school. Davis Aerospace Technical H.S. (0.00), Kettering H.S. (6.73) and Pershing H.S. (11.70) have lower percents of 10th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (14.32) and the District (21.68). Osborn H.S. (22.50) has higher percent of 10th grade students (repeating courses) leaving school than the Area (14.32) and the District (21.68).

TABLE 55

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*
June, 1996-97**

| Name of School | School | | | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Kettering High School | 7 | 104 | 6.73 | 61 | 426 | 14.32 | 597 | 2753 | 21.68 |
| Osborn High School | 34 | 151 | 22.50 | 61 | 426 | 14.32 | 597 | 2753 | 21.68 |
| Pershing High School | 20 | 171 | 11.70 | 61 | 426 | 14.32 | 597 | 2753 | 21.68 |
| Davis Aerospace Technical High School | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 61 | 426 | 14.32 | 597 | 2753 | 21.68 |

*See Appendix K for specific reasons leaving school - by school (1997)

TABLE 56**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING TENTH GRADE STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT*****June, 1996****(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)**

Table 56 shows that there were 1043 students who were enrolled in Area E schools during the 1995-96 school year. Sixty-eight (68) students (6.52%) left school during the school year. Forty-three (43) students (4.12%) continued their education in night school or in another school system. Twenty-five (25) students (2.40%) discontinued their education during the 1995-96 school year which is lower than the district (3.18%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 19 | 1043 | 1.82 | 67 | 7667 | 0.87 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 17 | 1043 | 1.63 | 144 | 7667 | 1.18 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 7 | 1043 | 0.67 | 62 | 7667 | 0.81 |
| Subtotal | 43 | | 4.12 | 273 | | 3.56 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 3 | 1043 | 0.29 | 37 | 7667 | 0.48 |
| e. Suspended | 0 | 1043 | 0.00 | 9 | 7667 | 0.12 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 1 | 1043 | 0.10 | 4 | 7667 | 0.05 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 8 | 1043 | 0.76 | 89 | 7667 | 1.16 |
| h. Overage | 12 | 1043 | 1.15 | 76 | 7667 | 0.99 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 1043 | 0.10 | 29 | 7667 | 0.38 |
| Subtotal | 25 | | 2.40 | 244 | | 3.18 |
| Grand Total | 68 | | 6.52 | 517 | | 6.74 |

*See Appendix H for individual schools (1996)

TABLE 57

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH INCOMING STUDENTS TENTH GRADE STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

June, 1997

(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 57 shows that there were 1104 students who were enrolled in Area E schools during the 1996-97 school year. Sixty-eight (68) students (6.16%) left school during the school year. Forty-one (41) students (3.71%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Twenty-seven (27) students (2.45%) discontinued their education during the 1996-97 school year which is slightly higher than the district (3.98%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 14 | 1104 | 1.27 | 30 | 7602 | 0.40 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 19 | 1104 | 1.72 | 121 | 7602 | 1.59 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 8 | 1104 | 0.72 | 48 | 7602 | 0.63 |
| Subtotal | 41 | | 3.71 | 199 | | 2.62 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 1 | 1104 | 0.09 | 55 | 7602 | 0.72 |
| e. Suspended | 2 | 1104 | 0.18 | 3 | 7602 | 0.04 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 0 | 1104 | 0.00 | 0 | 7602 | 0.00 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 4 | 1104 | 0.36 | 153 | 7602 | 2.01 |
| h. Overage | 17 | 1104 | 1.55 | 58 | 7602 | 0.76 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 1104 | 0.27 | 34 | 7602 | 0.45 |
| Subtotal | 27 | | 2.45 | 303 | | 3.98 |
| Grand Total | 68 | | 6.16 | 502 | | 6.60 |

*See Appendix I for individual schools (1997)

TABLE 58

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

June, 1996

(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 58 shows that there were 461 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 11th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. One hundred six (106) students (22.99%) left school during the school year. Forty-five (45) students (9.76%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Sixty-one (61) students (13.23%) discontinued their education during the 1995-96 school year which is lower than the district (16.22%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 38 | 461 | 8.24 | 106 | 2917 | 3.63 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 4 | 461 | 0.87 | 109 | 2917 | 3.74 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 3 | 461 | 0.65 | 17 | 2917 | 0.58 |
| Subtotal | 45 | | 9.76 | 232 | | 7.95 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 15 | 461 | 3.25 | 81 | 2917 | 2.78 |
| e. Suspended | 1 | 461 | 0.22 | 5 | 2917 | 0.17 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 1 | 461 | 0.22 | 2 | 2917 | 0.07 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 16 | 461 | 3.47 | 150 | 2917 | 5.14 |
| h. Overage | 26 | 461 | 5.64 | 198 | 2917 | 6.79 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 2 | 461 | 0.43 | 37 | 2917 | 1.27 |
| Subtotal | 61 | | 13.23 | 473 | | 16.22 |
| Grand Total | 106 | | 22.99 | 705 | | 24.17 |

*See Appendix J for individual schools (1996)

TABLE 59

**AREA E SCHOOLS WITH TENTH GRADE STUDENTS (REPEATING COURSES)
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT***

June, 1997

(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

Table 59 shows that there were 426 students who didn't have enough credit hours to be classified as 10th graders and they were repeating all or some of the courses. Sixty-one (61) students (14.32%) left school during the school year. Thirty-two (32) students (7.51%) continued their education in night school or another public school district. Twenty-nine (29) students (6.81%) discontinued their education during the 1996-97 school year which is lower than the district (15.87%). However, it should be noted that some of these students might return and continue their education.

| Reasons for Leaving | Area | | | District | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
| Group A: Continued School | | | | | | |
| a. Night School | 26 | 426 | 6.10 | 73 | 2753 | 2.65 |
| b. Transfer to a Michigan School | 4 | 426 | 0.94 | 64 | 2753 | 2.32 |
| c. Transfer to Other States/Countries | 2 | 426 | 0.47 | 23 | 2753 | 0.84 |
| Subtotal | 32 | | 7.51 | 160 | | 5.81 |
| Group B: Discontinued School | | | | | | |
| d. Non-Return | 6 | 426 | 1.41 | 119 | 2753 | 4.32 |
| e. Suspended | 0 | 426 | 0.00 | 3 | 2753 | 0.11 |
| f. Lost to Institutions | 1 | 426 | 0.23 | 1 | 2753 | 0.04 |
| g. Moved/Cannot Locate | 3 | 426 | 0.70 | 174 | 2753 | 6.32 |
| h. Overage | 16 | 426 | 3.77 | 108 | 2753 | 3.92 |
| i. Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 426 | 0.70 | 32 | 2753 | 1.16 |
| Subtotal | 29 | | 6.81 | 437 | | 15.87 |
| Grand Total | 61 | | 14.32 | 597 | | 21.68 |

*See Appendix K for individual schools (1997)

CONCLUSIONS

Summary of findings based on the data.

A. Principals' Perceptions of the Program

- Three (3) principals commented on twelve (12) statements.
- Mean average of all the positive statements is eighty-nine percent (89%)
- Preparation of the ninth grade staff:
 - staff development
 - staff were in-serviced
 - extensive discussion occurred
- Teaching strategies:
 - cooperative learning
 - peer tutoring
 - student-centered instruction
 - essential elements of effective instruction
- Organizational changes of the program:
 - flexible scheduling
 - team teaching
- Major concerns of the program:
 - support of multi-intelligence learning activities
 - reading must receive special attention
 - lack of student support with high needs
- Challenges of parental component:
 - getting parents actively involved
 - lack of parental involvement

B. Teachers' Perceptions of the Program

- Twenty-seven (27) teachers from three schools responded to nineteen (19) statements.
- Mean average of all the positive statements is eighty-two percent (82%)
- Classroom strategies:
 - cooperative learning
 - student-centered instruction
 - authentic methods of instruction
 - discovery method
- Organizational changes:
 - team teaching
 - block scheduling
 - school-within-a-school
- Major concerns of the program:
 - reading problems with most students
 - attendance and tardiness
 - class size and mobility
 - textbooks are too difficult
- Changes that would improve implementation:
 - continue with the existing program
 - have smaller class size
 - demand higher standards for academic achievement
- Major challenges of the program:
 - keeping students in school
 - improving attendance and parental involvement
 - motivating students to attend classes
- Challenges of the parental component:
 - lack of parental involvement
 - trying to stay in-touch with the parents

- getting more parents involved
- accommodating work schedules of parents

C. Students' Perceptions of the Program

- One hundred twenty-five (125) students commented on twenty (20) statements.
- Mean average of all the positive statements is seventy-five percent (75%)
- Liked best about the program:
 - learning many new things
 - teachers were very helpful
 - improving my skills
- Liked least about the program:
 - not enough activities
 - some counselors weren't cooperative
 - some teachers weren't cooperative

D. Ninth Grade Administrators' Perceptions of the Program

- Three (3) Ninth Grade Administrators commented on twelve (12) statements.
- The mean average of all the positive statements is ninety-seven percent (97%).
- Preparation of the staff:
 - reviewed last years strengths and weaknesses
 - identified areas of improvement
 - set goals for the incoming year
- Teaching strategies:
 - cooperative learning
 - student-centered instruction
 - project driven instruction

- **Organizational changes:**
 - team teaching
 - flexible scheduling
- **Major concerns about the delivery of instruction:**
 - time to plan with 9th grade teachers
 - time to collaborate with 9th grade teachers
 - inconsistency in the delivery of instruction
- **Changes that would improve implementation:**
 - full-time attendance officer
 - more time for meeting and planning
 - teachers of reading and math components
- **Major challenges:**
 - student absenteeism
 - lack of parental involvement
 - student academic deficiencies
- **Parental challenges:**
 - lack of parental responses and participation
 - increase parental involvement in the program
 - increase parental involvement in school activities

NINTH GRADE DATA*

E. 1. Grade Point Averages (1995)

- Schools' grade point average ranged from 1.2 to 1.9
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

2. Grade Point Averages (1996)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.2 to 1.9
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

*The 1995 data (Without the Program) compared to 1996 and 1997 data (With the Program).

