

MEMORANDUM

To: Eric Witherspoon, Superintendent

From: Judith Levinson, Director of Research, Evaluation & Assessment
Carrie Livingston, Senior Research Associate

Date: September 8, 2011

Subject: HUMANITIES EVALUATION

When the new model for Freshman Humanities was put into place, the administration directed that the program be evaluated over a three-year period. Based on this directive, an evaluation plan was developed around the overall goals of the new Freshman Humanities program: to prepare more students, particularly students of color, to take honors level courses; and to improve the achievement of all students in English and History. This report provides data from all three years of the study.

Mixed-Level Freshman Humanities

Evaluation: Year Three

2010-11

Judith Levinson
Carrie Livingston

Research, Evaluation and Assessment

September 8, 2011

Executive Summary

When the revised model for Freshman Humanities was put into place, the administration directed that the program be evaluated over a three-year period. Based on this directive, an evaluation plan was developed around the overall goals of the revised Freshman Humanities program: 1) to prepare more students, particularly students of color, to take honors level courses; and 2) to improve the achievement of all students in English and History. The plan included the collection of formative and summative information for the purpose of monitoring program implementation, making programmatic improvements, and analyzing overall program effectiveness. This report provides data from all three years under study.

Key Findings

Overall, the data show positive outcomes for the revised mixed-level Freshman Humanities course. The demographic data indicate the program is meeting its objectives, and students and faculty generally provided positive feedback with suggestions for improving the course as it transitions to the newly restructured 1 Humanities program in 2011-12 school year. Key findings from the evaluation, organized around ten objectives, are listed below.

Objective 1: Preparing Students for Honors Classes

The percentage of students in mixed-level Freshman Humanities taking the course for honors credit in 2010-11 continues to be almost double compared to the cohorts prior to 2008-09.

The percentage of students in mixed-level Freshman Humanities taking the course for regular credit is double the percentage of cohorts prior to 2008-09. Under the former model, many of these students would have been assigned to a non-mixed-level Humanities class or to a level below regular (Level 1).

The percentage of students in honors-only classes has remained relatively stable.

A higher percentage of students (total and across ethnic groups) from the 2008-09 and 2009-10 cohorts took honors English and History classes as sophomores and juniors compared to prior cohorts.

Two-thirds of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities received a score on the 3 English AP exam of a 3, 4, or 5. One-third of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities received a score of a 3, 4, or 5 on the US History AP exam. Typically colleges require a score of 3 or higher for college credit.

Objective 2: Increasing the Numbers of Under-represented Students in Honors Freshman Humanities

The mixed-level classes are more diverse and the numbers of Hispanic and Black students have doubled, as well as the numbers of low-income students.

Objective 3: Increasing Diversity of Student Views in Freshman Humanities

Students and faculty survey responses indicated that teachers and students believe that the diversity of mixed-level classes exposes students to a wide range of views. More teachers report “very much” and “a great deal” in 2010-11 than 2008-09 (65% vs. 53%). Responses were significantly higher for students in mixed-level classes than honors-only classes.

Over 80 percent of students in mixed-level and honors-only classes indicated that their teachers expect them to participate in small and large group discussions. When it comes to how often they contribute to discussion, there were significant differences among the groups in English, with honors and mixed-level honors contributing more than mixed-regular students. In History, responses for mixed-level honors and honors-only students were similar and significantly different than mixed-level regular students.

In English, the percentages for honors-only students are significantly higher than mixed-level students with respect to class discussions that are “interesting,” “make me think,” and “provide different points of view.” Honors-only students’ responses to class discussions were significantly lower than mixed-level regular students with respect to “boring.” For History, responses were similar for mixed-level and honors students.

Objective 4: Providing Same Learning Experience in Mixed-Level and Honors Level Freshman Humanities Classes

The same honors-level curriculum is being provided to mixed-level regular, mixed-level honors, and honors-only Freshman Humanities classes. Overall, students in mixed-level classes spent the same amount of time on their work outside of class.

Objective 5: Switching Levels Easily

According to student and teacher feedback, students are able to easily switch levels either by request or teacher recommendation.

Objective 6: Increasing Intellectual Rigor

In the 2009-10 survey, four questions were developed to assess rigor, which were asked again in 2010-11. Comparable percentages of mixed-level and honors students found that the Humanities classes challenged them to do their best work, and taught them to better analyze readings and ideas. A greater percentage of honors-only and mixed-level honors students found the Humanities work make them think deeply about the content than mixed-regular students. Honors-only students found the books and other materials to be more interesting in the Humanities classes than mixed-level students.

Similar to 2009-10, more mixed-level regular students felt their Humanities classes helped them improve in reading and research than students in mixed-level honors. In addition, more students in mixed-level honors classes reported improving in reading and research than honors-only Freshman Humanities students.

Objective 7: Increasing Student Achievement

For semester 1 of 2010-11, the percentages of A/B grades are similar to the percent in the first semester of 2009-10. Similarly, the percentage of D/F/NC grades in the mixed-level regular classes is lower than all prior cohorts.

For this year three report, EXPLORE to PLAN score gains were analyzed for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 cohorts experiencing the revised mixed-level Humanities program. Gains for these cohorts were compared with prior cohorts that were comparable in terms of initial test scores but were taught under the old mixed-level Humanities model. Overall, students made gains from EXPLORE to PLAN. In general, students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and PLAN tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Students who were placed up or moved up into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes. Students who were placed down or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally show smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes.

Similar to the findings in 2009-10, gains were similar for students whether they experienced the revised Humanities program or the former Humanities program. It is important to point out that with the revised program beginning in 2008-09, the number of regular level students in mixed-level classes was greater because of the more inclusive criteria. Even so, the gains of mixed-level honors students remained strong and similar to prior cohorts.

EXPLORE to PLAN to PSAT/ACT score gains were also analyzed for the first 2008-09 cohort. Gains for these cohorts were compared with prior cohorts that were comparable in terms of initial test scores but were taught under the old mixed-level Humanities model. Students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and ACT tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Students who were placed up or moved up into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes, as well as greater average gains than students placed in the honors only level. Students who were placed or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally showed smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes.

Objective 8: Encouraging and Explicitly Teaching Students to Become Successful

Students in both mixed-level and honors only Humanities classes rated themselves high on motivation. Students in honors-only Humanities English and History classes gave significantly higher ratings on motivation than students in mixed-level classes.

Faculty responses were lower for mixed-level regular, higher for mixed-level honors and even higher for honors-only students in terms of student motivation. In 2010-11 there were no differences in responses between English and History teachers.

Objective 9: Increasing Differentiated Instruction

Similar to 2009-10, teachers responded that they are better able to decide when to differentiate instruction. In 2010-11, the major focus of professional development related to the development of new curricula for both English and History in order to implement the restructured English and History Humanities program approved by the Board of Education in winter of 2010-11. Professional development focused on training teachers to map out curriculum aligned to the new Common Core Standards.

Objective 10: Increasing Support Structures

Programs such as STAE, Project EXCEL, AVID, and Freshman Reading were modified in 2008-09 to provide help aligned with the Humanities curricula. When AVID students were asked how much AVID helps them do well in Humanities, about 26 percent of students in mixed-level classes indicated “very much” or “a great deal.” When STAE students were asked how much STAE helps them do well in Humanities, about 17-18 percent of students in mixed-level and honors-only classes indicated “very much,” or “a great deal.”

Satisfaction

A higher percentage of students in honors-only classes than students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied, and in turn, a higher percentage of students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied compared to those in mixed-level regular classes. All of the faculty that responded (100%) felt that the mixed-level model is “somewhat effective” or “very effective” (scale ranges from “not at all effective” to “extremely effective”) for meeting students’ needs. Most faculty members selected “somewhat effective,” which is most likely indicative of concerns over this Humanities model and their interest in the restructured model to be implemented in 2011-12.

Recommendations

As we implement the restructured Humanities model in 2011-12, it is recommended that we monitor the following aspects based on the findings of this three year evaluation process:

- Continue to monitor students' interest and motivation in relation to the new curricula, texts and materials to ensure these texts and materials are interesting to students.
- Continue to monitor students with respect to their skills in reading, research, organization, effective effort, group work, writing, and taking responsibility for their learning.
- Continue to monitor faculty belief systems and expectations to ensure that all teachers hold and communicate high expectations for all students.
- Continue to monitor support structures to ensure that instruction in these courses is directly aligned with the coursework in Freshman Humanities.
- Monitor professional development in the areas of differentiated instruction and its application in the classroom.

Mixed-Level Freshman Humanities Evaluation: Year Three

Background

In the fall of 2008, a revised mixed-level Humanities course was implemented. Under the model, mixed-level Humanities classes were comprised of students enrolled at the regular level and honors level. This model allowed students to experience an honors level curriculum and then easily move up into honors level when they felt confident about doing the work without changing teachers. Elements of the model included:

- a common honors-level curriculum (which is used in both mixed-level and honors-only classes),
- a common grading policy and grading scales,
- common implementation of 5-point rubrics on core assessments,
- common semester exams,
- differentiated instruction, and
- focused student supports.

Prior to 2008, there had been five levels of Humanities courses: Enriched, Regular, Mixed-level Regular, Mixed-level Honors, and Honors-only. With the revision, students formerly qualifying for the regular class were folded into the mixed-level classes resulting in four rather than five levels. The following EXPLORE/MAP percentile ranges were used to place students under the new model:

- Humanities Enriched: 1- 39th %ile
- Mixed-level Humanities Regular: 40-69th %ile
- Mixed-level Humanities Honors: 70-94th %ile
- Honors-only Humanities: 95-99th %ile

Evaluation Overview

When the revised model for Freshman Humanities was put into place, the administration and Board of Education agreed that the course be evaluated over a three-year period. Based on this directive, an evaluation plan was developed around the overall goals of the revised Freshman Humanities program: 1) to prepare more students, particularly students of color, to take honors level courses; and 2) to improve the achievement of all students in English and History. The plan included the collection of formative and summative information for the purpose of monitoring program implementation, making programmatic improvements, and analyzing overall program effectiveness. The evaluation plan called for:

- collection of feedback from students, teachers, and department chairs
- analysis of student performance – EXPLORE-PLAN-ACT test data, course grades, common semester exams
- comparison of demographics and performance of students in the revised Freshman Humanities program to comparable prior cohorts

This report provides data from year three. It provides demographics for the first three cohorts experiencing the revised Freshman Humanities program compared to previous similar cohort groups. Data from honors-only classes are also provided for comparison purposes. In Year 2, two surveys were reworked by a representative group of Humanities teachers and volunteer parents from the Mixed-Level Advisory Committee to collect feedback from students and faculty. These surveys were again used in Year 3. Response rates for these surveys were strong although less than the previous year: 81 percent for the student survey and 80 percent for the faculty survey. Along with demographics and survey data, the report provides data on first semester grades and common semester exams. Two prior cohorts were

identified to serve as comparison groups: the 2006-07 and 2007-08 freshman students in mixed-level and honors Humanities with similar EXPLORE test scores to the 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 Humanities cohorts enrolled in the revised Humanities program.

Criteria for placement into the Freshman mixed-level and honors-only Humanities courses are based in part on students' EXPLORE Reading and MAP Reading scores. This is different than years past where placement was based on a combined EXPLORE Reading and English score, and a MAP score was not part of the placement criteria. To create comparison groups from past freshman cohorts, we identified students who were in regular level and honors level courses whose EXPLORE Reading scores meet the placement criteria, listed below:

- Students with EXPLORE reading scores between 40 and 69 percentile are placed in mixed-level regular classes.
- Students with EXPLORE reading scores between 70 and 94 percentile are placed in mixed-level honors classes.
- Students whose EXPLORE reading scores are at the 95th percentile or above are placed in honors-only classes.

This report is organized around ten objectives, six of which were identified in the Mixed-Level Study conducted in 2005 and updated in discussions with teachers and administrators. These objectives are listed below. A final section focuses on student/faculty satisfaction.

- Objective 1: exposing more students to Humanities honors level classes;
- Objective 2: increasing the numbers of under-represented students in Humanities honors level classes;
- Objective 3: increasing the diversity of views in Humanities classes;
- Objective 4: providing the same learning experience for Humanities students enrolled for regular or honors credit;
- Objective 5: switching levels easily from regular level to honors level credit within mixed-level Humanities classes;
- Objective 6: increasing intellectual rigor in Humanities classes;
- Objective 7: improving student achievement in Humanities classes;
- Objective 8: encouraging and explicitly teaching students how to become successful in English and History classes;
- Objective 9: increasing teachers' understanding and use of differentiated instruction; and
- Objective 10: increasing support structures to help students achieve.

