

Williams v. California: The Statewide Impact of Two Years of Implementation

METHODOLOGY

Williams v. California: *The Statewide Impact of Two Years of Implementation* is based on a study conducted by a team of researchers from the University of California, Los Angeles. Using a mixed methodological approach, the study documents the progress made during the first two years of *Williams* implementation: 2004-05 and 2005-06. Data for this investigation were provided through surveys, County Office of Education Annual Reports, School Accountability Report Cards, and interviews. Teacher misassignment and English learner monitoring data were made available through the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Qualitative Methods:

To understand the school-level progress made by California schools in their implementation of *Williams* legislation, a qualitative case-study design was developed. The design involved site visits to twelve decile 1-3 schools throughout the state during the fall of 2006. Sites were selected throughout the state—Southern, Central, and Northern California—to achieve a geographical distribution of schools. Within these areas of the state, we focused on regions and counties with a significant number of decile 1-3 schools. To capture the diversity of decile 1-3 schools, we selected schools in both urban and rural areas as well as at all grade levels—elementary, middle, and high schools. Finally, we selected school sites wherein we could also access pre-*Williams* data through depositions for the case. However, as in most qualitative studies, final site selection was based on accessibility and school site approval. A few county offices of education declined participation, and a number of school sites (particularly at the middle school and high school level) declined inclusion in the study. Most schools that declined participation explained that they were occupied with the implementation of other reform efforts and/or evaluation activities. County offices of education facilitated access to all school sites except those located within Sacramento County.

For the purposes of the report and to increase the reliability of data, the names of schools, administrators, and teachers were assured anonymity. However, only one school in the sample chose to preserve anonymity (teachers at all schools remained anonymous). This school is identified by a pseudonym throughout the report.

Williams Implementation Study School Sample

Region: County/District/School	Grade Levels	Urbanicity	2005-06 Enrollment	2003 API Ranking
<i>Central Valley</i>				
San Joaquin/Tracy Joint Unified/ Delta Island Elementary	k-8	Rural	164	1
Merced/Merced City Elementary/ Tenaya Middle	6-8	Urban/Rural	934	3
Fresno/Washington Union/ Washington High	9-12	Rural	1,143	1
<i>Greater Bay Area</i>				
San Mateo/Ravenswood City Elementary/ Green Oaks	k-3	Urban	392	1
Alameda/Oakland Unified/ Edna Brewer Middle	6-8	Urban	672	3
San Francisco/San Francisco Unified/ Vista High*	9-12	Urban	1,000 approx.	---
<i>Los Angeles</i>				
Los Angeles/Inglewood Unified/ Frank D. Parent Elementary	k-5	Urban	743	3
Los Angeles/Compton Unified/ Walton Middle	6-8	Urban	713	1
Los Angeles/Pomona Unified/ Pomona Senior High	9-12	Urban	1,777	1
<i>Sacramento</i>				
Sacramento/Sacramento City Unified/ Mark Hopkins Elementary	k-6	Urban	409	2
Sacramento/Sacramento City Unified/ Luther Burbank High	9-12	Urban	2,199	2
Sacramento/San Juan Unified/ El Sereno Alternative	9-12	Urban	308	1

*Identified with a pseudonym to retain the school's anonymity.

Other characteristics of the school sample included the following:

- Most schools were majority African American and/or Latino, with eight serving a population of 70% or more. Only one school sampled (El Sereno Alternative)

was majority (83%) Caucasian. The remaining 11 schools were at least 85% students of color.^{1 2}

- Most schools served a significant number of English learners. The average percent of enrollment for the schools in the sample was 37%. In seven of the sample schools, at least one-third of the student populations were English learners.
- In all but two schools the majority of students qualified for the free/reduced priced meals program.³ Nine of the schools reported at least two-thirds of student enrollment.
- Two-thirds of the schools in the sample received Title 1 funds.
- Two schools in the sample maintained year-round schedules.
- One school in the sample was an alternative school.

One-day site visits were conducted at each of the 12 schools selected. Visits took place throughout a ten-week span between October and December 2006. One-on-one interviews were conducted with at least one site administrator at each school site (the Principal in most cases). At middle schools and high schools, we conducted one-on-one interviews with 3-4 teachers of core subjects (English, math, science, and/or social studies). At elementary school sites, we interviewed 3-4 teachers each with different grade level assignments. In all, 42 teachers and 14 site administrators were interviewed. All of the teachers interviewed held full credentials and were appropriately assigned. Copies of the administrator and teacher interview protocols are available upon request.