3. Grade Point Averages (1997)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.1 to 1.8
- Area's grade point average is 1.4
- District's grade point average is 1.5

F. 1. Student Daily Attendance (1995)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 70% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 73%
- District's daily attendance average is 77%

2. Student Daily Attendance (1996)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 66% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 71%
- District's daily attendance average is 77%

3. Student Daily Attendance (1997)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 68% to 92%
- Area's daily attendance average is 72%
- District's daily attendance average is 78%

G. 1. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1995)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 46.9 to 64.1
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 27.0 to 56.7
- Area's average of credit hours attempted is 48.3
- Area's average of credit hours earned is 31.8
- District's average credit hours attempted is 48.5
- District's average credit hours earned is 32.8

2. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1996)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 49.1 to 66.8
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 29.3 to 57.0
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 51.3
- Area's average credit hours earned is 32.5
- District's average credit hours attempted is 49.7
- District's average credit hours earned is 34.4

3. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1997)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 45.5 to 67.4
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 43.4 to 66.0
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 49.0
- Area's average credit hours earned is 45.8
- District's average credit hours attempted is 49.7
- District's average credit hours earned is 46.9

H. 1. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1995)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.3 to 8.4
- Area's GME average is 6.6
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

2. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1995)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 4.7 to 8.1
- Area's GME average is 6.1
- District's GME average is 7.5
- National GME average is 9.7

3. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.5 to 8.1
- Area's GME average is 6.6
- District's GME average is 7.7
- National GME average is 9.7

4. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.6 to 7.6
- Area's GME average is 6.7
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

5. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.2 to 7.7
- Area's GME average is 6.5
- District's GME average is 7.1
- National GME average is 9.7

6. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.6 to 8.8
- Area's GME average is 6.7
- District's GME average is 7.6
- National GME average is 9.7

I. 1. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1995)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.44% to 25.99%
- Area's discontinued rate is 21.49%
- District's discontinued rate is 18.28%

2. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1996)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 4.25% to 15.51%
- Area's discontinued rate is 11.48%
- District's discontinued rate is 11.70%

3. Incoming 9th Grade Students Leaving School* (1997)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.10% to 4.29%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.92%
- District's discontinued rate is 5.14%

4. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1995)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 42.77% to 100%
- Area's discontinued rate is 50.56%
- District's discontinued rate is 42.79%

5. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1996)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 27.71% to 46.59%
- Area's discontinued rate is 35.43%
- District's discontinued rate is 34.72%

6. Ninth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1997)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.24% to 11.22%
- Area's discontinued rate is 7.94%
- District's discontinued rate is 16.44%

The product variables were measured for the ninth grade students for June, 1995 and the ninth grade students for June, 1996 and June, 1997. The results are based on all Area E schools having ninth grade students:

| | | 6/1996 Compared to 6/95 | 6/1997 Compared to 6/95 |
|----|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| a. | Grade Point Averages | - Remained the same | Remained the same |
| b. | Student Daily Attendance | - Decreased | Decreased |
| c. | Credit Hours Attempted | - Increased | Increased |
| d. | Credit Hours Earned | - Increased | Increased |
| e. | MAT Reading | - Remained the same | Decreased |
| f. | MAT Mathematics | - Increased | Increased |
| g. | Educational Status* | - Decreased** | Decreased** |

Four out of seven variables showed improvement, two remained the same and one declined for 1995 vs. 1996. Four out of seven variables showed improvement, one remained the same and two declined for 1995 vs. 1997.

TENTH GRADE DATA

E. 1. Grade Point Averages (1996)

- Schools' grade point average ranged from 1.5 to 2.2
- Area's grade point average is 1.8
- District's grade point average is 1.8

2. Grade Point Averages (1997)

- Schools' grade point average (GPA) average ranged from 1.5 to 2.1
- Area's grade point average is 1.7
- District's grade point average is 1.8

F. 1. Student Daily Attendance (1996)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 70% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 76%
- District's daily attendance average is 80%

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It shows improvement.

2. Student Daily Attendance (1997)

- Schools' daily attendance average ranged from 72% to 91%
- Area's daily attendance average is 76%
- District's daily attendance average is 80%

G. 1. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1996)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 46.8 to 66.7
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 45.3 to 65.6
- Area's average of credit hours attempted is 51.1
- Area's average of credit hours earned is 49.3
- District's average credit hours attempted is 51.8
- District's average credit hours earned is 48.7

2. Credit Hours Attempted and Earned (1997)

- Schools' average credit hours attempted ranged from 50.3 to 69.2
- Schools' average credit hours earned ranged from 50.5 to 68.3
- Area's average credit hours attempted is 55.3
- Area's average credit hours earned is 52.9
- District's average credit hours attempted is 53.6
- District's average credit hours earned is 51.5

H. 1. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.8 to 9.3
- Area's GME average is 7.9
- District's GME average is 8.8
- National GME average is 10.7

2. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1996)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 6.8 to 9.8
- Area's GME average is 7.3
- District's GME average is 8.5
- National GME average is 10.7

3. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Reading) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 7.3 to 9.2
- Area's GME average is 7.7
- District's GME average is 8.9

- National GME average is 10.7

4. Metropolitan Achievement Test (Mathematics) (1997)

- Schools' grade mean equivalent (GME) ranged from 7.6 to 8.7
- Area's GME average is 7.6
- District's GME average is 8.6
- National GME average is 10.7

I. 1. Incoming 10th Grade Students Leaving School* (1996)

(Not Exposed the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 0.00% to 3.74%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.40%
- District's discontinued rate is 3.18%

2. Incoming 10th Grade Students Leaving School* (1997)

(Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.25% to 2.84%
- Area's discontinued rate is 2.45%
- District's discontinued rate is 3.98%

3. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1996)

(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 3.39% to 17.86%
- Area's discontinued rate is 13.23%
- District's discontinued rate is 16.22%

4. Tenth Grade Students (Repeating Courses) Leaving School* (1997)

(Not Exposed to the Ninth Grade Program)

- Schools' discontinued average rate ranged from 1.92% to 9.27%
- Area's discontinued rate is 6.18%
- District's discontinued rate is 15.87%

The product variables were measured for the tenth grade students for June, 1996 (Without the Program), and the tenth grade students for June, 1997. The results are based on all Area E schools having tenth grade students:

6/1997
Compared to 6/96

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------------------|
| a. Grade Point Averages | - | Decreased |
| b. Student Daily Attendance | - | Remained the same |
| c. Credit Hours Attempted | - | Increased |
| d. Credit Hours Earned | - | Increased |
| e. MAT Reading | - | Decreased |
| f. MAT Mathematics | - | Increased |
| g. Educational Status* | - | Increased** |

Three out of seven variables showed improvement, one variable remained the same and three declined for 1996 vs. 1997.

Recommendations

Schools can help retain at-risk ninth graders through a variety of policies and practices. The following recommendations should be considered to help all ninth graders begin successful high school careers:

- Continue to decrease alienation in the high school by breaking the school down into small, stable units to increase personal attention from the staff. Examples of this strategy include:
 - create a school within-a-school environment
 - expanding the role of a homeroom teacher to include mentor and personal guide;
 - extending class to two periods (block scheduling) to limit the need for students to move from class to class;
 - creating clusters of students who remain together for several classes and thus can offer each other support;
 - creating alternative schools and mini-schools that offer disaffected students compensatory programs and more personalized attention.

*Students leaving school (discontinued their education).

**It does not show improvement.

- Continue to sensitize teachers to the problems of ninth graders so that the teachers can be helpful; assign more experienced teachers to this grade.
- Continue to offer special programs to orient middle school students to ninth grade, thus helping to smooth the passage. Such programs include:
 - schedule visits to the high schools by small groups of incoming students.
 - assign a high school student to mentor each new student.
 - have a middle school student shadow a high school student to learn what a high school day is like.
 - schedule orientation activities, preferably for small groups of ninth graders, that range from a single session on the first day in school to an ongoing program lasting up to a full semester. During these orientations, rules and expectations are discussed, courses of study are described, and human awareness issues like multicultural relations and drug use are explored.
 - have orientation activities for parents that cover much of the same ground as those for the new ninth graders.

All of the suggestions for easing the transition to ninth grade presented above have been successfully tested in school districts around the country. The experience of these school districts suggests that schools can make a real difference for students by giving special attention to the ninth grade as a pivotal year in a student's education. The experiences in Detroit, as documented in this report, add additional evidences that these approaches can yield success for Grade 9 students.

The following recommendations were made based on interviews with administrators and teachers and the surveys which solicited information regarding the program from principals, ninth grade administrators, teachers and students.

- All the ninth grade administrators indicated a district wide forum - such as a day-long conference - where they could get together to discuss, disseminate and critique and/or study options for improving the success of the ninth grade restructuring initiative.
- In order for a school to be successful in carrying out their goals for restructuring, all personnel should be in place on time.
- Almost all of the administrators interviewed indicated they would like to have a school within-a-school concept. Although some of them indicated they have space

problems, they should try to solve them so that all ninth grade students can be scheduled on one floor or a certain part of the building.

- Increase time for planning and developing integrated learning materials that initiate active student centered learning in the classroom.
- A full-time social worker, attendance agent and a counselor should be added to the program to deal with the problems of at-risk students.
- Development of a 'reading resource lab' coordinated by a reading specialist to assist at-risk students and the teachers of at-risk students in improving reading deficiencies.
- Research has shown that constructions strategies (student-centered, and active participation) improved student learning and retention. In-service should be provided to assist teachers in planning constructive activities because classroom visits reveal that teachers still rely heavily on traditional teacher-centered practices such as lecturing and paper-pencil participation activities.
- Seek ways to involve more parents in the school programs and activities.
- Most educators now recognize that it is imperative for schools to find better ways to increase parental and family involvement in children's education. The results of a study indicated that parental involvement is essential in helping children achieve optimum success in school, both academically and behaviorly. The results suggest that parental involvement should be encouraged in the classroom and at home for a number of reasons, including: (1) parental involvement sends a positive message to children about the importance of their education, (2) parental involvement keeps the parent informed of the child's performance and (3) parental involvement helps the school accomplish more.
- Continue to have block scheduling, team teaching, and continue to provide group and individual counseling with the 10th grade students. Counselors and teachers should collaborate to assure that the services to these students will not be drastically changed.
- Provide students with more opportunities to be actively involved in learning experiences. More effective, alternative discipline strategies need to be employed. Students need to be motivated to attend classes, accept responsibility for their own behavior, and to achieve academic success.
- Efforts should be made to continue the Ninth Grade Restructuring efforts into the 10th grade.