When summarizing the student survey data, students in mixed-level classes (whether enrolled for regular or honors level credit) are reported as a combined group since they generally responded similarly. Where differences occurred among students in mixed-level regular, mixed-level honors, and honors-only classes, they are noted. Statistical tests of significance were used to evaluate differences among groups. Statistically significant results are reported in the text. Appendix A includes the detailed tables for items in which differences among the groups were significant. In the faculty survey, data are disaggregated for some items by mixed-level regular, mixed-level honors and honors-only classes to highlight important differences.

Objective 1: Are we exposing more students to the Humanities honors level classes and preparing more students to take honors level classes in the future?

Overall, we are exposing and preparing more students for honors level classes since we introduced the revised mixed-level Humanities program. In our Year 3 evaluation, we looked at numbers/percentages of

students taking honors courses in English/History Humanities in freshman year over time (Table 1). By year 3, the 2008-09 cohort were juniors while the 2009-10 cohort were sophomores. Therefore, we also looked at subsequent honors coursework that these students took as sophomores (cohorts 08-09 and 09-10) and juniors (cohort 08-09) in English and History (Tables 2-5).

2010-11 Cohort: Numbers/Percentages in Freshman Humanities Honors Classes:

- The number of students in mixed-level classes taking the course for honors credit has increased from 119 (14%¹) and 123 (16%) in 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively, to 229 (26%), 231 (28%), and 257 (33%) respectively in 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11. (Numbers for English and History are slightly different but reflect the same overall picture.)
- The number of students in mixed-level Freshman Humanities enrolled for regular credit has more than doubled from 77 (9%) and 106 (13%) in 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively, to 213 (25%), 199 (24%), and 178 (23%) respectively, in 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11. The students are exposed to an honors curriculum, and it is anticipated that many of these students will enroll in honors courses in subsequent school years. Under the old model, many of these students would have been assigned to a lower level Humanities course in subsequent years.
- The number of students in honors-only classes increased slightly in recent years. Enrollments have ranged from 190 (22%) in 2006-07 and 177 (20%) in 2008-09 to 199 (24%) students in 2009-10 and 201 (26%) students in 2010-11.

Table 1. Freshman Humanities Demographic Summary

	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Mixed-level regular										
Black	31	40%	36	34%	112	53%	112	56%	81	46%
Hispanic	7	9%	15	14%	38	18%	33	17%	53	30%
Low-income	23	30%	27	26%	134	64%	128	64%	122	69%
<i>Total # students</i>	77		106		213		199		178	
Mixed-level honors										
Black	16	13%	33	27%	52	23%	54	23%	57	22%
Hispanic	9	8%	12	10%	22	10%	25	11%	43	17%
Low-income	17	14%	31	25%	57	25%	61	26%	88	34%
<i>Total # students</i>	119		123		229		231		257	
Honors-only										
Black	13	7%	11	7%	11	6%	15	8%	13	6%
Hispanic	4	2%	4	3%	6	3%	5	3%	11	5%
Low-income	11	6%	9	6%	14	8%	17	9%	15	7%
<i>Total # students</i>	190		155		177		199		201	
Total # Honors in Humanities										
Black	29	9%	44	16%	63	16%	69	16%	70	15%
Hispanic	13	4%	16	6%	28	7%	30	7%	54	12%
Low-income	28	9%	40	14%	71	17%	78	18%	103	22%
<i>Total # students</i>	309		278		406		430		458	

¹ Percentage is calculated based on the total freshmen enrollment in any given year as reported in the Opening of School Report.

2009-10 Cohort: Numbers/Percentages in Sophomore English and History Honors Classes

- **Percentage of students progressing to grade 10 honors classes:**
 - Table 2 shows grade 10 data for the 2009-10 cohort as well as comparison group data. A higher percentage of students from the 2009-10 cohort (25%) took honors English classes their sophomore year compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=15%; 2007-08=17%) that were not exposed to the revised Humanities curriculum.
 - Table 3 also shows these percentages by ethnicity; for all subgroups, there was a higher percentage of students from 2009-10 cohorts taking honors English classes than for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 comparison groups.
 - The same pattern is evident for History (Tables 4-5). A higher percentage of students from the 2009-10 cohort (25%) took honors history classes compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=15%; 2007-08=17%) that were not exposed to the revised Freshman Humanities curriculum. This pattern is also evident for all ethnic groups.

2008-09 Cohort: Numbers/Percentages in Sophomore /Junior English and History Honors Classes

- **Percentage of students progressing to grade 10 honors classes:**
 - Table 2 shows grade 10 data for the 2008-09 cohort as well as comparison group data. A higher percentage of students from the 2008-09 cohort (23%²) took honors English classes compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=15%; 2007-08=17%) that were not exposed to the revised Humanities curriculum.
 - Table 3 also shows these percentages by ethnicity; for all subgroups, there was a higher percentage of students from the 2008-09 cohort taking honors English classes in their sophomore year than in prior cohorts.
 - The same pattern is evident for History (Tables 4-5). A higher percentage of students from the 2008-09 cohort (21%) took honors history classes compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=15%; 2007-08=17%) that were not exposed to the revised Freshman Humanities curriculum. This pattern is also evident for all ethnic groups.
- **Percentage of students progressing to grade 11 honors classes:**
 - Table 2 shows grade 11 data for the 2008-09 cohort as well as comparison group data. Again, a higher percentage of students from the 2008-09 cohort (26%) took honors/AP English classes in their junior year compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=20%; 2007-08=17%). Two-thirds of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities received a score on the AP English exam of 3, 4, or 5. One-third of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities

² This figure represents the combined percentage of students taking honors sophomore classes from both mixed-level regular and mixed-level honors Freshman Humanities.

received a score of a 3, 4, or 5 on the US History AP exam. Typically colleges require a score of 3 or higher for college credit.

- For all racial subgroups (Table 3), there were a higher percentage of students from 2008-09 cohorts taking honors/AP English classes their junior year than in prior years.
- The same pattern is evident for History (Tables 4-5). A higher percentage of students from the 2008-09 cohort (26%) took honors/AP history classes compared to the comparison cohorts (2006-07=20%; 2007-08=20%) that were not exposed to the revised Freshman Humanities curriculum. This pattern is also evident for Black and White students.

Table 2. Course Progression: Number/Percent of Students Continuing into Honors-Level English Courses

	Mixed Regular English Cohorts								Mixed Honors English Cohorts							
	06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)		06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade 10	N=746		N=685		N=778		N=774		N=746		N=685		N=778		N=774	
EN0203 - 2 Hum Eng H	9	1%	10	1%	12	2%	9	1%	27	4%	13	2%	16	2%	29	4%
EN0253 - 2 Eng H	16	2%	23	3%	18	2%	20	3%	60	8%	67	10%	133	17%	133	17%
Total Students in Honors	25	3%	33	5%	30	4%	29	4%	87	12%	80	12%	149	19%	162	21%
Grade 11	N=704		N=663		N=722				N=704		N=663		N=722			
EN0113 - Amer Stud Eng H	23	3%	9	1%	11	2%			22	3%	2	0.3%	9	1%		
EN0303 - 3 Eng H	33	5%	36	5%	23	3%			63	9%	41	6%	51	7%		
EN0305 - 3 Eng AP			3	0%	11	2%					31	5%	81	11%		
Total Students in Honors/AP	56	8%	48	6%	45	7%			85	12%	74	11%	141	19%		

Table 3. Course Progression: Number/Percent of Students Continuing into Honors-Level English Courses by Ethnicity

	Mixed Regular English Cohorts								Mixed Honors English Cohorts							
	06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)		06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade 10																
Black (N=271, N=253, N=272, N=246)																
EN0203 - 2 Hum Eng H	6	2%	6	2%	7	3%	4	2%	6	2%	9	4%	4	1%	6	2%
EN0253 - 2 Eng H	9	3%	8	3%	11	4%	7	3%	4	1%	8	3%	23	8%	19	8%
Hispanic (N=86, N=89, N=107, N=113)																
EN0203 - 2 Hum Eng H	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	2	2%
EN0253 - 2 Eng H	1	1%	2	2%	2	2%	4	4%	4	5%	3	3%	12	11%	9	8%
White (N=347, N=286, N=351, N=333)																
EN0203 - 2 Hum Eng H	2	1%	0	0%	4	1%	5	2%	20	6%	2	1%	9	3%	18	5%
EN0253 - 2 Eng H	6	2%	13	5%	4	1%	8	2%	49	14%	51	18%	92	26%	86	26%
Grade 11																
Black (N=238, N=242, N=233)																
EN0113 - Amer Stud Eng H	14	6%	5	2%	7	3%			2	1%	0	0%	3	1%		
EN0303 - 3 Eng H	21	9%	18	7%	14	6%			8	3%	2	1%	7	3%		
EN0305 - 3 Eng AP	NA	NA	1	0.4%	3	1%			NA	NA	10	4%	16	7%		
Hispanic (N=72, N=84, N=119)																
EN0113 - Amer Stud Eng H	3	4%	1	1%	2	2%			2	3%	0	0%	2	2%		
EN0303 - 3 Eng H	2	3%	1	1%	0	0%			2	3%	3	4%	8	7%		
EN0305 - 3 Eng AP	NA	NA	1	1%	2	2%			NA	NA	1	1%	5	4%		
White (N=351, N=280, N=328)																
EN0113 - Amer Stud Eng H	5	1%	1	0.4%	2	1%			16	5%	2	1%	3	1%		
EN0303 - 3 Eng H	10	3%	14	5%	7	2%			51	15%	32	11%	32	10%		
EN0305 - 3 Eng AP	NA	NA	1	0.4%	6	2%			NA	NA	19	7%	59	18%		

*N represents the total number of students at each grade level during each school year

*N = (06-07 cohort, 07-08 cohort, 08-09 cohort)

Table 4. Course Progression: Number and Percent Continuing into Honors-Level History Courses

	Mixed Regular History Cohorts				Mixed Honors History Cohorts											
	06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)		06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade 10	N=746		N=685		N=778		N=774		N=746		N=685		N=778		N=774	
HS5203 - 2 Hum HSS H	8	1%	7	1%	12	2%	9	1%	26	3%	13	2%	18	2%	29	4%
HS3253 - Afr Hist H	16	2%	10	1%	5	1%	4	1%	13	2%	7	1%	15	2%	26	3%
HS3353 - Asian Stud H	3	0.4%	5	1%	5	1%	4	1%	12	2%	13	2%	24	3%	25	3%
HS3403 - Lat Amer Stud H	4	1%	3	0.4%	6	1%	8	1%	14	2%	10	1%	25	3%	32	4%
HS3453 - Middle East H	3	0.4%	8	1%	1	0%	1	0.1%	10	1%	18	3%	25	3%	16	2%
HS3503 - Russia H	1	0.1%	3	0.4%	1	0%	2	0.3%	6	1%	11	2%	23	3%	35	5%
HS0063 - Pacific Rim H			4	1%							3	0.4%				
Total Students in Honors	35	4%	40	6%	30	4%	28	4%	81	11%	75	11%	130	17%	163	21%
Grade 11	N=704		N=663		N=722				N=704		N=663		N=722			
HS0103 - US Hist H	26	4%	42	6%	31	4%			35	5%	38	6%	89	12%		
HS0105 - US Hist AP	8	1%	11	2%	4	1%			31	4%	35	5%	41	6%		
HS5113 - Amer Stud HSS H	23	3%	9	1%	11	2%			20	3%	2	0.3%	9	1%		
Total Students in Honors/AP	57	8%	62	9%	46	7%			86	12%	75	11%	139	19%		

Table 5. Course Progression: Number and Percent Continuing into Honors-Level History Courses by Ethnicity