Quantitative Methods:

Williams Settlement Legislation requires county superintendents to annually report the results of school visits and reviews to the governing board of each school district, the county board of education, and the county board of supervisors of his/her county, describing the state of decile 1-3 schools in the county. As such, the UCLA research team made efforts to extract quantitative data documenting improvements (through year-to-year comparisons) from the county superintendents' 2004-05 and 2005-06 Annual Reports. However, few annual reports were available publicly. Of the 45 County Offices of Education (COE) in California that oversee decile 1-3 schools, researchers were able to retrieve on-line versions of annual reports for 5 COEs. Further, a review of available 2004-05 and 2005-06 Annual Reports revealed inconsistencies in terms of reporting both between years and between COEs. As such, a "Year 2" survey was constructed and administered to all COEs, soliciting 2004-05 and 2005-06 data regarding results of *Williams* visits and reviews. County superintendents were asked to provide data regarding the number of site visits and reviews performed, textbook/instructional material

¹ "Students of color" is inclusive of Latino (identified as "Hispanic" in data drawn from the California Department of Education), African American, Asian (including Pacific Islanders and Filipino), African American, and Native American students enrolled.

² School level information reported is drawn from the California Department of Education's Ed-Data website. Additional data, information, and glossary of terms are available at <http://www.ed-data.k12.ca.us/welcome.asp>.

³ The Free/Reduced Price Meal percentage reported by Ed-Data is based on the number of students eligible divided by enrollment from the CBEDS data collection.

insufficiencies, facility conditions, teacher misassignments and vacancies, SARC reviews, and *Williams* Complaints. Data were requested for each district within the county with decile 1-3 schools, and aggregated at the county-level. A copy of the survey instrument is available upon request.

Forty-one COEs responded directly to the “Year 2” survey. Limited data from a non-responsive county was available through the COE website. In all, we received or were able to retrieve information from 42 (93%) of all COEs, accounting for more than 99% of all decile 1-3 schools in the state. Three counties (Siskiyou, Tehama and Yuba) did not respond to the “Year 2” survey. Cumulatively, these three counties oversee less than 1% of all decile 1-3 schools in California. These counties were excluded from all survey analyses.

Additionally, counties were excluded from the analysis of a particular indicator in the instance of incomplete survey data or inconsistent reporting. For example, analyses regarding the number of schools visited with identified textbook/instructional material insufficiencies are based on complete and consistent responses from 40 COEs for 2004-05 and 2005-06, accounting for 90% of decile 1-3 schools in the state. In contrast, analyses regarding the total classrooms identified with insufficient textbooks/instructional materials in 2004-05 and 2005-06 are based on complete and consistent responses from 34 COEs, representing 80% of all decile 1-3 schools in the state. Researchers found low response rates for all survey questions that diverged from required reporting elements in county office of education annual reports. COEs indicated, in these cases, they were unable to respond due to data unavailability. The analyses of several survey inquiries were not included in **Williams v. California: *The Statewide Impact of Two Years of Implementation*** due to low response rates. In most cases, the number of COEs included, and the percentage of decile 1-3 schools represented in the analyses are noted in the endnotes in **Williams v. California: *The Statewide Impact of Two Years of Implementation***.

Official documents (e.g., COE annual reports and School Accountability Report Cards) were used as a means of verifying survey responses. When discrepancies were identified between COE annual reports and COE survey responses, for example, data from the annual reports and/or other official documents were analyzed. Due to limited public availability of annual reports (few COEs submitted annual reports with their survey responses as requested), and concerns identified with the School Accountability Report Card,⁴ the research team relied heavily on survey data. Information regarding teacher misassignments and vacancies, however, deviates from this generalization and relies primarily on the analysis of data provided by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

⁴ Interview data reveals that the SARC has been difficult to review for accuracy and/or use as an accurate source of *Williams* data due to inconsistent reporting and data definitions. SARCs provide a “snapshot” of the school by capturing data for a particular time period. The data captured by the “snapshot” may be accurate, but can expectedly lose some validity by the time a site visit is performed by the COE months later.

Williams v. California: *The Statewide Impact of Two Years of Implementation*—the report drawn from this study—provides a comprehensive discussion of these quantitative and qualitative analyses. The report investigates the impact of the *Williams* Settlement Legislation on decile 1-3 schools by seeking answers to the following questions:

- **Since the enactment of the *Williams* Legislation, has access to textbooks and instructional materials increased for public school students in California?**
- **Since the enactment of the *Williams* Legislation, has access to clean, safe, and functional schools increased for public school students in California?**
- **Since the enactment of the *Williams* Legislation, has access to appropriately certificated and assigned teachers increased for public school students in California?**

For additional information, including copies of the survey instrument and interview protocols, please send an e-mail message with your request to WilliamsInfo@aclu-sc.org.