APPENDICES

112

151

APPENDIX A

**High School Allocations Title 1
and
Ninth Grade Restructuring 31a
by Area
1996-97**

TABLE 60
HIGH SCHOOL ALLOCATIONS TITLE 1 FUNDS
AND
NINTH GRADE RESTRUCTURING 31a FUNDS
1996-97

| PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS | FREE APPS. | REDUC. APPS. | 9TH GRADE RESTRUCT. * ALLOCATION | H.S. TITLE 1 * ALLOCATION | TOTAL |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | | | 31a | | |
| AREA A | | | | | |
| CASS H. S. | 860 | 14 | 425,018 | 268,967 | \$693,985 |
| CHADSEY H. S. | 550 | 6 | 271,814 | 296,423 | \$568,237 |
| COMMERCE AND BUSINESS H. S. | 79 | 19 | 39,042 | 52,247 | \$91,289 |
| CROCKETT TECHNICAL H. S. | 261 | 33 | 128,988 | 156,742 | \$285,730 |
| FREDERICK DOUGLASS ACADEMY | 223 | 19 | 110,208 | 193,528 | \$303,736 |
| FERGUSON ACADEMY | 276 | 3 | 136,401 | 297,489 | \$433,890 |
| MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. H. S. | 702 | 48 | 346,933 | 199,926 | \$546,859 |
| MILLER M.S. | 106 | | 52,386 | | |
| MURRAY - WRIGHT H. S. | 143 | 83 | 564,642 | 653,624 | \$1,218,266 |
| SOUTHWESTERN H. S. | 626 | 45 | 309,374 | 357,734 | \$667,108 |
| WESTERN INTERNATIONAL H. S. | 670 | 19 | 331,119 | 367,330 | \$698,449 |
| AREA B | | | | | |
| CODY H. S. | 860 | 41 | 425,018 | 480,355 | \$905,373 |
| DETROIT CITY H. S. | 145 | 10 | 71,660 | 165,272 | \$236,932 |
| HERMAN/ROGERS | 25 | | 12,355 | | |
| MACKENZIE H. S. | 1114 | 36 | 550,547 | 613,105 | \$1,163,652 |
| NORTHWESTERN H. S. | 995 | 39 | 491,736 | 551,262 | \$1,042,998 |
| AREA C | | | | | |
| COMMUNICATION & MEDIA ARTS | 153 | 21 | 75,614 | 46,383 | \$121,997 |
| COOLEY H. S. | 837 | 21 | 413,651 | 457,430 | \$871,081 |
| HENRY FORD H. S. | 791 | 27 | 390,918 | 218,052 | \$608,970 |
| REDFORD H. S. | 1,024 | 37 | 506,068 | 282,828 | \$788,896 |
| RENAISSANCE H. S. | 172 | | 85,004 | | |
| AREA D | | | | | |
| BEAUBIEN M.S. | 107 | | 52,880 | | |
| BOYKIN H.S. | 221 | 4 | 109,220 | 179,933 | \$289,153 |
| CENTRAL H.S. | 864 | 22 | 426,995 | 472,358 | \$899,353 |
| DETROIT H. S. | 173 | 34 | 85,498 | 55,179 | \$140,677 |
| HAMPTON M.S. | 103 | | 50,903 | | |
| MUMFORD H. S. | 630 | 41 | 311,351 | 178,867 | \$490,218 |
| NORTHERN H. S. | 926 | 12 | 457,636 | 500,081 | \$957,717 |
| AREA E | | | | | |
| DAVIS AEROSPACE TECHNICAL H | 99 | 20 | 48,927 | 63,443 | \$112,370 |
| KETTERING H. S. | 1019 | 27 | 503,597 | 557,659 | \$1,061,256 |
| OSBORN H. S. | 1155 | 28 | 570,809 | 315,349 | \$886,158 |
| PERSHING H. S. | 1083 | 9 | 535,226 | 582,184 | \$1,117,410 |
| AREA F | | | | | |
| BURBANK | 91 | | | | |
| DENBY H. S. | 1112 | 17 | 549,558 | 601,910 | \$1,151,468 |
| FINNEY H. S. | 726 | 23 | 403,767 | 399,318 | \$803,085 |
| JACKSON M.S. | 43 | | 21,251 | | |
| SOUTHEASTERN H. S. | 893 | 22 | 441,327 | 731,728 | \$1,173,055 |
| VINCENT CEC | 187 | 5 | 92,417 | 153,543 | \$245,960 |
| TOTALS | 20,044 | 785 | \$10,399,858 | 10,460,249 | \$20,575,328 |

** Includes all Middle Schools with 9th Grades.

APPENDIX B

Ninth Grade Incoming Students

**Reasons for Leaving School/District
by
School
June, 1995**

**NINTH GRADE INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1995**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 50 | 427 | 11.71 |
| Night School | 23 | 427 | 5.39 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 12 | 427 | 2.81 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 13 | 427 | 3.04 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 2 | 427 | 0.47 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 33 | 427 | 7.73 |
| Overage | 14 | 427 | 3.27 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 12 | 427 | 2.81 |
| Total | 159 | | 37.23 |

Continued Education: 48 students (11.24%)

Discontinued Education: 111 students (25.99%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 58 | 711 | 8.16 |
| Night School | 36 | 711 | 5.06 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 46 | 711 | 6.46 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 24 | 711 | 3.39 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 2 | 711 | 0.28 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 31 | 711 | 4.36 |
| Suspended | 1 | 711 | 0.14 |
| Overage | 18 | 711 | 2.53 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 9 | 711 | 1.26 |
| Total | 225 | | 31.64 |

Continued Education: 106 students (14.91%)

Discontinued Education: 119 students (16.73%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Non-Return | 39 | 702 | 5.57 |
| Night School | 32 | 702 | 4.56 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 57 | 702 | 8.12 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 9 | 702 | 1.28 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 57 | 702 | 8.12 |
| Suspended | 2 | 702 | 0.28 |
| Overage | 57 | 702 | 8.12 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 21 | 702 | 2.98 |
| Total | 274 | | 39.03 |

Continued Education: 98 students (13.96%)

Discontinued Education: 176 students (25.07%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Non-Return | 1 | 58 | 1.72 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 58 | 3.45 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 58 | 1.72 |
| Suspended | 1 | 58 | 1.72 |
| Total | 5 | | 8.61 |

Continued Education: 3 students (5.17%)

Discontinued Education: 2 students (3.44%)

APPENDIX C

Ninth Grade Incoming Students

**Reasons for Leaving School/District
by
School
June, 1996**

**NINTH GRADE INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1996**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 46 | 393 | 11.70 |
| Night School | 11 | 393 | 2.80 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 393 | 0.50 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 3 | 393 | 0.76 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 11 | 393 | 2.80 |
| Overage | 1 | 393 | 0.25 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 393 | 0.76 |
| Total | 77 | | 19.57 |

Continued Education: 16 students (4.06%)

Discontinued Education: 61 students (15.51%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 55 | 709 | 7.76 |
| Night School | 9 | 709 | 1.27 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 19 | 709 | 2.68 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 10 | 709 | 1.41 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 12 | 709 | 1.69 |
| Overage | 4 | 709 | 0.56 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 5 | 709 | 0.70 |
| Total | 114 | | 16.07 |

Continued Education: 38 students (5.36%)

Discontinued Education: 76 students (10.71%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 36 | 659 | 5.46 |
| Night School | 11 | 659 | 1.67 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 36 | 659 | 5.46 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 5 | 659 | 0.76 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 14 | 659 | 2.12 |
| Overage | 16 | 659 | 2.43 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 6 | 659 | 0.91 |
| Total | 124 | | 18.81 |

Continued Education: 52 students (7.89%)

Discontinued Education: 72 students (10.92%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 1 | 94 | 1.06 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 4 | 94 | 4.26 |
| Overage | 2 | 94 | 2.13 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 94 | 1.06 |
| Total | 8 | | 8.51 |

Continued Education: 4 students (4.26%)

Discontinued Education: 4 students (4.25%)

APPENDIX D

Ninth Grade Incoming Students

**Reasons for Leaving School/District
by
School
June, 1997**

**NINTH GRADE INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1997**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 364 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 2 | 364 | 0.55 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 7 | 364 | 1.93 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 364 | 0.27 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 2 | 364 | 0.55 |
| Overage | 0 | 364 | 0.00 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 364 | 0.82 |
| Total | 15 | | 4.12 |

Continued Education: 11 students (3.02%)

Discontinued Education: 4 students (1.10%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 3 | 603 | 0.50 |
| Night School | 13 | 603 | 2.17 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 24 | 603 | 3.49 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 18 | 603 | 2.99 |
| Lost to Institutions | 2 | 603 | 0.33 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 2 | 603 | 0.33 |
| Overage | 0 | 603 | 0.00 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 603 | 0.50 |
| Total | 65 | | 10.78 |

Continued Education: 55 students (9.12%)

Discontinued Education: 10 students (1.66%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 2 | 559 | 0.36 |
| Night School | 2 | 559 | 0.36 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 8 | 559 | 1.43 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 6 | 559 | 1.07 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 8 | 559 | 1.43 |
| Overage | 11 | 559 | 1.97 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 3 | 559 | 0.54 |
| Total | 40 | | 7.16 |