	Mixed Regular History Cohorts				Mixed Honors History Cohorts											
	06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)		06-07 (Old Hum. Program)		07-08 (Old Hum. Program)		08-09 (Revised Hum. Program)		09-10 (Revised Hum. Program)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Grade 10	N=271, N=253, N=272, N=246		N=86, N=89, N=107, N=113		N=347, N=286, N=351, N=333				N=238, N=242, N=233		N=72, N=84, N=119		N=351, N=280, N=328			
Black (N=271, N=253, N=272, N=246)																
HS5203 - 2 Hum HSS H	5	2%	5	2%	8	3%	4	2%	6	2%	9	4%	4	1%	6	2%
HS3253 - Afr Hist H	8	3%	5	2%	4	1%	3	1%	1	0.4%	2	1%	5	2%	6	2%
HS3353 - Asian Stud H	1	0.4%	1	0%	1	0.4%	0	0%	1	0.4%	1	0%	4	1%	5	2%
HS3403 - Lat Amer Stud H	2	1%	1	0%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%	2	1%	4	1%	7	3%
HS3453 - Middle East H	1	0.4%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%
HS3503 - Russia H	0	0%	1	0%	1	0.4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0.4%	2	1%
HS0063 - Pacific Rim H			1	0.4%							0	0%				
Hispanic (N=86, N=89, N=107, N=113)																
HS5203 - 2 Hum HSS H	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	2	2%
HS3253 - Afr Hist H	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%
HS3353 - Asian Stud H	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	2	2%
HS3403 - Lat Amer Stud H	1	1%	0	0%	2	2%	3	3%	3	3%	0	0%	6	6%	1	1%
HS3453 - Middle East H	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	2	2%	1	1%
HS3503 - Russia H	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%
HS0063 - Pacific Rim H			1	1%							1	1%				
White (N=347, N=286, N=351, N=333)																
HS5203 - 2 Hum HSS H	2	1%	0	0%	4	1%	5	2%	19	5%	2	1%	9	3%	18	5%
HS3253 - Afr Hist H	7	2%	5	2%	1	0.3%	1	0%	12	3%	4	1%	8	2%	17	5%
HS3353 - Asian Stud H	2	1%	3	1%	2	1%	3	1%	9	3%	10	3%	18	5%	12	4%
HS3403 - Lat Amer Stud H	1	0.3%	2	1%	2	1%	4	1%	11	3%	7	2%	14	4%	18	5%
HS3453 - Middle East H	1	0.3%	6	2%	0	0%	1	0%	9	3%	17	6%	20	6%	13	4%
HS3503 - Russia H	1	0.3%	1	0%	0	0%	2	1%	4	1%	9	3%	18	5%	25	8%
HS0063 - Pacific Rim H			2	1%							2	1%				
Grade 11																
Black (N=238, N=242, N=233)																
HS0103 - US Hist H	15	6%	16	7%	17	7%			5	2%	6	2%	16	7%		
HS0105 - US Hist AP	3	1%	3	1%	3	1%			3	1%	6	2%	7	3%		
HS5113 - Amer Stud HSS H	14	6%	5	2%	7	3%			2	1%	0	0%	3	1%		
Hispanic (N=72, N=84, N=119)																
HS0103 - US Hist H	3	4%	8	10%	2	2%			4	6%	5	6%	9	8%		
HS0105 - US Hist AP	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%			0	0%	0	0%	3	3%		
HS5113 - Amer Stud HSS H	3	4%	1	1%	2	2%			2	3%	0	0%	2	2%		
White (N=351, N=280, N=328)																
HS0103 - US Hist H	8	2%	14	5%	10	3%			26	7%	24	9%	61	19%		
HS0105 - US Hist AP	4	1%	6	2%	0	0%			26	7%	27	10%	29	9%		
HS5113 - Amer Stud HSS H	5	1%	1	0.4%	2	1%			14	4%	2	1%	3	1%		

*N represents the total number of students at each grade level during each school year

*N = (06-07 cohort, 07-08 cohort, 08-09 cohort)

Objective 2: Are we increasing the numbers of under-represented students in honors Humanities classes?

We have increased the number of under-represented Black, Hispanic, and low-income students in honors Humanities classes.

- Using first semester enrollments, Table 1 (provided under Objective 1) shows that the total number of Black students at the honors level increased from 29 students (9%) in 2006-07 to 69 (16%) students in 2009-10 and 70 students (15%) in 2010-11.
- The total number of Hispanic students at the honors level increased from 13 students (4%) in 2006-07 to 30 students (7%) in 2009-10 and 54 students (12%) in 2010-11.
- The total number of low-income students at the honors level increased from 28 students (9%) in 2006-07 to 78 students (18%) in 2009-10 and 103 students (22%) in 2010-11.

Objective 3: Are we increasing the diversity of student views in the Freshman Humanities course?

Several items on the faculty and student surveys were used to examine this objective. The items and percentages of student/faculty responses relating to diversity of students' views are shown below in Table 6. The table provides the percentages for each response option as well as a percentage for "positive responses ("Very much" and "A great deal") and a percentage for "negative responses ("Not at all" and "Not too much").

Table 6. Diversity of Student Views

<i>Student Survey item</i>		Not at all	Not too much	Somewhat	Very much	A great deal	Positive Response	Negative Response
How much does the diversity of students in your Humanities class expose you to a wide range of views?								
Mixed-level (n=412)	2008-09	9%	17%	39%	24%	11%	35%	26%
(n=369)	2009-10	8%	15%	38%	29%	10%	39%	23%
(n=328)	2010-11	7%	14%	40%	25%	13%	38%	21%
Honors-only								
(n=169)	2008-09	27%	40%	25%	6%	2%	8%	67%
(n=189)	2009-10	18%	30%	37%	12%	4%	16%	48%
(n=173)	2010-11	17%	31%	27%	17%	8%	25%	48%
<i>Faculty Survey Item</i>								
How much does the diversity of students in mixed-level classes contribute to exposing students to a wide range of views?								
(n=17)	2008-09	0%	0%	47%	47%	6%	53%	0%
(n=20)	2009-10	0%	10%	20%	40%	30%	70%	10%
(n=17)	2010-11	0%	0%	35%	35%	30%	65%	0%

For 2010-11:

- The data suggest that more students in mixed-level classes than honors-only classes feel that the diversity of the students in the class exposes them to a wide range of views. Responses were significantly higher for students in mixed-level than honors-only classes as measured by a chi-square test of significance, $\chi^2_{(10, N=506)} = 44.76, p < .001$.

- More teachers selected “very much” and “a great deal” when asked how much the diversity of students in mixed-level classes contribute to exposing students to a wide range of views in both 2010-11 (65%) and 2009-10 (70%) compared to 2008-09 (53%).

Several related questions asked students about class discussion. Results are shown below in Table 7.

Table 7. Class Discussion

<i>Student Survey</i>		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Most of the time	All of the time	Positive Response	Negative Response	
How often do you contribute to the class discussion in your English or History class?									
English class									
Mixed-level (n=420)	2008-09	2%	14%	37%	28%	19%	47%	16%	
(n=371)	2009-10	1%	14%	39%	33%	14%	47%	15%	
(n=327)	2010-11	3%	16%	35%	33%	13%	46%	19%	
Honors-only (n=171)	2008-09	1%	9%	33%	39%	19%	58%	10%	
(n=187)	2009-10	1%	11%	24%	39%	26%	65%	12%	
(n=169)	2010-11	1%	10%	30%	37%	23%	60%	11%	
History class									
Mixed-level (n=416)	2008-09	2%	17%	30%	32%	19%	51%	19%	
(n=367)	2009-10	2%	13%	40%	29%	16%	45%	15%	
(n=325)	2010-11	4%	15%	36%	27%	18%	45%	19%	
Honors-only (n=169)	2008-09	1%	9%	31%	36%	23%	59%	10%	
(n=186)	2009-10	4%	15%	30%	32%	19%	51%	19%	
(n=168)	2010-11	2%	7%	35%	36%	20%	56%	9%	
<i>Student Survey</i>		1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 - Strongly agree	Avg.	Positive Response	Negative Response
My Humanities classes expect me to participate in small and large group discussions.									
Mixed-level (n=372)	2009-10	2%	5%	13%	25%	56%	4.29	81%	7%
(n=331)	2010-11	3%	3%	13%	29%	52%	4.26	81%	6%
Honors-only (n=189)	2009-10	0%	2%	10%	29%	60%	4.46	89%	2%
(n=170)	2010-11	1%	1%	7%	27%	65%	4.55	92%	2%
<i>Student Survey</i>		Mixed-level			Honors-only				
<i>On a scale where 1 represents "strongly disagree" and 5 represents "strongly agree"</i>		2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11		
English discussions are...		Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.		
Interesting		3.39	3.33	3.24	3.45	3.96	3.81		
Make me think		3.53	3.54	3.55	3.47	3.93	3.85		
Provide different points of view		3.85	3.81	3.84	3.98	4.19	4.09		
Boring		2.75	2.82	3.01	2.68	2.31	2.52		
Add to my knowledge of the topic		2.17	3.76	3.71	2.16	3.85	3.84		
History discussions are...									
Interesting		3.38	3.44	3.43	3.71	3.45	3.60		
Make me think		3.56	3.64	3.67	3.62	3.54	3.58		
Provide different points of view		3.77	3.68	3.96	3.83	3.61	3.85		
Boring		2.79	3.02	2.94	2.43	2.86	2.63		
Add to my knowledge of the topic		2.30	3.81	3.85	1.96	3.83	3.92		

For 2010-11:

- For both mixed-level and honors-only classes, 80 percent or more of students indicated that their teachers expect them to participate in small and large group discussions.
- When it comes to how often students contributed to discussion, there were significant differences among the groups for English with honors and mixed-level honors contributing more than mixed-level regular students, $\chi^2_{(10, N=506)} = 41.33, p < .001$. In History, responses for mixed-level

honors and honors-only students were similar and significantly different than mixed-level regular students, $\chi^2_{(10, N=506)} = 54.20, p < .001$

- Students were also asked for feedback on the attributes of class discussions on a 5-point scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree.” For History, responses were similar for mixed-level and honors students. However, for English, the percentages for honors-only students were significantly higher than mixed-level honors students, and in turn, mixed-level honors students were significantly higher than mixed-level regular students with respect to “interesting,” and “provide different points of view.”³ Honors-only student responses were significantly higher than mixed-level with respect to “make me think” $\chi^2_{(8, N=503)} = 16.93, p = .031$. Honors-only students responses were significantly lower than mixed-level regular and mixed-level honors students with respect to “boring” $\chi^2_{(8, N=499)} = 28.70, p < .001$.

Objective 4: Are we providing the same learning experience for students whether enrolled for regular or honors credit?

The revised Freshman Humanities course provides the same honors level curriculum to the mixed-level classes and the honors-only classes. A review of the curricula for the Freshman Humanities program in the first year evaluation report substantiated this focus.

For the 2008-09 survey, students were asked to rate the amount of work assigned in their course. Results from this question were difficult to interpret. The question was reworked for the 2009-10 survey. Students were asked to assess how much time they spend on various activities as shown in Table 8.

³ Interesting: $\chi^2_{(8, N=503)} = 55.07, p < .001$; Provides different points of view: $\chi^2_{(8, N=500)} = 23.14, p = .003$.

Table 8. Amount of Work

		No time at all	Very little time	Some amount of time	A lot of time	Positive Response	Negative Response	
How much time do you spend outside of class on the following activities for your English class?								
Doing homework								
Mixed-level	(n=375)	2009-10	2%	15%	63%	19%	82%	17%
	(n=330)	2010-11	3%	20%	57%	19%	76%	23%
Honors-only	(n=189)	2009-10	1%	21%	64%	15%	79%	22%
	(n=172)	2010-11	4%	28%	51%	18%	69%	32%
Studying for tests								
Mixed-level	(n=374)	2009-10	13%	44%	36%	8%	44%	57%
	(n=330)	2010-11	15%	42%	34%	9%	43%	57%
Honors-only	(n=189)	2009-10	18%	42%	33%	7%	40%	60%
	(n=171)	2010-11	19%	42%	31%	8%	39%	61%
Completing projects/essays								
Mixed-level	(n=375)	2009-10	0%	9%	41%	50%	91%	9%
	(n=329)	2010-11	3%	9%	43%	45%	88%	12%
Honors-only	(n=189)	2009-10	0%	4%	40%	56%	96%	4%
	(n=171)	2010-11	1%	9%	35%	56%	91%	10%
Completing assigned readings								
Mixed-level	(n=375)	2009-10	3%	20%	56%	21%	77%	23%
	(n=328)	2010-11	4%	22%	52%	22%	74%	26%
Honors-only	(n=189)	2009-10	1%	20%	59%	20%	79%	21%
	(n=172)	2010-11	4%	26%	48%	23%	71%	30%
Studying for a semester exam								
Mixed-level	(n=375)	2009-10	8%	18%	37%	37%	74%	26%
	(n=329)	2010-11	7%	20%	40%	33%	73%	27%
Honors-only	(n=188)	2009-10	5%	28%	36%	31%	67%	33%
	(n=171)	2010-11	8%	16%	46%	30%	76%	24%
How much time do you spend outside of class on the following activities for your History class?								
Doing homework								
Mixed-level	(n=372)	2009-10	4%	24%	55%	17%	72%	28%
	(n=329)	2010-11	3%	24%	58%	15%	73%	27%
Honors-only	(n=190)	2009-10	3%	27%	55%	15%	70%	30%
	(n=172)	2010-11	2%	33%	54%	11%	65%	35%
Studying for tests								
Mixed-level	(n=372)	2009-10	14%	40%	36%	10%	46%	54%
	(n=328)	2010-11	10%	35%	45%	10%	55%	45%
Honors-only	(n=190)	2009-10	16%	38%	37%	10%	47%	54%
	(n=172)	2010-11	16%	30%	41%	13%	54%	46%
Completing projects/essays								
Mixed-level	(n=371)	2009-10	1%	13%	45%	42%	87%	14%
	(n=329)	2010-11	3%	11%	48%	38%	86%	14%
Honors-only	(n=187)	2009-10	2%	7%	53%	39%	92%	9%
	(n=172)	2010-11	2%	11%	44%	44%	88%	13%
Completing assigned readings								
Mixed-level	(n=372)	2009-10	7%	28%	50%	15%	65%	35%
	(n=328)	2010-11	7%	27%	52%	13%	65%	34%
Honors-only	(n=190)	2009-10	6%	33%	51%	11%	62%	39%
	(n=172)	2010-11	11%	32%	43%	14%	57%	43%
Studying for a semester exam								
Mixed-level	(n=372)	2009-10	9%	19%	36%	36%	72%	28%
	(n=326)	2010-11	8%	21%	41%	31%	72%	29%
Honors-only	(n=190)	2009-10	6%	22%	38%	34%	72%	28%
	(n=172)	2010-11	8%	13%	43%	36%	79%	21%

For 2010-11:

- Overall, students in mixed-level classes spent the same amount of time on their work outside of class (e.g., doing homework, studying for tests, completing projects/essays, completing assigned readings, and studying for a semester exam) as honors-only students. On a scale from “no time at all,” “very little time,” “some amount of time,” and “a lot of time,” generally 70 percent or more of students chose “some amount of time” or “a lot of time” except “studying for tests.” For this item, between 50 and 60 percent selected “very little time” or “no time at all.”