Continued Education: 16 students (2.86%)

Discontinued Education: 24 students (4.29%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 80 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 1 | 80 | 1.25 |
| Overage | 1 | 80 | 1.25 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 80 | 0.00 |
| Total | 2 | | 2.50 |

Continued Education: 1 students (1.25%)

Discontinued Education: 1 students (1.25%)

APPENDIX E

Ninth Grade Students Repeating Courses

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1995

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS REPEATING COURSES
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1995**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 43 | 233 | 18.45 |
| Night School | 43 | 233 | 18.45 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 9 | 233 | 3.86 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 7 | 233 | 3.00 |
| Suspended | 1 | 233 | 0.43 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 60 | 233 | 25.46 |
| Overage | 16 | 233 | 6.87 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 8 | 233 | 3.43 |
| Total | 187 | | 80.25 |

Continued Education: 59 students (25.31%)

Discontinued Education: 128 students (54.94%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 40 | 346 | 11.54 |
| Night School | 66 | 346 | 19.08 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 17 | 346 | 4.91 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 5 | 346 | 1.45 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 43 | 346 | 12.43 |
| Suspended | 2 | 346 | 0.58 |
| Overage | 55 | 346 | 15.90 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 8 | 346 | 2.31 |
| Total | 236 | | 68.21 |

Continued Education: 88 students (25.44%)

Discontinued Education: 148 students (42.77%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 19 | 298 | 6.38 |
| Night School | 27 | 298 | 9.06 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 13 | 298 | 4.36 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 3 | 298 | 1.01 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 1 | 298 | 0.34 |
| Suspended | 5 | 298 | 1.68 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 41 | 298 | 13.76 |
| Overage | 97 | 298 | 32.55 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 4 | 298 | 1.35 |
| Total | 210 | | 70.49 |

Continued Education: 17 students (14.43%)

Discontinued Education: 193 students (56.06%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 1 | 100.00 |
| Total | 1 | | 100.00 |

Continued Education: 0 students (0.00%)

Discontinued Education: One student (100.00%)

APPENDIX F

Ninth Grade Students Repeating Courses

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1996

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS REPEATING COURSES
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1996**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 88 | 294 | 29.93 |
| Night School | 24 | 294 | 8.16 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 5 | 294 | 1.70 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 5 | 294 | 1.70 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 35 | 294 | 11.90 |
| Overage | 7 | 294 | 2.38 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 7 | 294 | 2.38 |
| Total | 171 | | 58.15 |

Continued Education: 34 students (11.56%)

Discontinued Education: 137 students (46.59%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 74 | 446 | 16.60 |
| Night School | 61 | 446 | 13.69 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 10 | 446 | 2.24 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 8 | 446 | 1.79 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 3 | 446 | 0.67 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 32 | 446 | 7.17 |
| Overage | 31 | 446 | 6.95 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 7 | 446 | 1.56 |
| Total | 226 | | 50.67 |

Continued Education: 79 students (17.72%)

Discontinued Education: 147 students (32.95%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 33 | 296 | 11.15 |
| Night School | 32 | 296 | 10.81 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 16 | 296 | 5.40 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 2 | 296 | 0.68 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 1 | 296 | 0.34 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 17 | 296 | 5.74 |
| Suspended | 1 | 296 | 0.34 |
| Death | 2 | 296 | 0.68 |
| Overage | 23 | 296 | 7.77 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 7 | 296 | 2.37 |
| Total | 132 | | 44.60 |

Continued Education: 50 students (16.89%)

Discontinued Education: 82 students (27.71%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

There were no ninth grade students repeating courses.

APPENDIX G

Ninth Grade Students Repeating Courses

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1997

**NINTH GRADE STUDENTS REPEATING COURSES
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1997**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 185 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 7 | 185 | 3.78 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 185 | 1.08 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 0 | 185 | 0.00 |
| Lost to Institutions | 1 | 185 | 0.54 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 4 | 185 | 2.16 |
| Overage | 1 | 185 | 0.54 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 185 | 0.00 |
| Total | 15 | | 8.10 |

Continued Education: 9 students (4.86%)

Discontinued Education: 6 students (3.24%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 7 | 384 | 1.82 |
| Night School | 29 | 384 | 7.55 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 12 | 384 | 3.13 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 9 | 384 | 2.34 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 2 | 384 | 0.52 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 8 | 384 | 2.08 |
| Suspended | 1 | 384 | 0.26 |
| Overage | 7 | 384 | 1.82 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 4 | 384 | 1.04 |
| Total | 79 | | 20.57 |

Continued Education: 50 students (13.02%)

Discontinued Education: 29 students (7.55%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 9th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 2 | 312 | 0.64 |
| Night School | 7 | 312 | 2.24 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 11 | 312 | 3.53 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 2 | 312 | 0.64 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 0 | 312 | 0.00 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 2 | 312 | 0.64 |
| Suspended | 0 | 312 | 0.00 |
| Overage | 29 | 312 | 9.29 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 2 | 312 | 0.64 |
| Total | 55 | | 17.62 |

Continued Education: 20 students (6.41%)

Discontinued Education: 35 students (11.22%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

There were no ninth grade students repeating courses.

APPENDIX H

Tenth Grade Incoming Students

Reasons for Leaving School/District
by
School
June, 1996

**TENTH GRADE INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1996**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 214 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 4 | 214 | 1.87 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 0 | 214 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 0 | 214 | 0.00 |
| Lost to Institutions | 1 | 214 | 0.47 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 3 | 214 | 1.40 |
| Overage | 4 | 214 | 1.87 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 214 | 0.00 |
| Total | 12 | | 5.61 |

Continued Education: 4 students (1.87%)

Discontinued Education: 8 students (3.74%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 3 | 443 | 0.68 |
| Night School | 13 | 443 | 2.93 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 6 | 443 | 1.35 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 6 | 443 | 1.35 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 4 | 443 | 0.90 |
| Overage | 7 | 443 | 1.58 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 443 | 0.23 |
| Total | 40 | | 9.03 |

Continued Education: 25 students (5.64%)

Discontinued Education: 15 students (3.39%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 335 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 2 | 335 | 0.60 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 10 | 335 | 2.99 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 335 | 0.30 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 335 | 0.30 |
| Overage | 1 | 335 | 0.30 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 335 | 0.00 |
| Total | 15 | | 4.49 |

Continued Education: 13 students (3.88%)

Discontinued Education: 2 students (0.61%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 51 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 1 | 51 | 1.96 |
| Overage | 0 | 51 | 0.00 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 51 | 0.00 |
| Total | 1 | | 1.96 |

Continued Education: 1 students (1.96%)

Discontinued Education: 0 students (0.00%)

APPENDIX I

Tenth Grade Incoming Students

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1997

**TENTH GRADE INCOMING STUDENTS
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1997**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 253 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 4 | 253 | 1.58 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 3 | 253 | 1.19 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 0 | 253 | 0.00 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 253 | 0.40 |
| Suspended | 1 | 253 | 0.40 |
| Overage | 2 | 253 | 0.79 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 253 | 0.40 |
| Total | 12 | | 4.76 |

Continued Education: 7 students (2.77%)

Discontinued Education: 5 students (1.98%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 1 | 419 | 0.24 |
| Night School | 8 | 419 | 1.91 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 6 | 419 | 1.43 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 6 | 419 | 1.43 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 2 | 419 | 0.48 |
| Suspended | 1 | 419 | 0.24 |
| Overage | 6 | 419 | 1.43 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 419 | 0.24 |
| Total | 31 | | 7.40 |

Continued Education: 20 students (4.77%)

Discontinued Education: 11 students (2.63%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 352 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 2 | 352 | 0.57 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 8 | 352 | 2.27 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 352 | 0.28 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 352 | 0.28 |
| Overage | 9 | 352 | 2.56 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 352 | 0.00 |
| Total | 21 | | 5.97 |

Continued Education: 11 students (3.13%)

Discontinued Education: 10 students (2.84%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 80 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 80 | 2.50 |
| Transfer to Other States | 1 | 80 | 1.25 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 80 | 1.25 |
| Total | 4 | | 5.00 |

Continued Education: 3 students (3.75%)

Discontinued Education: 1 students (1.25%)

APPENDIX J

Tenth Grade Students Repeating Courses

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1996

**TENTH GRADE STUDENTS REPEATING COURSES
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1996**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 131 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 4 | 131 | 3.05 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 131 | 1.53 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 2 | 131 | 1.53 |
| Lost to Institutions | 0 | 131 | 0.00 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 8 | 131 | 6.11 |
| Overage | 5 | 131 | 3.82 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 131 | 0.76 |
| Total | 22 | | 16.79 |

Continued Education: 8 students (6.10%)

Discontinued Education: 14 students (10.69%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 15 | 140 | 10.71 |
| Night School | 18 | 140 | 12.86 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 0 | 140 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 140 | 0.71 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 1 | 140 | 0.71 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 7 | 140 | 5.00 |
| Overage | 16 | 140 | 11.43 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 140 | 0.71 |
| Total | 59 | | 42.13 |

Continued Education: 34 students (24.28%)

Discontinued Education: 25 students (17.86%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 190 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 16 | 190 | 8.42 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 190 | 1.05 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 0 | 190 | 0.00 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 0 | 190 | 0.00 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 190 | 0.53 |
| Suspended | 0 | 190 | 0.00 |
| Overage | 5 | 190 | 2.63 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 190 | 0.53 |
| Total | 25 | | 13.16 |

Continued Education: 18 students (9.48%)

Discontinued Education: 7 students (3.68%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

There were no ninth grade students repeating courses.