Objective 5: Are students able to switch between mixed-level regular and mixed-level honors level credit?

Students can request a level change, and teachers may recommend level changes. English and History teachers reported that between 10 and 16 (6% to 9 %) students requested a change from mixed-level regular to mixed-level honors. Three students requested a move from honors credit to regular credit in mixed-level classes in English. All in all, including student and teacher requests, English teachers reported that they recommended 32 students (18%) move from mixed-level regular to mixed-level honors credit; these teachers reported recommending 4 students move from honors to regular credit. History teachers reported that they recommended 9 students (5%) move from mixed-level regular to mixed-level honors credit; they did not recommend any students to move from honors to regular credit. Since no teacher change is necessary, these changes are easily accomplished.

Objective 6: Are we increasing the intellectual rigor of the course experience?

The year one study on Freshman Humanities reported that the following changes in the Freshman Humanities course (as documented in the curriculum) suggest an increase in intellectual rigor. For example,

- a common honors curriculum provided to all students whether enrolled in mixed-level or honors-only classes;
- common grading criteria and common scales for regular and honors levels; and
- administration of common semester exams for the Humanities courses.

For the 2008-09 survey, students were asked the extent to which the Freshman Humanities course challenged them. Results from this question were difficult to interpret. The question was reworked for the 2009-10 survey using the definitions about rigor provided in the February 22, 2010 report to the ETHS Board of Education entitled “Defining Rigor.” These same questions were asked of students in the 2010-11 survey. Students were asked four questions using a 5-point scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree” as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Rigor

Student Survey	1-Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5- Strongly Agree	Avg.
My Humanities classes challenge me to do my best work.						
Mixed-level (n=370) 2009-10	3%	11%	32%	35%	20%	3.57
Mixed-level (n=331) 2010-11	4%	9%	32%	33%	22%	3.59
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	3%	13%	22%	37%	25%	3.68
Honors-only (n=173) 2010-11	4%	10%	24%	35%	27%	3.73
The books and other materials in my Humanities classes are interesting to me.						
Mixed-level (n=370) 2009-10	11%	20%	35%	23%	11%	3.02
Mixed-level (n=331) 2010-11	9%	27%	30%	24%	11%	3.01
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	3%	15%	31%	35%	16%	3.48
Honors-only (n=173) 2010-11	4%	18%	31%	30%	18%	3.40
The work in my Humanities classes makes me think deeply about the content.						
Mixed-level (n=370) 2009-10	8%	22%	34%	25%	12%	3.11
Mixed-level (n=331) 2010-11	7%	21%	33%	26%	13%	3.16
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	5%	16%	34%	33%	13%	3.33
Honors-only (n=173) 2010-11	5%	20%	26%	27%	22%	3.41
My Humanities classes have taught me to better analyze readings and ideas.						
Mixed-level (n=370) 2009-10	4%	15%	26%	31%	24%	3.56
Mixed-level (n=331) 2010-11	6%	12%	31%	30%	22%	3.5
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	5%	10%	20%	42%	24%	3.69
Honors-only (n=173) 2010-11	4%	12%	23%	31%	30%	3.72

For 2010-11:

- Ratings were comparable for the mixed-level and honors-only students for two items: “challenge me to do my best work” and “better analyze readings and ideas.” These results differ from a year ago when results were comparable for all items except “interest level for books and other materials.”
 - For the item “makes me think deeply,” there were significant differences among the groups with more honors-only and mixed-level honors students indicating that Humanities work makes them think deeply about content than mixed-level regular students, $\chi^2_{(8,N=501)} = 15.62, p = .048$.
 - There were also significant differences among the groups for the item relating to the interest level for books and other materials. Honors-only students found the books/materials to be more interesting than mixed-level honors students, and in turn, more mixed-level honors students found books/materials interesting than mixed-level regular students, $\chi^2_{(8,N=503)} = 19.84, p = .011$.
 - In general, over 80% or more of both mixed-level and honors-only students gave a rating of “3” or higher to being challenged to do their best work, and learning to better analyze readings and ideas. Approximately fifty percent selected a “4” or “5” for these items.

Objective 7: Are we increasing the level of student achievement?

Several sources of data were used to provide information on student achievement in the Humanities course including grades, results from the common semester exam, selected student survey items, and longitudinal analyses of student growth from Explore to PLAN and from EXPLORE to ACT.

Grades

When the revised Humanities program was implemented, the following changes were put into place that may have directly or indirectly affected grades:

- With the revised curriculum in 2008-09, students in the regular-level classes are taught the same curriculum that students in the honors level classes receive. This adds to the rigor of the course.
- Since 2008-09, the Freshman Humanities classes have a common semester exam, which is reflected in the semester grade.
- In addition, there are common grading scales for Humanities classes.
- The number of students in the mixed-level classes has doubled. More students are now exposed to the honors curriculum, and more students have the option of moving up from a regular-level course to an honors-level course. In the past, some of these students were placed in a course called Freshman Humanities Level 2 (regular level) or Level 1.

Tables 10 and 11 show first semester grades for the three recent Freshman Humanities mixed-level cohorts that experienced the revised program along with the 2006-07 and 2007-08 comparison cohort groups.

Table 10. Semester Grades - English

	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Mixed-level Regular (EN4012/EN0002)										
A/B	62	47%	60	45%	32	27%	50	40%	35	41%
C	45	34%	38	28%	41	34%	45	36%	35	41%
D/F/NC	25	19%	36	27%	47	40%	30	24%	15	18%
Total	132		134		120		125		85	
Mixed-Level Honors (EN4013)										
A/B	81	88%	72	85%	125	76%	150	86%	157	80%
C	7	8%	9	11%	22	13%	16	9%	24	12%
D/F/NC	4	4%	4	5%	17	11%	8	5%	15	8%
Total	92		85		164		174		196	

Table 11. Semester Grades – History

	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Mixed-level Regular (HS4012/HS5002)										
A/B	59	44%	64	48%	43	35%	49	40%	40	47%
C	43	32%	47	35%	37	30%	46	37%	32	38%
D/F/NC	31	23%	22	17%	44	35%	29	23%	13	15%
Total	133		133		124		124		85	
Mixed-Level Honors (HS4013)										
A/B	78	86%	72	87%	118	72%	142	82%	156	81%
C	11	12%	9	11%	34	21%	25	15%	23	12%
D/F/NC	2	2%	2	2%	12	7%	6	3%	13	7%
Total	91		83		164		173		192	

- The data for the 2010-11 cohort continues to be positive compared to the first year of implementation in 2008-09. In 2008-09, the baseline year of the revised curriculum, there were fewer A/B grades and more D/F grades both in History and English than in prior years

before the revised Humanities program. It was suggested that this decline was in part due to the implementation of a new program. Similar to the first semester of 2009-10, the 2010-11 first semester percentages of A/B grades were higher for English and History than in 2008-09 and were back to the levels prior to implementing the revised mixed-level curriculum. Likewise, the percentage of D/F/NC grades were lower than 2008-09.

Common Exam

The 2010-11 school year was the third year that common semester exams were administered to students in Freshman Humanities English and History classes. These exams included both a multiple-choice test and an essay test. For the multiple choice portion, the departments utilized a software program which allowed teachers to scan and grade the multiple choice exam and analyze the scores in a variety of ways, including using general item analyses and item analyses by concepts/skill areas. The teachers in both the English and History departments were able to use the item analyses to determine areas of strength and weakness, as well as to review item statistics (distribution of scores, reliability coefficients, etc.). The item analyses provided a means for teachers to look at incorrect responses to understand students’ misconceptions. The overall average score for the multiple-choice portion of the English common exam was 77.5% compared to 81.5% in 2009-10 and 75.0% in 2008-09. The overall average score for the multiple-choice portion of the History common exam was 70.9% compared to 71.5% in 2009-10 and 70% in 2008-09.

EXPLORE to PLAN Analysis of Gains

One of the long-term objectives of the Humanities evaluation was to look at test score gains for each cohort from the EXPLORE test taken in grade 8 by students prior to entering freshman year to the PLAN test taken at the beginning of sophomore year to the ACT test taken at the end of students’ junior year. For this year three report, we now have EXPLORE and PLAN scores for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 cohorts and we have EXPLORE, PLAN and ACT scores for the 2008-09 cohort. We compared the performance for these cohorts that experienced the revised mixed-level Humanities program with prior cohorts identified as comparable in terms of initial test scores but were taught under the old mixed-level Humanities program.

In this analysis, we compared sophomore PLAN reading subtest results of the different cohorts, some experiencing the old Humanities program (2006-07 and 2007-08) and some experiencing the revised Humanities program (2008-09 and 2009-10). An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to look at the differences in average PLAN reading scores among the four cohorts: 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010. The 2007 and 2008 cohorts serve as the control group for the evaluation. Taking into account the initial EXPLORE scores for the cohorts, the ANCOVA showed that there were no significant differences among the mixed-level regular students’ average PLAN reading scores across the cohorts. There were also no significant differences among the mixed-level honors students’ average PLAN reading scores across the cohorts. Tables 12a and 12b reports the mean PLAN reading scores for each cohort and the adjusted mean PLAN reading scores for each cohort once the analysis controlled for the initial EXPLORE reading scores of these groups.

Table 12a. Mixed-level Regular Students’ Adjusted PLAN (Grade 10) Reading Score

<i>School Year</i>	<i>Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Adjusted Avg. Scale Score</i>
2006-2007 (N=115)	15.1	15.1
2007-2008 (N=115)	15.8	15.9
2008-2009 (N=114)	14.9	15.0
2009-2010 (N=115)	15.4	15.4

Table 12b. Mixed-level Honors Students' Adjusted PLAN (Grade 10) Reading Score

<i>School Year</i>	<i>Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Adjusted Avg. Scale Score</i>
2006-2007 (N=88)	20.8	20.7
2007-2008 (N=80)	20.4	20.3
2008-2009 (N=161)	20.0	20.1
2009-2010 (N=165)	20.5	20.6

We further disaggregated cohort data by the following placement groups:

- Mixed-level regular Humanities (EXPLORE percentiles 40-69)
- Mixed-level honors Humanities (EXPLORE percentiles 70-94)
- Placed up into mixed-level honors Humanities from mixed-level regular Humanities
- Placed down into mixed-level regular Humanities from mixed-level honors Humanities

One of the advantages of the mixed-level Humanities course is the fluidity between the levels. Students can place themselves up into mixed-level honors or place themselves down from mixed-level honors into mixed-level regular Humanities. Teachers can recommend level changes as well. Table 12 shows the average scale score for the EXPLORE and PLAN tests and the gains for these placement/cohort groups.

Table 13. Mixed-level Students' Gain Between Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 10 (PLAN) Reading Achievement by Placement Group

<i>Placement Group</i>	<i>Grade 8 Av. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 10 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Gain</i>
Mixed Regular Level			
2006-2007 (N=115)	13.2	15.1	1.9
2007-2008 (N=115)	13.0	15.8	2.8
2008-2009 (N=114)	13.0	14.9	1.9
2009-2010 (N=115)	13.1	15.4	2.3
Mixed Honors Level			
2006-2007 (N=88)	17.1	20.8	3.7
2007-2008 (N=80)	17.2	20.4	3.2
2008-2009 (N=161)	17.0	20.0	3.0
2009-2010 (N=165)	16.9	20.5	3.6
Placed Up into Mixed Honors Level			
2006-2007 (N=14)	13.4	18.4	5.0
2007-2008 (N=20)	13.5	16.5	3.0
2008-2009 (N=42)	13.4	17.9	4.5
2009-2010 (N=44)	13.3	17.2	3.9
Placed Down into Mixed Regular Level			
2006-2007 (N=76)	16.0	18.4	2.4
2007-2008 (N=72)	16.0	18.2	2.2
2008-2009 (N=26)	16.5	17.4	0.9
2009-2010 (N=13)	16.0	17.1	1.1
Note: "Correctly Placed Mixed Regular" means students in 2006-07 & 2007-08 = EN0002 & EN4012 combined and 2008-09 = EN4012 only meeting EXP Reading percentile criteria of 40-69			
Note: "Correctly Placed Mixed Honors" means students in EN4013 only meeting EXP Reading percentile criteria of 70-94			

In general, students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and PLAN tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Students who were placed up or moved up into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes. Students who were placed or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally showed smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes. A repeated measures analysis of variance was applied to the data to determine if there were significant differences from pretest to post-test between placement groups. For each group of students, the gain between the EXPLORE test (pretest) and PLAN test (posttest) in reading performance was statistically significant. (See Table 14 below.) There were no significant interactions between the reading scores and cohort groups.

Table 14. Statistics for Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance

<i>Placement Group</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Correctly placed into Mixed Regular	1117.1	1	229.5	<.001
Correctly placed into Mixed Honors	2515.6	1	467.9	<.001
Placed up into Mixed Honors	799.31	1	110.5	<.001
Placed down into Mixed Regular	184.25	1	34.48	<.001

Furthermore, there were no significant differences in the gain scores among the placement groups for each cohort. In other words, gains were similar for students whether they experienced the revised Humanities program or the former Humanities program. It is important to point out that with the revised program beginning in 2008-09, the number of regular level students in mixed-level classes was greater because of the more inclusive criteria. Even so, the gains of mixed-level honors students remained strong and similar to prior cohorts.

It was pointed out in last year's evaluation that the 2008-09 mixed-level regular cohort did not show stronger gains than the prior comparison groups. In that report, it was stated that one might anticipate greater gains for the mixed-level regular students in upcoming cohorts. The gain data for the 2009-10 cohort bears this out. There were larger gains for students at the mixed-level regular level and honors level than in the previous year.

EXPLORE to PLAN to ACT Analysis of Gains

Students in the 2008-09 cohort are the first ones to have gone experienced the revised 1 Humanities model and taken the PSAE/ACT. Similar to the EXPLORE to PLAN analysis, students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and ACT tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Furthermore, students in the mixed-level honors level and the honors-only level have the same reading score gain of 8.0 points between the EXPLORE and PSAE/ACT. (See Tables 15a-15c below.)

Table 15a. Mixed-level Regular Students' Gain Between Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 11 (PSAE/ACT) Reading Achievement

<i>School Year</i>	<i>Grade 8 Av. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 10 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 11 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PLAN (Gr. 10) Gain</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PSAE/ACT (Gr. 11) Gain</i>
2006-2007 (N=104)	13.2	15.2	18.8	2.0	5.6
2007-2008 (N=108)	13.0	15.7	18.5	2.7	5.5
2008-2009 (N=104)	13.1	15.1	17.7	2.0	4.6

Table 15b. Mixed-level Honors Students' Gain Between Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 11 (PSAE/ACT) Reading Achievement

<i>School Year</i>	<i>Grade 8 Av. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 10 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 11 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PLAN (Gr. 10) Gain</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PSAE/ACT (Gr. 11) Gain</i>
2006-2007 (N=86)	17.1	20.8	26.9	3.7	9.8
2007-2008 (N=75)	17.3	20.5	24.6	3.2	7.3
2008-2009 (N=146)	17.0	20.0	25.0	3.0	8.0

Table 15c. Honors-Only Students' Gain Between Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 11 (PSAE/ACT) Reading Achievement

<i>School Year</i>	<i>Grade 8 Av. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 10 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 11 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PLAN (Gr. 10) Gain</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PSAE/ACT (Gr. 11) Gain</i>
2006-2007 (N=110)	23.0	24.4	31.9	1.4	8.9
2007-2008 (N=79)	23.1	24.3	31.8	1.2	8.7
2008-2009 (N=120)	23.0	24.7	31.0	1.7	8.0

Students who were placed up or moved up into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes, as well as greater average gains than students placed in the honors only level. (See Table 16 below.) Students who were placed or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally showed smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes.

Table 16. Mixed-level Students' Gain Between Grade 8 (EXPLORE) and Grade 11 (PSAE/ACT) Reading Achievement by Placement Group

<i>Placement Group</i>	<i>Grade 8 Av. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 10 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>Grade 11 Avg. Scale Score</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PLAN (Gr. 10) Gain</i>	<i>EXP (Gr. 8) to PSAE/ACT (Gr. 11) Gain</i>
Mixed Regular Level					
2006-2007 (N=104)	13.2	15.2	18.8	2.0	5.6
2007-2008 (N=108)	13.0	15.7	18.5	2.7	5.5
2008-2009 (N=104)	13.1	15.1	17.7	2.0	4.6
Mixed Honors Level					
2006-2007 (N=86)	17.1	20.8	26.9	3.7	9.8
2007-2008 (N=75)	17.3	20.5	24.6	3.2	7.3
2008-2009 (N=146)	17.0	20.0	25.0	3.0	8.0
Placed Up into Mixed Honors Level					
2006-2007 (N=13)	13.6	18.3	21.2	4.7	7.6
2007-2008 (N=16)	13.6	16.2	19.7	2.6	6.1
2008-2009 (N=37)	13.5	17.8	22.1	4.3	8.6
Placed Down into Mixed Regular Level					
2006-2007 (N=76)	15.9	18.4	22.5	2.5	6.6
2007-2008 (N=72)	15.9	18.4	21.9	2.5	6.0
2008-2009 (N=26)	16.3	17.3	20.6	1.0	4.3

A repeated measures analysis of variance was applied to the data to determine if there were significant differences from pretest to post-test between placement groups. For each group of students, the gain between the EXPLORE test (pretest) and ACT test (posttest) in reading performance was statistically significant. (See Table 17 below.) There were no significant interactions between the reading scores and cohort groups.

Table 17. Statistics for Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance

<i>Placement Group</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Correctly placed into Mixed Regular	4390.98	1	501.31	<.001
Correctly placed into Mixed Honors	9875.64	1	1144.23	<.001
Placed up into Mixed Honors	1502.13	1	177.96	<.001
Placed down into Mixed Regular	1834.50	1	184.11	<.001

Objective 8: Are we encouraging and explicitly teaching students how to become successful in English and History classes?

Several student and faculty survey items focused on motivation, preparedness, and helpful strategies for students including effective effort. The items on strategies are only shown for 2009-10 and 2010-11 because they were revised from the 2008-09 survey. Table 18 summarizes results for the revised items.

Table 18. Motivation, Effective Effort, and Strategies

Student Survey	1- Not at all	2	3	4 - A great deal	Avg.		Positive Response	Negative Response
To what extent have the Humanities classes helped you improve in the following areas:								
Effective effort								
Mixed-level (n=374) 2009-10	7%	27%	47%	19%	2.77		66%	34%
(n=329) 2010-11	9%	23%	51%	18%	2.79		69%	32%
Honors-only (n=190) 2009-10	12%	30%	42%	16%	2.62		58%	42%
(n=173) 2010-11	15%	26%	39%	20%	2.64		59%	41%
Being responsible for your learning								
Mixed-level (n=375) 2009-10	4%	20%	45%	31%	3.03		76%	24%
(n=329) 2010-11	7%	16%	45%	32%	3.02		77%	23%
Honors-only (n=190) 2009-10	6%	24%	47%	23%	2.87		70%	30%
(n=173) 2010-11	9%	25%	38%	28%	2.86		66%	34%
Working in groups								
Mixed-level (n=375) 2009-10	5%	20%	44%	32%	3.02		76%	25%
(n=330) 2010-11	8%	16%	43%	33%	3.02		76%	24%
Honors-only (n=190) 2009-10	8%	20%	46%	26%	2.89		72%	28%
(n=173) 2010-11	6%	23%	42%	30%	2.96		72%	29%
Organization								
Mixed-level (n=372) 2009-10	15%	27%	36%	23%	2.67		59%	42%
(n=331) 2010-11	14%	23%	42%	21%	2.70		63%	37%
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	15%	35%	33%	17%	2.51		50%	50%
(n=173) 2010-11	19%	30%	33%	18%	2.50		51%	49%
Reading								
Mixed-level (n=373) 2009-10	7%	21%	46%	27%	2.93		73%	28%
(n=330) 2010-11	9%	18%	46%	27%	2.91		73%	27%
Honors-only (n=190) 2009-10	14%	27%	40%	20%	2.65		60%	41%
(n=171) 2010-11	12%	24%	37%	26%	2.78		63%	36%
Writing								
Mixed-level (n=373) 2009-10	4%	15%	43%	37%	3.14		80%	19%
(n=330) 2010-11	5%	15%	43%	38%	3.15		81%	20%
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	6%	17%	41%	37%	3.08		78%	23%
(n=173) 2010-11	9%	16%	39%	36%	3.01		75%	25%
Research								
Mixed-level (n=373) 2009-10	6%	17%	41%	36%	3.07		77%	23%
(n=329) 2010-11	8%	12%	45%	36%	3.09		81%	20%
Honors-only (n=189) 2009-10	8%	27%	41%	27%	2.88		68%	35%
(n=172) 2010-11	10%	19%	36%	36%	2.97		72%	29%
I am motivated to do well in my...	1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 - Strongly agree	Avg.		
English class								
Mixed-level (n=423) 2008-09	3%	5%	16%	27%	49%	4.2	76%	8%
(n=376) 2009-10	2%	6%	15%	34%	43%	4.1	77%	8%
(n=332) 2010-11	4%	5%	20%	28%	42%	4.0	70%	9%
Honors-only (n=171) 2008-09	1%	5%	10%	37%	47%	4.2	84%	6%
(n=190) 2009-10	2%	2%	8%	27%	61%	4.4	88%	4%
(n=172) 2010-11	2%	8%	10%	23%	57%	4.2	80%	10%
History class								
Mixed-level (n=423) 2008-09	3%	5%	16%	29%	47%	4.1	76%	8%
(n=375) 2009-10	3%	5%	18%	36%	38%	4.0	74%	8%
(n=329) 2010-11	4%	5%	17%	31%	43%	4.0	74%	9%
Honors-only (n=171) 2008-09	2%	4%	15%	30%	49%	4.2	79%	6%
(n=189) 2009-10	3%	5%	12%	34%	47%	4.2	81%	8%
(n=171) 2010-11	1%	6%	13%	28%	53%	4.3	81%	7%
How would you rate the effort you put forth in this class?	None at all	Not too much	Somewhat	Very much	A great deal			
English class								
Mixed-level (n=420) 2008-09	0%	7%	31%	41%	21%		62%	7%
(n=375) 2009-10	2%	8%	31%	38%	21%		59%	10%
(n=327) 2010-11	3%	8%	29%	40%	20%		60%	11%
Honors-only (n=168) 2008-09	1%	2%	25%	50%	22%		72%	3%
(n=186) 2009-10	0%	4%	22%	48%	25%		73%	4%
(n=171) 2010-11	2%	8%	23%	35%	32%		67%	10%
History class								
Mixed-level (n=420) 2008-09	1%	7%	32%	41%	20%		61%	8%
(n=375) 2009-10	2%	9%	34%	41%	13%		54%	11%
(n=327) 2010-11	2%	8%	33%	37%	20%		57%	10%
Honors-only (n=169) 2008-09	0%	3%	34%	45%	18%		63%	3%
(n=187) 2009-10	4%	8%	35%	37%	16%		53%	12%
(n=171) 2010-11	2%	10%	30%	34%	24%		58%	12%