APPENDIX K

Tenth Grade Students Repeating Courses

Reasons for Leaving School/District

by

School

June, 1997

**TENTH GRADE STUDENTS REPEATING COURSES
REASONS FOR LEAVING SCHOOL/DISTRICT
JUNE, 1997**

Kettering High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 104 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 4 | 104 | 3.85 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 0 | 104 | 0.00 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 104 | 0.96 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 104 | 0.96 |
| Overage | 1 | 104 | 0.96 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 0 | 104 | 0.00 |
| Total | 7 | | 6.73 |

Continued Education: 5 students (4.81%)

Discontinued Education: 2 students (1.92%)

Osborn High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Non-Return | 6 | 151 | 3.97 |
| Night School | 18 | 151 | 11.92 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 151 | 1.32 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 0 | 151 | 0.00 |
| Lost to Institutions (Except Youth Home) | 1 | 151 | 0.66 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 151 | 0.66 |
| Overage | 4 | 151 | 2.65 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 2 | 151 | 1.32 |
| Total | 34 | | 22.50 |

Continued Education: 20 students (13.25%)

Discontinued Education: 14 students (9.27%)

Pershing High School

| Reasons for Leaving | Number Left | 10th Grade Population | Percent Left |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Non-Return | 0 | 171 | 0.00 |
| Night School | 4 | 171 | 2.34 |
| Transfer to a Michigan School | 2 | 171 | 1.17 |
| Transfer to Other States/Countries | 1 | 171 | 0.58 |
| Moved/Cannot Locate | 1 | 171 | 0.58 |
| Overage | 11 | 171 | 6.43 |
| Other (Voluntary) | 1 | 171 | 0.58 |
| Total | 20 | | 11.70 |

Continued Education: 7 students (4.09%)

Discontinued Education: 13 students (7.60%)

Davis Aerospace Technical High School

There were no ninth grade students repeating courses.

APPENDIX L

Literature Review and Bibliography Sources

LITERATURE REVIEW

Based on the literature review, it is apparent that effective programs address several levels of students' experiences:

- At the individual level, interpersonal relationships with adults in school
- At the classroom level, the instructional approaches and curriculum content
- At the school level, the policies which are relevant to dropouts, particularly tracking, absenteeism, suspension, retention (holding a student back to repeat a grade level), and personnel
- At the community level, the involvement of parents and community agencies which serve youth

At each level of students' experiences it is necessary to make the school experience relevant to students' needs.

Deschamps (1992) study examined research from 1980 to 1992 that addressed characteristics of high school dropouts. Data from 32 empirical studies were synthesized into an integrative review. A list of the most common characteristics of high school dropouts was generated and the major policy issues related to dropping out were identified and addressed. Four major categories of dropout characteristics were found: demographic, social and family, deviant behavior in society, and in-school. Some of the more common characteristics of dropouts included ethnicity, low socioeconomic status, coming from a single-parent family, a high rate of absenteeism, disciplinary problems, grade retention, low academic performance, and poor achievement test scores. The major policy issues related to the dropout problem included: the lack of uniform definition of the term dropout; the inaccuracy of statistics measuring local, state and national dropout rates; the correlation between grade retention and dropping out; the dropout rate in special education; and the need for more research on how many dropouts return to school or receive their Graduate Equivalency Diploma.

Because children who live in poverty drop out of school disproportionately, some might argue that important factors influencing high school graduation rates are not within the school's control. Though there are powerful economic and social forces influencing school attendance among poor, urban youth, intervention programs have been successful in affecting drop out rates. This review attempts to identify those factors within the realm of the school's control which can make going to school and graduating worthwhile to students who might otherwise drop out of school.

Interpersonal Relationships

The importance of students' interpersonal relationships with adults in the school is stressed more frequently than almost any other feature or effective programs.

Individualized Treatment/Instruction:

Several studies suggest that treating students as individuals helps to reduce the dropout rate. In Cippollone's study of six schools with differential dropout rates (1987), schools with lower dropout rates had administrators and teachers who were more willing to look at students individually and later specify discipline practices accordingly. Hess, Jr. and others (1986) cite more interaction between teachers and students as characteristic of schools with lower dropout rates in their study of eight Chicago high schools.

Small classes provide an opportunity for more frequent and more intimate contact between students and teachers. Ruby and Law's paper to the American Association of School Psychologists (1987) asserts that successful dropout programs have low student/teacher ratios and provide personal attention.

Caring:

Caring staff is repeatedly cited as an essential component of successful dropout prevention programs. It is also probably the most difficult component to operate. Mann (1985) suggests that teachers should know students by name and ask about their personal lives.

Finally, Cippollone's study of six schools with differential dropout rates (1987) concludes that in schools with lower dropout rates the staff had a sense of advocacy for students and were more willing to become involved in the social and affective needs of students.

Cultural Differences:

McLaughlin (1994) summarized various theories developed to explain minority language learners' failures to thrive in existing school systems. These theories may provide ideas for understanding dilemmas faced by minority youths.

Education psychologists have focused on the individual learner who, they believe, arrives at school broken by impoverishing home and community experiences. This deficit theory calls for helping individual students acquire mastery of skills before moving ahead, as well as providing enrichment to overcome deficits in background experiences.

Organizational theorists have focused on schools and school systems which they see as the primary culprits in school failure. These schools effectiveness proponents call for school restructuring and systemic reform efforts, including rethinking such important issues as how time is used and who is involved in planning and decision making.

Sociologists and anthropologists have focused on powerful economic and political structures that underpin all aspects of society and "create arrangements.....that systematically give voice to some and deny it to others" and are structured "around successful and unsuccessful competence displays such that winners and losers are inevitable" (McLaughlin, p. 53). These critical theorists call for teachers as coaches, pedagogy as problem solving, and a curriculum that addresses important themes connected to the lives of students.

Lastly, sociolinguists have a narrower focus on the teacher-learner interaction, where they find constant miscommunication resulting from different cultural and linguistic preferences for interaction. Cultural differences theorists believe solutions lie in teachers becoming knowledgeable about the culture and language of their students and adopting curriculum and teaching methods to students' needs.

The idea of cultural discontinuity contains elements of both of the last two theories just described. Increasingly, it has become an explanation for the difficulties minority students face in adjusting to and finishing high school.

Theories of cultural discontinuity have their origins in the anthropological studies of ethnic minority groups within a dominant, majority culture. According to students of cultural discontinuity theory, minority children having been initially raised in a distinctive culture of their own, are often thrust into a school system that promotes the values of the majority culture--not those of their own. If the resulting clash of culture continues, the minority child may feel forced to choose one culture at the expense of the other. A tragic paradox emerges: success (in school) becomes failure (in the community), and failure becomes success. Moreover, it has been argued that failure is not simply the passive act of neglecting to complete required tasks, but that it may be a status that is actively pursued by ethnic minority students in order to preserve their culture of origin. In other words, failure in school is a tacit cultural goal that must be achieved (McDermott, 1987; Spindler, 1987).

Self-Esteem:

An analysis of the research and scholarly literature (Walz, 1991) suggests a number of significant findings and generalizations about the importance and the effects of self-esteem upon youth and adults. Overall it would appear that self-esteem can be envisaged as a "social vaccine," a dimension of personality that empowers people and inoculates them against a wide spectrum of

self-defeating and socially undesirable behavior (California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem, 1990.) Among the more compelling generalizations to be made are the following:

- The family is a strong force in the development of self-esteem. The early years are particularly important in establishing an "authentic and abiding self-esteem" in a person.
- High parental self-esteem is crucial to the ability to nurture high self-esteem and personal effectiveness in children.
- School climate plays an important role in the development of the self-esteem of students. Schools that target self-esteem as a major school goal appear to be "more successful academically as well as in developing healthy self-esteem among their students." (California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem, 1990, p. 5.)
- Self-esteem and achievement may be either the cause or the effect of each other, depending upon the person and the particular situation in which they function.
- Young girls who possess positive self-esteem are less likely to become pregnant as teenagers.
- Persons who hold themselves in high esteem are less likely to engage in destructive and self-destructive behavior including child abuse, alcohol and drug abuse, violence and crime.
- Exclusive attention to just self-esteem or personal achievement may well result in less favorable outcomes in either or both areas than when an approach is used which attends to both self-esteem and achievement. Walz (1991) in postulating the presence of an "esteem-achievement connection" emphasize the importance of presenting students with challenging experiences that enable the student to "earn" high esteem by successfully coping with difficult tasks.
- The choice to esteem oneself or not is ultimately the responsibility of the individual no matter what the background and prior experiences of the individual may be. High self-esteem can never be given to a person by another person or society. It must be sought, "earned" by the individual for him or herself.
- Self-esteem may be expressed as an overall generic characteristic, i.e., "she exhibits a high self-esteem" or as a more specific behavioral attribute, i.e., "he certainly has a high sense of self-esteem in tackling a difficult writing task, but he has absolutely no belief in his competence to do anything numerical." The experience of many counselors would favor a counseling intervention that explores a client's overall self-esteem (enhancing his/her generic self-esteem), but also

focuses upon blockages which retard the expression of high self-esteem in specific areas.

- Writers and researchers show general, although by no means complete, agreement on the preconditions necessary for someone to demonstrate high self-esteem. Among the commonly used terms are: security, connectedness, uniqueness, assertiveness, competence, and spirituality.

Research shows (Waltz, 1991) that gaining greater knowledge and understanding of self-esteem can be beneficial to a counselor. However, to specifically impact upon a client's self-esteem requires greater focus and effort upon the part of the counselor. Six action steps are suggested as guides for how a counselor can intervene to assist clients in enhancing their own self-esteem.

- Acknowledge that the self-esteem of a client is a vital determinant in his/her behavior and should be a major focus of the counseling relationship.
- Explore with the client the meaning of self-esteem and how his/her self-esteem has impacted upon past behaviors and actions (and can influence present and future plans and decisions).
- Assist the client in assessing the internal and external forces contributing to or retarding their self-esteem. Develop a personally meaningful profile of esteem builders and detractors.
- Recognize that the self-esteem of the counselor has a stimulating or depressing effect upon the esteem of a client and that each needs to be aware of his/her self-esteem and its effect upon others.
- Assist the client in designing a self-esteem enhancement program that is customized to her/his learning style and desired goals.
- Above all else, act upon the conviction that self-esteem is a disposition to know oneself as someone who is competent to cope with the realities and demands of life and as personally worthy of experiencing joy and happiness. Acting upon this conviction a counselor will then know that she/he can neither bestow nor induce self-esteem in another person. Through their efforts, however, counselors can assist a person to learn the processes by which they can examine the antecedents of their self-esteem, and take responsibility for thinking and acting in ways which will heighten their own self-esteem and hence their capacity to experience life confidently and joyously.