Table 18. Motivation, Effective Effort, and Strategies cont'd

Faculty Survey									
		Not at all motivated	Not too motivated	Somewhat motivated	Very motivated	Extremely motivated		Positive Response	Negative Response
Mixed-level regular students (n=17)	2008-09	0%	24%	71%	6%	0%		6%	24%
	(n=21) 2009-10	0%	5%	62%	33%	0%		33%	5%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	12%	53%	35%	0%		35%	12%
Mixed-level honors students (n=17)	2008-09	0%	6%	24%	71%	0%		71%	6%
	(n=21) 2009-10	0%	5%	29%	62%	5%		67%	5%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	0%	41%	59%	0%		59%	0%
Honors-only students (n=11)	2008-09	0%	0%	0%	46%	54%		100%	0%
	(n=14) 2009-10	0%	0%	14%	50%	36%		86%	0%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	0%	9%	64%	27%		91%	0%
How would you describe the effort put forth by your...		None at all	Not too much	Somewhat	Very much	A great deal			
Mixed-level regular students (n=16)	2008-09	0%	19%	44%	31%	6%		37%	19%
	(n=21) 2009-10	0%	10%	52%	33%	5%		38%	10%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	13%	40%	40%	7%		47%	13%
Mixed-level honors students (n=16)	2008-09	0%	0%	19%	62%	19%		81%	0%
	(n=21) 2009-10	0%	0%	29%	67%	5%		72%	0%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	0%	40%	47%	13%		60%	0%
Honors-only students (n=10)	2008-09	0%	0%	0%	30%	70%		100%	0%
	(n=14) 2009-10	0%	0%	23%	54%	23%		77%	0%
	(n=17) 2010-11	0%	0%	20%	50%	30%		80%	0%
Overall, do you think your students come prepared for class with their homework completed? (2010-11)		Never prepared	Rarely prepared	Somewhat prepared	Usually prepared	Always prepared			
Mixed-level regular students (n=17)		0%	24%	53%	24%	0%		24%	24%
Mixed-level honors students (n=17)		0%	0%	29%	71%	0%		71%	0%
Honors-only students (n=11)		0%	0%	0%	64%	36%		100%	0%
Overall, how prepared are your students to participate in class? (2010-11)		Never prepared	Rarely prepared	Somewhat prepared	Usually prepared	Always prepared			
Mixed-level regular students (n=17)		0%	0%	24%	77%	0%		77%	0%
Mixed-level honors students (n=17)		0%	0%	12%	82%	6%		88%	0%
Honors-only students (n=11)		0%	0%	0%	73%	27%		100%	0%
Overall, how prepared are your students for class activities? (2010-11)		Never prepared	Rarely prepared	Somewhat prepared	Usually prepared	Always prepared			
Mixed-level regular students (n=17)		0%	0%	35%	65%	0%		65%	0%
Mixed-level honors students (n=17)		0%	0%	18%	82%	0%		82%	0%
Honors-only students (n=11)		0%	0%	10%	80%	10%		90%	0%

For 2010-11:

- Students were asked to rate the extent to which they improved in seven areas using a 4-point scale ranging from “not at all” to “a great deal.” For all seven areas, more students in mixed-level Humanities gave a rating of “3” or “4” compared to honors-only students. Furthermore, there were significant differences for one item, effective effort, $\chi^2_{(6, N=502)} = 13.83, p = .032$. More mixed-level regular students reported improving in effective effort (72%) than mixed-level honors students (67%) and in turn, more mixed-level honors students reported improving compared to honors-only students (50%). These results were different than reported in Year 2 when there were significant differences for reading and research.
- When 2010-11 students were asked to rate their motivation to do well on a scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree,” students in honors-only Humanities English and History classes gave significantly higher ratings than students in mixed-level classes, $\chi^2_{(8, N=504)} = 21.65, p = .006$ and $\chi^2_{(8, N=500)} = 16.82, p = .032$.
- When faculty members were asked to rate student motivation on a 5-point scale where 1 represented “not at all motivated” and 5 represented “extremely motivated,” the percentages fell along a continuum. Fifty-three percent described students in mixed-level regular classes as “somewhat motivated, but only 35 percent described students as “very motivated,” and no faculty

members described students in mixed-level regular classes as “extremely motivated.” In contrast, 59 percent of faculty described students in mixed-level honors students as “very motivated,” 64 percent described students in honors-only classes as “very motivated,” and another 27 percent described students in honors-only classes as “extremely motivated.” This has been the general faculty pattern over the three year evaluation period. Although in prior years there have been some differences in responses between English and History teachers, this was not the case for 2010-11.

- In 2010-11, students and faculty were again asked to respond to an item about effort. In general, the response pattern was similar to prior years with between half and two thirds of students in all classes responding “very much” or “a great deal” and about 10 percent or less of students responding “None at all” or “Not too much.” There were significant differences among groups. In English, there were higher ratings for effort for students in honors-only classes and mixed-level honors classes compared to students in the mixed-level regular classes, $\chi^2_{(10, N=506)} = 19.26, p = .037$. However, for History, there were no significant differences among groups. Teachers’ responses, on the other hand, followed a pattern where the amount of effort as represented by “very much” or “a great deal” increased from students in mixed-level regular classes (47%) to mixed-level honors classes (60%) to honors-only classes (80%).
- For the 2008-09 and 2009-10 surveys, teachers were asked about student preparedness. These questions were reworked for the 2010-11 survey to specifically ask about student preparedness with respect to completed homework, class participation, and class activities. A pattern similar to that seen in motivation and effort was also evident for faculty items relating to student preparedness.
 - Twenty-four percent described students in mixed-level regular classes as “usually prepared” for class with their homework completed. In contrast, 71 percent of faculty described students in mixed-level honors students as “usually prepared” with completed homework, and 100 percent described students in honors-only classes as “usually” or “always prepared” with completed homework.
 - Seventy-seven percent described students in mixed-level regular classes as “usually prepared” or “always prepared” to participate in class. Eighty-eight percent of faculty described students in mixed-level honors classes as “usually prepared” or “always prepared” to participate, and 100 percent described students in honors-only classes as “usually” or “always prepared” to participate in class.
 - Sixty-five percent described students in mixed-level regular classes as “usually prepared” or “always prepared” for class activities. Eighty-two percent of faculty described students in mixed-level honors students as “usually prepared” or “always prepared” for class activities, and 90 percent described students in honors-only classes as “usually” or “always prepared” for class activities.

Objective 9: Are we increasing teacher understanding and use of differentiated instruction?

During the 2009-10 year, teachers participated in 17 days of workshops on differentiated instruction with Jessica Hockett, a consultant on this topic. In 2010-11, the major focus of professional development related to the development of new curricula for both English and History in order to implement the restructured English and History Humanities program⁴ approved by the Board of Education in winter of

⁴ Beginning in 2011-12, the restructured program is another step in improving Humanities so that more students perform better and ultimately take Honors and Advanced Placement courses in subsequent years. The restructured program requires Humanities students to earn honors credit by demonstrating proficiency on a series of benchmark

2010-11. Professional development focused on training teachers to map out curriculum aligned to the new Common Core Standards.

Teachers were asked about their professional development experience on the faculty survey. Table 19 shows faculty responses. Responses from 2008-09 are not included in the table. New questions were developed for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 survey to better understand teacher views on professional development.

- For English, the response pattern is for the most part similar to 2009-10. Most of the professional development activities in 2010-11 focused on curriculum development for the upcoming restructured Humanities program. There was no consultant conducting classroom observations and providing feedback, nor was there lesson study.
- For History, response patterns are difficult to interpret for two reasons: 1) similar to English, the questions did not really connect to teachers' most recent PD experience; and 2) only six of ten History teachers responded to the survey.
- Similar to 2009-10, teachers responded that they are better able to decide when to differentiate instruction with about two-thirds choosing a rating of 4 or 5 for this item on a scale of 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 5 representing "strongly agree." Although the focus of professional development was the development of the new Humanities curricula, several Humanities teachers (5) attended a professional development activity on differentiated instruction in June after school was out and after this survey was administered.

assessments. All freshman students (including the traditional honors-only students) will be in these English and History Humanities classes with the exception of students performing well below grade level.

Table 19. Professional Development

Faculty Survey		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	All the time		Positive Response	Negative Response
When creating your lessons, how often did you implement ideas that you learned in professional development activities this year?									
English (n=10)	2009-10	0%	20%	60%	20%	0%		20%	20%
(n=10)	2010-11	10%	20%	40%	30%	0%		30%	30%
History (n=11)	2009-10	0%	9%	27%	55%	9%		64%	9%
(n=6)	2010-11	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%		17%	50%
		1 - Not at all	2	3	4	5 - To a great extent			
To what extent have the following professional development components changed your classroom practices?									
Lesson study									
English (n=10)	2009-10	10%	40%	20%	10%	20%		30%	50%
(n=10)	2010-11	30%	10%	30%	10%	20%		30%	40%
History (n=11)	2009-10	0%	18%	27%	36%	18%		54%	18%
(n=6)	2010-11	17%	33%	33%	17%	0%		17%	50%
Small group workshops									
English (n=10)	2009-10	0%	30%	20%	40%	10%		50%	30%
(n=10)	2010-11	0%	30%	40%	20%	10%		30%	30%
History (n=11)	2009-10	9%	9%	36%	36%	9%		45%	18%
(n=6)	2010-11	0%	17%	67%	17%	0%		17%	17%
Peer observations									
English (n=10)	2009-10	10%	30%	30%	20%	10%		30%	40%
(n=10)	2010-11	22%	11%	33%	22%	11%		33%	33%
History (n=11)	2009-10	27%	9%	36%	18%	9%		27%	36%
(n=6)	2010-11	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%		0%	66%
Observation and feedback by consultant									
English (n=10)	2009-10	30%	30%	10%	20%	10%		30%	60%
(n=10)	2010-11	20%	30%	50%	0%	0%		0%	50%
History (n=11)	2009-10	20%	0%	50%	20%	10%		30%	20%
(n=6)	2010-11	33%	17%	50%	0%	0%		0%	50%
		1 - Strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 - Strongly agree	Avg.		
I am better able to decide when to differentiate instruction.									
English (n=10)	2009-10	0%	0%	30%	50%	20%	3.9	70%	0%
(n=10)	2010-11	0%	11%	22%	44%	22%	3.8	66%	11%
History (n=11)	2009-10	0%	18%	18%	55%	9%	3.6	64%	18%
(n=6)	2010-11	0%	0%	33%	50%	17%	3.8	67%	0%

Teachers' open-ended responses for these items reflected the following types of comments in response to "How do you differentiate instruction in your classes?":

- *By designing equally respectable tasks for my students and offering choices and assessments that allow students to demonstrate ability and knowledge in a variety of ways.*
- *I differentiate instruction according to skill readiness and interest.*

Objective 10: Are we increasing support structures to help students achieve?

With the implementation of the revised mixed-level Humanities program, several support structures were modified to help assist students. Table 20 shows survey results for students in AVID and STAE.

In particular, these supports focused on explicit teaching of strategies, lessons on effective effort, and other skills (time management) needed to be successful in school.

Table 20. Support Structures

<i>Student Survey</i>	Not at all	Not too much	Somewhat	Very much	A great deal	Positive Response	Negative Response
How much does AVID help you do well in your Humanities class?							
Mixed-level (n=116) 2009-10	41%	17%	29%	6%	6%	12%	58%
(n=77) 2010-11	19%	17%	38%	21%	5%	26%	36%
Honors-only (n=2) 2009-10	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
(n=5) 2010-11	40%	20%	0%	0%	40%	40%	60%
How much does STAE help you do well in your Humanities class?							
Mixed-level (n=110) 2009-10	42%	18%	21%	16%	3%	19%	60%
(n=84) 2010-11	39%	19%	25%	13%	5%	18%	58%
Honors-only (n=34) 2009-10	44%	18%	21%	12%	6%	18%	62%
(n=29) 2010-11	52%	10%	21%	17%	0%	17%	62%
<i>Student Survey</i>							
How often did you see your Humanities teachers outside of class for extra help?							
Mixed-level (n=377) 2009-10	16%	52%	23%	7%	2%		
(n=331) 2010-11	19%	60%	15%	5%	2%		
Honors-only (n=187) 2009-10	17%	70%	9%	4%	0%		
(n=173) 2010-11	19%	72%	8%	2%	0%		

- When AVID students were asked how much AVID helps them do well in their Humanities class, about one-quarter of mixed-level students indicated “very much” or “a great deal,” and another 38 percent indicated “somewhat.” The response pattern for honors-only students is difficult to interpret given the small numbers who were in these classes.
- When STAE students were asked how much STAE helps them do well in their Humanities class, about 17 to 18 percent of mixed-level and honor-students indicated “very much” or “a great deal.” An additional 21-25 percent indicated that STAE only helps them “somewhat.”
- The majority of students both in mixed-level (60%) and honors-only (72%) students only came in for extra help when they needed something explained or clarified.

How satisfied are students and faculty with the mixed-level Humanities course?

Students and faculty were also asked to rate the Humanities course with respect to satisfaction/ effectiveness. Table 21 shows these results.