Student Motivation:

Much of the recent research on student motivation has rightly centered on the classroom, where the majority of learning takes place and where students are most likely to acquire a strong motivation to gain new knowledge. Making the classroom a place that naturally motivates students to learn is much easier when students and teachers function in an atmosphere where academic success and the motivation to learn are expected and rewarded.

An environment that nurtures educational motivation can be cultivated at home, in the classroom, or throughout an entire school. One of the most effective avenues for engendering student motivation is a school's culture. According to Deal (1987), school culture can be embodied and transformed through channels such as shared values, heroes, rituals, ceremonies, stories, and cultural networks.

Davis (1989) suggests using a wide variety of activities and symbols to communicate motivational goals. "Visible symbols," he says, "illustrate and confirm what is considered to be important in the school." He suggests using "school newsletters, statements of goals, behavior codes, rituals, symbols, and legends" to "convey messages of what the school really values." Staging academic awards assemblies, awarding trophies for academic success and displaying them in trophy cases, scheduling motivational speakers, and publicizing students' success can help them see that the desire to be successful academically is recognized and appreciated.

Klug (1989) notes that school leaders can influence levels of motivation by "shaping the school's instructional climate," which in turn shapes "the attitudes of teachers, students, parents, and the community at large toward education." By effectively managing this aspect of a school's culture, principals can "increase both student and teacher motivation and indirectly impact learning gains."

School administrators can take advantage of times of educational change by including strategies for increasing student motivation. Acknowledging that school restructuring is inevitable, Maehr (1991) challenges school leaders to ensure that "motivation and the investment in learning of students will be enhanced" as a result of school reform. School leaders have seldom "considered motivation vis-a-vis the current restructuring movement," he says, "and few have considered that the school as an entity in its own right, may have effects that supersede those of individual classrooms and the acts of individual teachers."

A positive "psychological environment" strongly influences student motivation, says Maehr. School leaders can create this type of environment by establishing policies and programs that:

- stress goal setting and self-regulation/management
- offer students choices in instructional settings

- reward students for attaining "personal best" goals
- foster teamwork through group learning and problem-solving experiences
- replace social comparisons of achievement with self-assessment and evaluation techniques
- teach time management skills and offer self-paced instruction when possible

Instructional Approaches

The research on dropouts almost universally recommends non-traditional instructional approaches in small class groups. Research suggests utilizing low student/teacher ratios, a multi-media approach, and flexible course scheduling.

Low Student/Teacher Ratios:

Low student/teacher ratios provide greater opportunities for personalized attention. The U.S. General Accounting Office's survey of dropout program (1987) found that individualized instruction favorably influenced dropout reduction.

Many large urban school districts where the dropout problem is particularly acute do not have the resources to provide the recommended student/teacher ratios. However, as Strother (1986) points out, "large schools make it difficult for teachers to respond to individual student's needs." Wheelock and Dorman (1988) address this problem in their research findings regarding adolescents by recommending a team teaching approach, homerooms, and teacher-based counseling as ways to create "smallness within bigness."

Wheelock (1990) states that recent literature suggests it is not students' backgrounds, but schools' response to students' backgrounds that determine students' success in school. School practices and policies adopted in response to student performance in attendance, academics, and behavior also have a significant impact on students' decision to leave school before graduating.

According to a literature review by Quinn (1991) school practices such as placement of at-risk students in alternative, nontraditional programs, individualized counseling, low student-teacher ratio, and peer tutoring successfully lower dropout rates, whereas remediation, retention in grade, tracking, and suspension exacerbate the problem.

Multi-Media Approach:

Media refers to the means of communication. Students at risk are not responding to traditional methods of teaching, such as lectures and seat work. Many researchers feel that

creative approaches are needed, particularly to teach basic reading and math skills to older students. Such approaches provide students with opportunities to experience success in school where they have previously failed.

Other researchers support the concept of a multi-media approach which allows students to experience success. Wheelock and Dorman (1988) suggest varying teaching methods and using diverse instructional approaches to provide multiple opportunities for success.

Flexible Scheduling:

In addition to innovation and variety of instructional approaches, changes in the scheduling of classes are encouraged. The U.S. General Accounting Office survey of programs (1987) finds that "flexibility in curriculum and school hours are important to prevent dropping by students unable to progress in the standard school setting."

Cooperative Learning:

Johnson and Johnson (1987) are well-known proponents of this last type of grouping, called cooperative learning. These heterogeneous groups are based on positive interdependence among the group members who help and support one another. Their goals focus on bringing each member's learning to the maximum and on maintaining good working relationships among members. "Nothing is more basic than learning to use one's knowledge in cooperative interaction with others," the Johnsons' state. And they continue: "Greater achievement is typically found in collaborative situations where peers work together than in situations where individuals work alone..."

Johnson and Johnson (1987) recommend assigning students of high, medium, and low abilities in the same group. They also suggest that it is very beneficial for those students who are not as task oriented as others to be put with their more academically oriented peers. Teachers should allow students to choose one person with whom they would like to work, and then carefully place these pairs with others to maximize the heterogeneous makeup of each group.

As the group works together as a team, some of the benefits predicted for individual members are higher critical thinking competencies, more positive social interaction with classmates, improved collaborative competencies, an understanding of other perspectives, and more self-esteem. The Johnsons believe that:

- Cooperative learning procedures may be used successfully with any type of academic task, although they are most successful when conceptual learning is required.
- Whenever possible, cooperative groups should be structured so that controversy and academic disagreements among group members are possible and are managed constructively.

- Students should be encouraged to keep each other on task and to discuss assigned material in ways that ensure elaborate rehearsal and the use of higher learning strategies.
- Students should be encouraged to support each other's efforts to achieve.

Educators must make many choices every year about grouping arrangements. Good teachers who provide supportive environments for their students and who are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of grouping will make the decisions that are right for themselves, for their classroom situation, and for their students.

Cross-Age Tutoring:

Although references in the literature to cross-age and peer tutoring programs are sparse (Natriello and others, 1988), (Wheelock, 1988), these programs appear to produce significant results. Cross-age tutoring seems to meet several needs of students at risk:

- Feeling important, competent, and needed in a school setting
- Developing an interpersonal, interdependent relationship with someone in school
- Reviewing basic math and reading skills without the stigma of remedial education
- Active involvement in the learning process
- Providing individualized instruction to younger students
- Providing an opportunity for community service

Gaustand (1993) states that one to one tutoring programs, such as peer and cross-age tutoring, can result in emotional and learning benefits for the tutor and the tutee. In cross-age tutoring, the tutor is older than the tutee. Advantages of these programs are that tutors are better than adults in relating to their tutees on a cognitive, emotional, and social level. Also, cross-age tutoring offers the tutor the higher status of being older but still being close in age. Tutors can benefit from cross-age and peer tutoring because it allow them to review material, and to improve thinking and communication skills.

Positive Discipline

Criticizing, discouraging, creating obstacles and boundaries, blaming, shaming, using sarcastic or cruel humor, or using physical punishment are some negative disciplinary methods used with young children.

Any adult might occasionally do any of these things. Doing any or all of them more than once in a while means that a negative approach to discipline has become a habit and urgently needs to be altered before the child experiences low self-esteem as a permanent part of his/her personality.

ERIC (1990) in an article on "Positive Discipline" states the following as good approaches to discipline:

- increase a student's self-esteem
- allow the student to feel valued
- encourage the student to feel cooperative
- enable the student to learn gradually the many skills involved in taking some responsibility for what happens to him/her
- motivate the student to change his/her strategy rather than to blame others
- help the student to take initiative, relate successfully to others, and solve problems

School discipline has two main goals: (1) ensure the safety of staff and students, and (2) create an environment conducive to learning. Serious student misconduct involving violent or criminal behavior defeats these goals and often makes headlines in the process. However, the commonest discipline problems involve non-criminal student behavior (Moles, 1989).

These less dramatic problems may not threaten personal safety, but they still negatively affect the learning environment. Disruptions interrupt lessons for all students, and disruptive students lose even more learning time.

As educator researcher Daniel Duke (1989) points out, "The goal of good behavior is necessary, but not sufficient to ensure academic growth." Effective school discipline strategies seek to encourage responsible behavior and to provide all students with a satisfying school experience as well as to discourage misconduct.

When John Hopkins University researchers Gary D. Gottfredson and Denise C. Gottfredson (1989) analyzed data from over 600 of the nation's secondary schools, they found that the following school characteristics were associated with discipline problems:

- rules were unclear or perceived as unfairly or inconsistently enforced
- students did not believe in the rules

- teachers and administrators did not know what the rules were or disagreed on the proper responses to student misconduct
- teacher-administration cooperation was poor or the administration inactive
- teachers tended to have punitive attitudes
- misconduct was ignored
- schools were large or lacked adequate resources for teaching

Written policies should be developed with input from everyone who will be affected by them. Once developed, discipline policies must be communicated to staff, students, parents and community. But a policy on paper is meaningless in itself. Ongoing administrative support, in-service training in new techniques, continued communication, and periodic evaluation and modification are needed to adopt a school discipline plan to the changing needs of the school community.

Curriculum Content

The curriculum content is the "what" of instruction, or the information and knowledge which the school system attempts to convey to its students.

The research on dropouts consistently recommends a curriculum which focuses on infusing basic skills, stressing practical skills, and offering a multiple abilities curriculum.

Basic Skills Instruction:

Students who are at risk of dropping out are typically those who exhibit poor basic academic skills (Wheelage, 1988). Often middle school curriculums assume basic reading comprehension and math skills, however, many students may not have mastered these basic skills yet (Wheelock and Dorman, 1988). Students who are weak in basic skills at the middle school level have increased difficulties in high school. It is extremely important that dropout prevention programs recognize and address the need for students to master basic reading and math skills.