Table 21. Satisfaction

Student Survey	1 - Very dissatisfied	2	3	4	5 - Very Satisfied	Avg.	Positive Response	Negative Response
Rate your satisfaction with this course.								
Mixed-level (n=409) 2008-09	8%	13%	34%	29%	16%	3.3	45%	21%
(n=368) 2009-10	3%	12%	30%	42%	13%	3.5	55%	15%
(n=324) 2010-11	5%	11%	36%	32%	16%	3.5	48%	16%
Honors-only (n=164) 2008-09	2%	11%	26%	51%	10%	3.5	61%	13%
(n=190) 2009-10	2%	8%	27%	39%	25%	3.8	64%	10%
(n=171) 2010-11	5%	15%	15%	41%	25%	3.7	66%	20%
Faculty Survey	Not at all effective	Not too effective	Somewhat effective	Very Effective	Extremely effective			
After one year of implementation, how effective do you think this mixed-level Humanities course is for meeting your students' instructional needs? (n=18) 2008-09	0%	6%	72%	22%	0%		22%	6%
After two years of implementation, how effective do you think this mixed-level Humanities course is for meeting your students' instructional needs? (n=21) 2009-10	5%	14%	48%	33%	0%		33%	19%
English (n=10)	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%		40%	0%
History (n=11)	9%	27%	36%	27%	0%		27%	36%
After three years of implementation, how effective do you think this mixed-level Humanities course is for meeting your students' instructional needs? (n=17) 2010-11	0%	0%	77%	24%	0%		24%	0%
English (n=10)	0%	0%	90%	10%	0%		10%	0%
History (n=6)	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%		50%	0%

Students

- A chi-square test applied to the percentages found significant differences among groups. A higher percentage of students in honors-only classes than students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied, and in turn, a higher percentage of students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied compared to than those in mixed-regular classes, $\chi^2_{(8, N=495)} = 32.52, p < .001$.
- It should be noted that for both honors-only students and mixed-level students, 80 percent or more of these students selected a rating of 3, 4 or 5.
- When asked an open-ended question about the strengths of the mixed-level classes, the following themes and comments were typical responses:

Group work

- *The strengths of the Humanities classes are getting to know different people because we always work in groups and in class discussions.*
- *We work in groups and we help each other out. We make sure everyone understands the material before moving on.*

Connection between English and History classes

- *For me, it is easier to relate to both classes because they are entwined. It's helpful and beneficial to have what I'm learning in History be reflected in what I'm reading in English*
- *I get to be with a lot of different kinds of people and we do group things, and the classes are connected so it's cool to be reading a book in English and then at the same time we are learning about what was going on in the setting of the book in history class.*
- *I think the strengths are the fact that, although English and History are very different subjects, they get tied together by teaching us about certain literature along with their respective time period and origin in their respective classes.*

Interesting discussions

- *I learn to work well in groups and I get to hear other's opinions which may help me get a better view of a subject. The classes also helped me participate and talk in class more because we have a lot of deep [conversations] and debates and sometimes it's fun to participate and it's what they expect.*
- *The conversations we have are very engaging and make everyone think deeper into the topic we are discussing. The books that we read are also very interesting books.*
- *We have good discussions and I like the books we read. Looking deeper is interesting and I notice myself doing it outside of class even.*

Interesting topics/class

- *The material they cover keeps me very interested [and] alert so I am more propelled to try my best to understand the material in the classes.*
- *The strengths of the humanities course is that it is very diverse and the topics are interesting and well explained by the teacher but you also get alot of different inputs from students.*
- *The strengths of this class are that the information is presented in an interesting way and group discussions add to the knowledge base of all participants and listeners. I enjoyed the large groups.*

Teachers

- *Teachers are nice and are greatly interested in the topics they teach and help us as a class better understand the topics.*
- *The teachers have been very supportive and helpful; they always encourage me to do my best work and push me to my limits.*
- *The teachers know what they [are] talking about, the classrooms environments are interesting, and the connections are enjoyable*

- Students were also asked about what they would change in the Humanities classes. The following themes and comments were typical responses from students. While some of the themes are similar to the ones regarding the strengths of the mixed-level classes, it should be noted that a greater number of students commented that their English and History classes are connected than those felt they were not connected. In addition, a greater number of students felt the mixed-level classes were interesting than those who felt it was boring. Students in the honors-only Humanities class felt that there should be more diversity in their classes.

Boring/Make more interesting

- *A lot of the materials and texts were boring to me. I would have liked to have read more modern literature that contained modern problems that are more connected to me as a 21st century teen. I would have liked to have more multimedia in the classes. For me, there was too much lecturing and talking, and I felt like I got bored and zoned out often.*
- *Make class more engaging, exciting.*
- *Read more interesting books.*

English and History classes not very connected

- *I know that other people's classes are, but my history and English classes do not overlap that much, so our history and English work are not connected. It would be nice if we did more connected things.*
- *I would make the assignments a little more connected for both classes so students are not completely changing focus between classes.*
- *The history curriculum doesn't really match what we're doing in English.*

More diversity

- *I think that if something were to be changed it would be the level of diversity, there isn't very much of that in my class and I think it would be better to have a mixed class because you can get different views on things as well as learning a lot more because you don't have the same background as your classmates might.*
- *It strongly lacks multiple points of view when it should be emphasizing many ideas from different angles.*

Amount of work is too much

- *I would change the amount of projects and papers that we get.*
- *I would change the fact that at the end of the quarter we have project on top of project for humanities which makes me a bit stressed out.*
- *Less homework.*

Faculty

- All faculty members surveyed felt that the mixed-level model is “somewhat effective” or “very effective” (scale ranges from “not at all effective” to “extremely effective”) for meeting students’ needs. Most faculty members selected “somewhat effective,” which is most likely indicative of concerns over this Humanities model and their interest in the restructured model to be implemented in 2011-12. Representative comments were as follows:
- When asked about the strengths of the mixed-level classes, the following comments were typical responses:

Diversity of student’s perspectives

- *Different perspectives.*
 - *Exposure to many views; a more fair, equitable experience for all.*
 - *The diversity of students*
 - *Diversity of opinions.*
- When asked about how the mixed-level classes could be improved, the following were typical responses:

Eliminate the honors-only class

- *By removing the honors credit and eliminating all tracking/sorting distinctions.*
- *Eliminate straight honors element.*
- *Actually mix kids together. Eliminate the honors bump. Trust teachers to develop, implement, and teach an excellent course.*

Year Three Findings

Overall, the data show positive outcomes for the revised mixed-level Freshman Humanities course. The demographic data indicate the program is meeting its objectives, and students and faculty generally provided positive feedback with suggestions for improving the course as it transitions to the newly restructured 1 Humanities program in 2011-12 school year.

Objective 1: Preparing Students for Honors Classes

- The percentage of students in mixed-level Freshman Humanities taking the course for honors credit in 2010-11 continues to be almost double compared to the cohorts prior to 2008-09.
- The percentage of students in mixed-level Freshman Humanities taking the course for regular credit is double the percentage of cohorts prior to 2008-09. Under the former model, many of these students would have been assigned to a non-mixed-level Humanities class or to a level below regular (Level 1).
- The percentage of students in honors-only classes has remained relatively stable.
- A higher percentage of students (total and across ethnic groups) from the 2008-09 and 2009-10 cohorts took honors English and History classes as sophomores and juniors compared to prior cohorts.
- Two-thirds of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities received a score on the 3 English AP exam of a 3, 4, or 5. One-third of students who were in mixed-level honors in Freshman Humanities received a score of a 3, 4, or 5 on the US History AP exam. Typically colleges require a score of 3 or higher for college credit.

Objective 2: Increasing the Numbers of Under-represented Students in Honors Freshman Humanities

- The mixed-level honors classes are more diverse compared to 2006-07 and 2007-08. The numbers of Hispanic and Black students have doubled; the number of low-income students has more than doubled.

Objective 3: Increasing Diversity of Student Views in Freshman Humanities

- Students and faculty survey responses indicated that teachers and students believe that the diversity of mixed-level classes exposes students to a wide range of views. More teachers report “very much” and “a great deal” in 2010-11 than 2008-09 (65% vs. 53%). Responses were significantly higher for students in mixed-level classes than honors-only classes.
- Over 80 percent of students in mixed-level and honors-only classes indicated that their teachers expect them to participate in small and large group discussions. When it comes to how often they contribute to discussion, there were significant differences among the groups in English with honors and mixed-level honors contributing more than mixed-regular students. In History, responses for mixed-level honors and honors-only students were similar and significantly different than mixed-level regular students.
- In English, the percentages for honors-only students are significantly higher than mixed-level students with respect to class discussions that are “interesting,” “make me think,” and “provide different points of view.” Honors-only students’ responses to class discussions were significantly lower than mixed-level regular students with respect to “boring.” For History, responses were similar for mixed-level and honors students.

Objective 4: Providing Same Learning Experience in Mixed-Level and Honors Level Freshman Humanities Classes

- The same honors-level curriculum is being provided to mixed-level regular, mixed-level honors, and honors-only Freshman Humanities classes. Overall, students in mixed-level classes spent the same amount of time on their work outside of class (e.g., doing homework, studying for tests, completing projects/essays, completing assigned readings, and studying for a semester exam) as honors-only students.

Objective 5: Switching Levels Easily

- All in all, including student and teacher requests, English teachers reported that they recommended 32 students (18%) move from mixed-level regular to mixed-level honors credit. History teachers reported that they recommended 9 students (5%) move from mixed-level regular to mixed-level honors credit. Teachers reported that less than five students requested a move from honors credit to regular credit in mixed-level classes. Since no teacher change is necessary, these changes are easily accomplished.

Objective 6: Increasing Intellectual Rigor

- In the 2009-10 survey, questions were revised for this objective. These questions were administered again in the 2010-11 survey. Four questions were developed to assess rigor using a 5-point scale where 1 represented “strongly disagree” and 5 represented “strongly agree:”
 - My Humanities classes challenge me to do my best work.
 - My Humanities classes have taught me to better analyze readings and ideas.
 - The work in my Humanities classes makes me think deeply about the content.
 - The books and other materials in my Humanities classes are interesting to me.
- There were no significant differences between honors-only and mixed-level responses for the first two items relating to rigor. Comparable percentages of mixed-level and honors students found the class to challenge them to do their best work, and taught them to better analyze readings and ideas. A significantly greater percent of honors-only and mixed-level honors students found the Humanities work makes them think deeply about the content than mixed-level regular students. Honors-only students found the books/materials to be more interesting.

Objective 7: Increasing Student Achievement

- **Grades:** Similar to the first semester of 2009-10, the 2010-11 first semester percentages of A/B grades were higher for English and History than in 2008-09 and were back to the levels prior to implementing the revised mixed-level curriculum. Likewise, the percentage of D/F/NC grades were lower than 2008-09.
- **EXPLORE to PLAN Analysis of Gains:** One of the long-term objectives of the Freshman Humanities evaluation is to look at test score gains for each cohort from the EXPLORE test taken in grade 8 by students prior to entering freshman year to the PLAN test taken at the beginning of sophomore year to the ACT test taken at the end of students’ junior year. For this year three report, we analyzed EXPLORE to PLAN score gains for the 2008-09 and 2009-10 cohorts experiencing the revised mixed-level Humanities program. We compared the gains for this cohort with prior cohorts who were comparable to 2008-09 in terms of initial test scores but were taught under the old mixed-level Humanities program.
- Overall, students made gains from EXPLORE to PLAN. Students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and PLAN tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Students who were placed up or moved up

into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes. Students who were placed or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally showed smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes. A repeated measures analysis of variance was applied to the data to determine if there were significant differences from pretest to post-test between placement groups. For each group of students, gain between the EXPLORE test (pretest) and PLAN test (posttest) in reading performance was statistically significant.

- There were no significant differences in the gain scores among the placement groups for each cohort. In other words, gains were similar for students whether they experienced the revised Humanities program or the former Humanities program. It is important to point out that with the revised program beginning in 2008-09, the number of regular level students in mixed-level classes was greater because of the more inclusive criteria. Even so, the gains of mixed-level honors students remained strong and similar to prior cohorts.
- It was pointed out in last year's evaluation that the 2008-09 mixed-level regular cohort did not show stronger gains than the prior comparison groups. In that report, it was stated that one might anticipate greater gains for the mixed-level regular students in upcoming cohorts. The gain data for the 2009-10 cohort bears this out. There were larger gains for students at the mixed-level regular level and honors level than in the previous year.
- **EXPLORE to PLAN to PSAT/ACT Analysis of Gains:** Students in the 2009 cohort are the first ones to have experienced the revised 1 Humanities model and taken the PSAT/ACT. Students in the mixed-level honors level and the honor only level have the same reading score gain of 8.0 points between the EXPLORE and PSAT/ACT.
- Students in the mixed-level honors classes demonstrated greater gains in reading achievement between the EXPLORE and ACT tests than students in the mixed-level regular classes. Students who were placed up or moved up into mixed-level honors showed greater average gains than students qualifying for mixed-level honors classes, as well as greater average gains than students placed in the honors only level. Students who were placed or moved down into mixed-level regular Humanities generally showed smaller gains than students qualifying for the mixed-level regular classes. A repeated measures analysis of variance was applied to the data to determine if there were significant differences from pretest to post-test between placement groups. For each group of students, the gain between the EXPLORE test (pretest) and ACT test (posttest) in reading performance was statistically significant.

Objective 8: Encouraging and Explicitly Teaching Students to Become Successful

- Both students in mixed-level and honors-only Humanities classes rated themselves high on motivation. Students in honors-only Humanities English and History classes gave significantly higher ratings than students in mixed-level classes.
- However, faculty responses relating to student motivation were lower for mixed-level regular, higher for mixed-level honors and even higher for honors-only students. In 2010-11 there were no significant differences in responses between English and History teachers.
- The question about student preparedness was reworked for 2010-11 survey to specifically ask about student preparedness with respect to completed homework, class participation, and class activities. A pattern similar to that seen in motivation and effort was also evident for the faculty survey items relating to student preparedness.
- Students were also asked to rate the extent to which they improved in seven areas (effective effort, being responsible for your learning, working in groups, organization, reading, writing, and

research). In 2010-11 there were significant differences between honors-only, mixed-level honors and mixed-level regular students in the area of effective effort. More mixed-level regular students felt their Humanities classes helped them improve in effective effort than students in mixed-level honors. Also, more students in mixed-level honors classes reported improving in effective effort than honors-only Freshman Humanities students.

Objective 9: Increasing Differentiated Instruction

- In 2010-11, the major focus of professional development was the development of new curricula for both English and History in order to implement the restructured English and History Humanities program approved by the Board of Education in winter of 2010-11. Professional development focused on training to teachers to map out curriculum aligned to the new Common Core Standards. Since most of the professional development activities in 2010-11 focused on curriculum development for the upcoming restructured Humanities program, it is believed that the responses reflect the fact that most of the questions did not really resonate with teachers' most recent PD experience. Overall, teachers responded that they are better able to decide when to differentiate instruction.

Objective 10: Increasing Support Structures

- Programs such as STAE, Project EXCEL, AVID, and Freshman Reading were modified in 2008-09 to provide help aligned with the Humanities curricula. When AVID students were asked how much AVID helps them do well in Humanities, about 26 percent of students in mixed-level classes indicated "very much" or "a great deal." When STAE students were asked how much STAE helps them do well in Humanities, about 17-18 percent of students in mixed-level and honors-only classes indicated "very much," or "a great deal."

Satisfaction

A higher percentage of students in honors-only classes than students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied, and in turn, a higher percentage of students in mixed-level honors classes were satisfied compared to those in mixed-level regular classes. All of the faculty that responded (100%) felt that the mixed-level model is "somewhat effective" or "very effective" (scale ranges from "not at all effective" to "extremely effective") for meeting students' needs. Most faculty members selected "somewhat effective," which is most likely indicative of concerns over this Humanities model and their interest in the restructured model to be implemented in 2011-12.

Recommendations

As we implement the restructured Humanities model in 2011-12, it is recommended that we monitor the following aspects based on the findings of this three year evaluation process:

- Continue to monitor students' interest and motivation in relation to the new curricula, texts and materials to ensure these texts and materials are interesting to students.
- Continue to monitor students with respect to their skills in reading, research, organization, effective effort, group work, writing, and taking responsibility for their learning.
- Continue to monitor faculty belief systems and expectations to ensure that all teachers hold and communicate high expectations for all students.
- Continue to monitor support structures to ensure that instruction in these courses is directly aligned with the coursework in Freshman Humanities.
- Monitor professional development in the areas of differentiated instruction and its application in the classroom.

Appendix A

Objective 3: Diversity of Student Views

		Level			Total
		ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q14_Diversity	Count	3	2	0	5
	% within Level	2.4%	1.0%	.0%	1.0%
Not at all	Count	10	14	29	53
	% within Level	8.1%	6.7%	16.8%	10.5%
Not too much	Count	15	32	54	101
	% within Level	12.2%	15.2%	31.2%	20.0%
Somewhat	Count	51	79	47	177
	% within Level	41.5%	37.6%	27.2%	35.0%
Very much	Count	32	51	30	113
	% within Level	26.0%	24.3%	17.3%	22.3%
A great deal	Count	12	32	13	57
	% within Level	9.8%	15.2%	7.5%	11.3%
Total	Count	123	210	173	506
	% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

		Level			Total
		ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q8_Contribute Discuss_Eng	Count	3	3	4	10
	% within Level	2.4%	1.4%	2.3%	2.0%
Never	Count	7	2	2	11
	% within Level	5.7%	1.0%	1.2%	2.2%
Rarely	Count	28	23	16	67
	% within Level	22.8%	11.0%	9.2%	13.2%
Sometimes	Count	49	67	51	167
	% within Level	39.8%	31.9%	29.5%	33.0%
Most of the time	Count	30	77	62	169
	% within Level	24.4%	36.7%	35.8%	33.4%
All of the time	Count	6	38	38	82
	% within Level	4.9%	18.1%	22.0%	16.2%
Total	Count	123	210	173	506
	% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q8_Contribute Discuss_HSS	Count		5	3	5	13
		% within Level	4.1%	1.4%	2.9%	2.6%
	Never	Count	11	3	4	18
		% within Level	8.9%	1.4%	2.3%	3.6%
	Rarely	Count	26	22	11	59
		% within Level	21.1%	10.5%	6.4%	11.7%
	Sometimes	Count	51	67	58	176
		% within Level	41.5%	31.9%	33.5%	34.8%
	Most of the time	Count	23	63	61	147
		% within Level	18.7%	30.0%	35.3%	29.1%
	All of the time	Count	7	52	34	93
		% within Level	5.7%	24.8%	19.7%	18.4%
	Total	Count	123	210	173	506
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q6_Interesting_Eng	Strongly disagree	Count	10	17	10	37
		% within Level	8.3%	8.1%	5.8%	7.4%
	Disagree	Count	23	22	18	63
		% within Level	19.0%	10.5%	10.5%	12.5%
	Neutral	Count	50	76	28	154
		% within Level	41.3%	36.2%	16.3%	30.6%
	Agree	Count	26	63	55	144
		% within Level	21.5%	30.0%	32.0%	28.6%
	Strongly agree	Count	12	32	61	105
		% within Level	9.9%	15.2%	35.5%	20.9%
	Total	Count	121	210	172	503
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q6_MakeMeThink_Eng	Strongly disagree	Count	4	18	4	26
		% within Level	3.3%	8.6%	2.3%	5.2%
	Disagree	Count	15	17	15	47
		% within Level	12.4%	8.1%	8.7%	9.3%
	Neutral	Count	37	55	41	133
		% within Level	30.6%	26.2%	23.8%	26.4%
	Agree	Count	41	71	55	167
		% within Level	33.9%	33.8%	32.0%	33.2%
	Strongly agree	Count	24	49	57	130
		% within Level	19.8%	23.3%	33.1%	25.8%
	Total	Count	121	210	172	503
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q6_DiffPointsView_Eng	Strongly disagree	Count	6	5	3	14
		% within Level	5.0%	2.4%	1.8%	2.8%
	Disagree	Count	6	23	14	43
		% within Level	5.0%	11.0%	8.2%	8.6%
	Neutral	Count	37	36	22	95
		% within Level	30.8%	17.2%	12.9%	19.0%
	Agree	Count	37	67	58	162
		% within Level	30.8%	32.1%	33.9%	32.4%
	Strongly agree	Count	34	78	74	186
		% within Level	28.3%	37.3%	43.3%	37.2%
	Total	Count	120	209	171	500
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 3: Class Discussion

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q6_Boring_Eng	Strongly disagree	Count	8	28	46	82
		% within Level	6.8%	13.4%	26.7%	16.4%
	Disagree	Count	33	58	49	140
		% within Level	28.0%	27.8%	28.5%	28.1%
	Neutral	Count	35	58	36	129
		% within Level	29.7%	27.8%	20.9%	25.9%
	Agree	Count	22	26	24	72
		% within Level	18.6%	12.4%	14.0%	14.4%
	Strongly agree	Count	20	39	17	76
		% within Level	16.9%	18.7%	9.9%	15.2%
	Total	Count	118	209	172	499
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 6: Rigor

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q13_Books Interesting	Strongly disagree	Count	10	19	6	35
		% within Level	8.3%	9.1%	3.5%	7.0%
	Disagree	Count	39	49	31	119
		% within Level	32.2%	23.4%	17.9%	23.7%
	Neutral	Count	38	60	54	152
		% within Level	31.4%	28.7%	31.2%	30.2%
	Agree	Count	26	54	51	131
		% within Level	21.5%	25.8%	29.5%	26.0%
	Strongly agree	Count	8	27	31	66
		% within Level	6.6%	12.9%	17.9%	13.1%
	Total	Count	121	209	173	503
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 6: Rigor

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q13_Think Deeply	Strongly disagree	Count	7	17	9	33
		% within Level	5.8%	8.2%	5.2%	6.6%
	Disagree	Count	33	36	34	103
		% within Level	27.3%	17.3%	19.8%	20.6%
	Neutral	Count	39	69	45	153
		% within Level	32.2%	33.2%	26.2%	30.5%
	Agree	Count	32	55	46	133
		% within Level	26.4%	26.4%	26.7%	26.5%
	Strongly agree	Count	10	31	38	79
		% within Level	8.3%	14.9%	22.1%	15.8%
	Total	Count	121	208	172	501
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 8: Motivation, Effective Effort, & Strategies

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q4_Motivated_ Eng	Strongly disagree	Count	4	9	4	17
		% within Level	3.3%	4.3%	2.3%	3.4%
	Disagree	Count	8	10	14	32
		% within Level	6.5%	4.8%	8.1%	6.3%
	Neutral	Count	32	35	17	84
		% within Level	26.0%	16.7%	9.9%	16.7%
	Agree	Count	32	62	39	133
		% within Level	26.0%	29.7%	22.7%	26.4%
	Strongly agree	Count	47	93	98	238
		% within Level	38.2%	44.5%	57.0%	47.2%
	Total	Count	123	209	172	504
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 8: Motivation, Effective Effort, & Strategies

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q4_Motivated_ HSS	Strongly disagree	Count	6	7	1	14
		% within Level	4.9%	3.4%	.6%	2.8%
	Disagree	Count	9	7	10	26
		% within Level	7.3%	3.4%	5.8%	5.2%
	Neutral	Count	26	30	22	78
		% within Level	21.1%	14.6%	12.9%	15.6%
	Agree	Count	39	64	47	150
		% within Level	31.7%	31.1%	27.5%	30.0%
	Strongly agree	Count	43	98	91	232
		% within Level	35.0%	47.6%	53.2%	46.4%
	Total	Count	123	206	171	500
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 8: Motivation, Effective Effort, & Strategies

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q11_Effective Effort	1 - Not at all	Count	9	19	26	54
		% within Level	7.6%	9.0%	15.0%	10.8%
	2	Count	24	50	45	119
		% within Level	20.2%	23.8%	26.0%	23.7%
	3	Count	70	97	68	235
		% within Level	58.8%	46.2%	39.3%	46.8%
		% of Total	13.9%	19.3%	13.5%	46.8%
	4 - A great deal	Count	16	44	34	94
		% within Level	13.4%	21.0%	19.7%	18.7%
	Total	Count	119	210	173	502
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Objective 8: Motivation, Effective Effort, & Strategies

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q12_Effort_Eng	Count		4	2	2	8
		% within Level	3.3%	1.0%	1.2%	1.6%
	None at all	Count	3	6	4	13
		% within Level	2.4%	2.9%	2.3%	2.6%
	Not too much	Count	10	17	13	40
		% within Level	8.1%	8.1%	7.5%	7.9%
	Somewhat	Count	45	51	40	136
		% within Level	36.6%	24.3%	23.1%	26.9%
	Very much	Count	44	86	60	190
		% within Level	35.8%	41.0%	34.7%	37.5%
	A great deal	Count	17	48	54	119
		% within Level	13.8%	22.9%	31.2%	23.5%
	Total	Count	123	210	173	506
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Overall Satisfaction

			Level			Total
			ML - Regular	ML - Honors	Straight Honors	
Q15_Overall Satisfaction	Very dissatisfied	Count	6	9	8	23
		% within Level	5.1%	4.4%	4.7%	4.6%
	Dissatisfied	Count	13	21	25	59
		% within Level	11.0%	10.2%	14.6%	11.9%
	Neutral	Count	51	67	25	143
		% within Level	43.2%	32.5%	14.6%	28.9%
	Satisfied	Count	30	74	70	174
		% within Level	25.4%	35.9%	40.9%	35.2%
	Very satisfied	Count	18	35	43	96
		% within Level	15.3%	17.0%	25.1%	19.4%
	Total	Count	118	206	171	495
		% within Level	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%