Hornbeck (1991) states that while research has shown that computer-assisted instruction (CAI) can help at-risk students learn basic skills such as reading, writing and mathematics, studies have also revealed that CAI helps students think critically, solve problems and draw inferences.

Stress Practical Skills:

Because the irrelevance of the school experience to students' needs is considered to be the major cause of dropping out, stressing practical skills is recommended by some researchers. Ruby and Law's paper presented at the Annual Meeting of School Psychologists (1987) states that successful programs stress the immediate and practical and offer opportunities for paid employment. Strother (1986) also recommends that the curriculum should focus on real-life problems.

Multiple Abilities Curriculum:

Students who do not experience success in school may not have opportunities to use their strongest abilities as part of traditional curriculums. A multiple abilities curriculum provides a chance for students to use a wide range of skills to earn credit towards graduation.

Natriello and others (1988) assert that schools should offer a multiple abilities curriculum and move beyond the narrow range of academic tasks which rely on reading skills to allow students to experience success. Wheelage (1988) recommends an "experiential" curriculum including community service, career internship, political/social action, and/or outdoor adventure.

Researchers (1990) of the Office of Research, Evaluation and Assessment, New York City Board of Education, state that poor and minority students are at the greatest risk of failure because of a gap between home and school. This gap is the difference in the expectations parents and teachers have of students, and between the social and language skills required of students at home and at school. When the schools represent an alien culture to students and fail to represent parental interests, students disengage from the school culture and the socioeconomic universe it represents. The following traditional compensatory education approaches are not effective in educating at-risk students: (1) retention; (2) pullout programs; and (3) in-class aides. The following strategies are more promising: (1) reduced class size; (2) early intervention; (3) cohesive social unit; (4) comprehensive services; (5) intensive interventions; (6) bilingual instructional services (7) culturally sensitive programs (8) built-in flexibility; (9) active teaching; (10) engaged learning; (11) cooperative learning; and (12) community involvement.

School Policies

Monitoring/Early Intervention:

The importance of identifying potential dropouts early and then immediately taking action to re-engage them in the school is almost universally agreed upon in the literature on dropout prevention.

Some researchers recommend monitoring and intervention at the earliest points in a student's career. Gruskin and other (1987) recommend good preschool and early childhood programs and Beck and Muia (1980) suggest intervention in nursery school and kindergarten. Those who advocate monitoring and intervention in early elementary school include Walz (1987).

The middle school years are viewed by other researchers as the critical monitoring and intervention stage because this is when students begin to feel disconnected (Sherwood, 1987), (Massachusetts Advocacy Center, 1986), (Wheelock and Dorman, 1988).

Other researchers who advocate monitoring and early intervention include, Natriello and others (1988), Naylor (1987), O'Connor (1985), Sherman (1987), Strother (1986), and Sween and Kyle (1987).

Focus on Absenteeism:

Chronic absenteeism is an obvious early warning sign of potential dropout (Sherman, 1987), (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1987), (Wheelage, 1988). The school's reaction to a student's absenteeism can send a strong message to the student regarding his or her importance to the school. The school's efforts to promote daily school attendance help to reduce dropout rates (Walz, 1987).

Bonikowski (1987), suggests nurturing a cooperative, rather than an adversarial, relationship with parents regarding students' attendance. Wheelock and Dorman's (1988) suggestions include the following:

- Establish an attendance team for monitoring attendance
- Interview students regarding reasons for non-attendance
- Maintain persistent contact with students' homes

Herman (1991) states that educators must take into account the changing social, cultural, and economic trends' contributions to high absenteeism and dropout rates. No curriculum can succeed if the students are not in attendance to learn, develop and advance in society.

Literature on absenteeism written after 1985 demonstrates a shift of focus from the student as truant to the school as part of both the problem and the solution. Four major principles are necessary to any successful intervention--awareness, change in perspectives, early intervention, and cooperation and involvement. Components of an intervention include developing and implementing attendance policies, monitoring, tracking, and recording; getting parents involved; providing counseling and guidance; and providing relevant curriculum or alternative program. Research shows that programs (Harte, 1995) implemented as school wide improvements have

consistently been successful in reducing attendance problems. Effective schools are student-centered and operate as: a caring institutional and functional community, a community organization, an experimenter and risk-taker, and a team.

In School Suspension:

Traditional approaches to student discipline include suspending a student for severe infractions. However, a history of suspension is not only predictive of dropout (Wheelock, 1986), but suspension actually encourages students to dropout by sending a clear message that they are not wanted in school (Massachusetts Advocacy Center, 1986).

In-school suspension differs from traditional suspension practices because the student stays on the school premises while serving the term of his/her suspension. Supervised, in-school suspension which includes academic support is recommended as a means to maintain a relationship with students and to make them feel as though they belong in school (Mahood, 1981), (Wheelock and Dorman, 1988).

Roquemore (1991) suggested that intervention in-school suspension programs could counteract students' low self-concepts and negative attitudes toward teachers. Such programs would include: parent training, teacher staff development, school programs that focus on one to one relationships with students, remediation of academic difficulties and administrative monitoring of individual teachers and evaluation of the school involvement.

Non-Retention:

Students who have been retained in a grade are much more likely to dropout than those who have not (Massachusetts Advocacy Center, 1986), (Sherman, 1987), (Wheelock, 1986). Walz (1987) quantifies the relationship between retention and dropout in his literature review:

"The child who has been held back one grade level is 60 times more likely to become a dropout than a student who has not, and the child who has been held back two grade levels is 250 times more likely to become a dropout."

Wheelock and Dorman (1988) argue strongly against retention and suggest giving students specialized instruction with a designated target date at which they will be "caught up" and reintegrated into their appropriate grade level. Some programs they suggest include the following:

- Competency-based curriculum in multi-grade groupings
- Smaller class size
- Summer school with different teaching techniques stressing more active student involvement.

George (1993) suggest that: (a) school districts and schools should disseminate current research on retention to schools staffs (b) school districts with high retention rates should develop a plan to reduce the rate and improve the instructional program for at-risk students (c) school districts should monitor differential effects of retention for different ethnic groups and boys and girls.

Sherwood (1993) states that despite a growing trend toward retention in grade of low-achieving students and apparent public support for the practice, many educators and psychologists disagree with the perception that flunking is an appropriate response to poor academic performance. Research reported in the past two decades indicates that grade-level retention produces little improvement in student achievement. Some studies presented evidence that students required to repeat a grade actually made less progress than comparable classmates who were promoted. In addition, there are many studies that demonstrate significant psychological damage to children, particularly in terms of lowered self-esteem. Still others associate an increase in the dropout level with retention in grade. In Florida, a number of approaches to improving student achievement without resorting to grade retention have been proposed. Among them are the following:

- tutorial programs, including peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring, and adult volunteer tutoring, coordinated with classroom instruction;
- extended basic skills programs, which eliminate "non-essentials" from the student day, with the additional time being applied to reading, writing, and mathematics;
- cooperative learning programs;
- extended-year programs, achieved in Florida because of funding constraints through summer school; and
- individualized instruction through such technologies as interactive video, word processing, and story starters.

Students At Risk:

Most studies agree that the main factors associated with dropping out include students' socioeconomic status, school behavior, and academic achievement.

"Dropout rates are higher for students coming from low socioeconomic backgrounds, from single-parent families, and from non-English language family backgrounds," stated Frase (1989) in the first annual report by the National Center for Education Statistics. This nationwide study also found higher dropout rates for students living in cities than in suburbs or rural areas, and in the South and West rather than in the Northeast. Students who marry or have children, or who have had problems with the law or school authorities, are also at greater risk.

Academic factors are clearly related to dropping out. Students who received poor grades, who had repeated a grade, who were overage for their class, and who had poor attendance for reasons other than illness were more likely to drop out. "A powerful predictor... was the attendance record during the first four months of tenth grade," Frase reported.

Barber and McLellan (1987) found that dropouts in a Wisconsin community showed clear indications of academic problems by the third grade. Their achievement test scores were significantly lower than those of their classmates and also below their ability as measured by intelligence tests; teacher comments alone identified potential dropouts with 63 percent accuracy. Poor attendance, failing grades, and low overall GPA marked these students' high school careers.

Conley (1992) in his research states that national and state policies are establishing expectations that essentially all students will graduate from high school. As schools begin to adjust their goals accordingly, they found most of their basic organizational practices must change. At-risk students demand personalized education, meaningful material, success-based tasks, continuous contact with trusted adults, and a stable peer group.

Traditional grouping and grading practices do not facilitate success for at-risk students. Teachers have a very difficult time accepting the notion that all students can succeed without standards being lowered. There is an increasing tension between meeting the needs of both "gifted" and "at-risk" students within the traditional organizational paradigm.

Restructuring schools are using cooperative learning strategies, project centered learning, learning teams, schools-within-schools, block scheduling, advisor-advisee programs, enhanced parental involvement, expansion of learning into the community, and an increasing integration of vocational and academic curricula into "applied academics" courses or strategies to meet the needs of diverse group of students.

Parent/Community Involvement

The complex needs of at risk students call for the utilization of a wide range of resources. The school's efforts to coordinate with others who have an interest in the student's life can result in synergistic benefits to the student at risk.

Parents:

Parents may be the most important force keeping children in school. At the high school level there is a tendency for parental involvement to decline. Efforts must be made to re-engage parents in their children's education.

"Student achievement is strongly influenced by efforts to bridge home and school as a team" (Ochoa, 1987).

"The collaboration with families is an important intervention strategy" (Willis, 1986).

"Encouraging parental involvement in school learning activities helps prevent dropping out" (Walz, 1987).

The above observations illustrate the conventional wisdom regarding the role of parental influence on dropout prevention. It has been found that successful dropout programs have activities to enhance parental support (Naylor, 1987). Programs should develop policies to help increase parents' interest and monitoring of their children's progress (Strother, 1986), (Ekstrom and others, 1986).

Wheelock and Dorman (1988) suggest "blurring the home-school boundary line" by involving parents in adult education classes at the school, offering a GED program for parents, and involving parents in policy making.

Wagonseller (1992) states that despite the difficulties of parenting, few people have actually been trained to be parents or to become involved in their children's education. To address these problems, each community needs to develop a comprehensive parent involvement model.

A community parent involvement model would include the following elements:

- training parent trainers to conduct parenting classes in every school
- change the focus of the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) to parent-teacher administration
- develop in each school a parent education program for expectant parents and parents of very young children
- develop a parent education program for parents of elementary age children
- develop a parent education program for parents of children with special needs (Example: disabilities, gifted, etc.)
- develop monthly parents' workshops on topics of interest to parents
- create a family lifestyle class for high school students

Research has shown that one of the most promising ways to increase students' achievement is to involve their families (Charkin, 1993; Henderson and Berla, 1994). They also found that family participation in education was twice as predictive of academic learning as family socioeconomic status. Establishing partnerships with families has many benefits for schools and

families, but Epstein says, "the main reason to create such partnerships is to help all youngsters succeed in school and in later life" (1995, p. 701).

Research on families and student learning has shown that students at all grade levels do better work in school, feel better about themselves as learners, set higher goals, and dream bigger dreams when their parents are knowledgeable, supportive, encouraging and involved with their education. Parent involvement in education can take a variety of forms, including volunteering to help in the school, doing a presentation for a class, helping chaperon field trips, and supplying materials. The most important type of involvement, however, is encouraging, monitoring, and helping your children with their schoolwork. When parents and school work together, children grow in an environment of consistent expectations and shared purpose, where children become better students and parents become better teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, March 5, 1987.
- Barber, Larry W. and McLellan, Mary C., "Looking at America's Dropouts: Who Are They?", Phi Delta Kappa, 69, 4, December, 1987: Z64-67.
- Beck, Lisa and Muia, Joseph A., "A Portrait or a Tragedy: Research Findings on the Dropout", HighSchool Journal, November, 1980.
- Bonikowski, Dennis, Truancy: A Prelude to Dropping Out, Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service, 1987.
- California Task Force, Final Report of the State Committee to Promote Self-esteem, Personal and Social Responsibility, Bureau of Publications, California State Department of Education Sacramento, CA, 1990.
- Charkin, N.F. (Ed.), Families and Schools in a Puralistic Society. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Cippollone, Tony, "No Frills Dropout Prevention: A Preliminary Analysis of a Study of Differentially Effective Comprehensive High Schools", Paper prepared for the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 1987.
- Conley, David, Emerging Trade in School Restructuring, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, O.R., (1992).
- Davis, John, "Effective Schools, Organizational Culture, and Local Policy Initiatives". In EDUCATIONAL POLICY FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS, edited by Mark Holmes, Keith Leithwood, and Donald Musella. New York: Teachers College Press, 1989.
- Deal, Terrence E., "The Culture of Schools". In LEADERSHIP: EXAMINING THE ELUSIVE, edited by Linda T. Sheive and Marian B. Schoenheit, 1987.
- Deschamps, Ann-Barnes, On Integrative Review of Research on Characteristics of Dropouts. Doctoral Dissertation, George Washington University, 1992 (ED378520).
- Duke, Daniel L., "School Organization, Leadership, and Student Behavior." In Strategies to Reduce Student Misbehavior, Washington, D.C. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1989.

- Ekstrom, Ruth B., Goertz, Margaret E., Pollack, Judith M., and Rock, Donald A., "Who Drops Out of High School and Why? Findings from a National Study," Teachers College Record, Vol. 87 (3), Spring 1986.
- Epstein, J.L., School Family Community Partnerships: Caring for the Children We Share. Phi Beta Kappan 76(9), 701-712, 1995.
- ERIC Digest, Positive Discipline, ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Education, Urbana, ILL, 1990 (ED327271).
- Frase, Mary J., "Dropout Rates in the United States," National Center for Education Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1988.
- Gaustand, Joan, Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., 1993 (ED354608).
- George, Catherine, Beyond Retention. A Study of Retention Rates, Practices, and Successful Alternatives in California. California State Department of Education. Sacramento, C.A. (1993)
- Gottfredson, Denise C., and Gottfredson, Gary D., "Developing Effective Organizations to Reduce School Disorder," Washington, D.C. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1989.
- Gruskin, Susan J., Dealing with Dropouts: The Urban Superintendents Call to Action. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., (1987).
- Harte, Austin J., Improving School Attendance: Responsibility and Challenge, Canadian Education Association, Toronto, Ontario, 1995, (ED383042).
- Henderson, A.T., and Berla, N. (Eds), A New Generation of Evidence: The Family Is Critical to Student Achievement. Washington, DC: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1994, (ED375968).
- Herman, James L., Developing a Procedure for Accountability of Student Absenteeism. M.S. Practicum, Nova University, ED340144, 1991.
- Hess, G. Alfred, Jr., Wells, Emily, Prindle, Carol, Liffman, Paul, and Kaplan, Beatrice, Where's Room 185? How Schools Can Reduce Their Dropout Problem: An Ethnographic Investigation of Four Matched Pairs of Urban High School, Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and Finance, December, 1986.
- Hornbeck, David W., Technology and Students at-risk of School Failure. North Central Educational Lab., Elmhurst, ILL. 1991

Johnson, Roger T. and Johnson, David W. "How Can We Put Cooperative Learning into Practice?" *Science Teacher*, 54(6), 46-48, 1987.

Klug, Samuel, "Leadership and Learning: A Measurement-Based Approach for Analyzing School Effectiveness and Developing Effective School Leaders". In *ADVANCES IN MOTIVATION AND ACHIEVEMENT*, Connecticut: JAI Press, 1989.

Maehr, Martin L., "Changing the Schools: A Word to School Leaders about Enhancing Student Investment in Learning." Paper presented at the annual meeting American Educational Research Association, 1991.

Mahood, Wayne, "Born Losers: School Dropouts and Push Outs," *NASSP Bulletin*, January, 1981.

Mann, Dale, Report of the National Invitational Working Conference on Holding Power and Dropouts, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, March, 1985.

Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Report Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Boston, 1986.

Moles, Oliver C., Strategies to Reduce Student Misbehaviors, Washington, D.C., Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1989.

McDermott, R.P., Achieving School Failure: An Anthropological Approach to Illiteracy and Social Satisfaction. *Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches* (2nd Ed. 173-209) Prospect Heights, IL, 1987.

McLaughlin, D., Critical Literacy for Navajo and Other American Indian Learners. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 33(3), 47-49, 1994.

Natriello, Gary, Pallas, Aaron M., McDill, Edward L., McPartland, James M., and Royster, Deirde, An examination of the Assumptions and Evidence for Alternative Dropout Prevention Programs in High School. Report No. 365, Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1988.

Naylor, Michelle, Reducing the Dropout Rate through Career and Vocational Education, Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1987.

Ochoa, Alberto, Hurtado, Juan, Espinosa, Ruben, and Zachman, Jill, The Empowerment of all Students: A Framework for the Prevention of School Dropouts, San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism, San Diego State University, January, 1987.

O'Connor, Patrick, "Dropout Prevention Programs That Work,": *OSSC Bulletin*, December, 1985.

- Office of Research Evaluation, and Assessment. Beyond Remediation: School Based Strategies for Reducing Educational Risk, New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1990.
- Quinn, Terrence, The Influence of School Policies and Practices on Dropout Rates, NASSP-Bulletin pp 73-83, November, 1991.
- Rillero, Peter, Doing Science With Your Children, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., 1994, (ED372952).
- Roquemore, Barbara D. The Academic Motivation of Students Who Are Discipline Problems. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AASA, New Orleans, 1991.
- Ruby, Theodore and Law, Robert, "School Dropouts -- Why Does the Problem Prevail," New Orleans, LA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, March 5, 1987.
- Sherman, Joel D., Dropping Out of School. Executive Summary, Washington, DC: Pelavin Associates, Inc., December, 1987.
- Sherwood, Charles, Retention in Grade: Lethal Lessons, ERIC, ED361122, 1993.
- Spindler, G.G., Why Have Minority Groups in North America been Disadvantaged in their Schools. Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches (2nd Ed., 160-172) Prospect Heights, IL, 1987.
- Strother, Deborah Burnett, "Dropping Out," Phi-Delta-Kappa, Vol. 88, (4), December, 1986. 1986.
- Sween, Joyce and Kyle, Charles L., Chicago Public High School: How Their Students' Low Income, Reading Scores, and Attendance Rates Relate to Dropout Level and Type of School, First Report to the Illinois State Board of Higher Education, 1987.
- U.S. General Accounting Office, School Dropouts: Survey of Local Programs. Report to Congressional Requesters, Gaithersbur, MD: U.S. General Accounting Office, Division of Human Resources, July, 1987.
- Wagonseller, Bill R., Parent Involvement Model for Our Changing Society. Las Vegas, NV., Parent Family Wellness Center, University of Nevada, 1992.
- Walz, Gary R., Combating the School Dropout Problem: Proactive Strategies for School Counselors, Ann Arbor, MI ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, 1987.

Walz, Gary R., The Esteem-Achievement Connection, Ann Arbor, MI ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, 1991.

Wheelage, Gary G., Effective Programs for the Marginal High School Students, Bloomington, IN: Phi-Delta-Kappa Educational Foundation, 1988.

Wheelock, Anne and Dorman, Gayle, Before It's Too Late: Dropout Prevention in the Middle Grades, Carrboro, NC: Center for Early Adolescence, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, August, 1988.

Wheelock, Anne, The Way Out: Exclusion Practices in Boston Middle Schools. A Report by the Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Massachusetts Advocacy Center, Boston, 1986.

Willis, Harriet Doss, Students at Risk: A Review of Conditions, Circumstances, Indicators, and Educational Implications, Elmhurst IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, October, 1986.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").