



# **Consolidated Annual Program Evaluation Report**

**THECB Funded Programs  
Fiscal Year 2008**

**January 2009**



## Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| A.W. "Whit" Riter III, CHAIR                             | Tyler       |
| Fred W. Heldenfels IV, VICE-CHAIR                        | Austin      |
| Elaine Mendoza, SECRETARY OF THE BOARD                   | San Antonio |
| Charles E. "Trey" Lewis III, STUDENT MEMBER OF THE BOARD | Houston     |
| Laurie Bricker   | Houston     |
| Joe B. Hinton  | Crawford    |
| Brenda Pejovich  | Dallas      |
| Lyn Bracewell Phillips                                   | Bastrop     |
| Robert W. Shepard  | Harlingen   |
| Robert V. Wingo  | El Paso     |

Raymund A. Paredes, COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

### Mission of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's mission is to work with the Legislature, Governor, governing boards, higher education institutions, and other entities to help Texas meet the goals of the state's higher education plan, *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, and thereby provide the people of Texas the widest access to higher education of the highest quality in the most efficient manner.

### Philosophy of the Coordinating Board

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies. The Coordinating Board will engage in actions that add value to Texas and to higher education. The agency will avoid efforts that do not add value or that are duplicated by other entities.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, or disability in employment or the provision of services.

## Foreword

This is the first edition of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's (THECB) Consolidated Annual Program Evaluation Report. This report represents the first time that the THECB has pulled together a concise and informative report on all of its funded programs. This report will be produced on an annual basis, enabling policy makers and higher education leaders to make more informed judgments about the relative costs and benefits of specially funded higher education programs.

The printed version of the report provides an overview of the THECB's funded programs and projects that fall under each program. Its online companion enables anyone who is interested in knowing more about a particular program or specific projects to obtain the full evaluation report at the click of a button. The online report will be available on the THECB's website ([www.thecb.state.tx.us](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us)) on the Program Evaluation web page in early 2009.

It is the goal of the THECB to provide the best information possible. To that end, we invite public comments via the online site or by email.

Evaluation Report prepared by: Robin Zuniga, [Robin.Zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Robin.Zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6536.

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction.....  | 1  |
| Summary and Recommendations .....  | 3  |
| Pilot Programs High-Stakes (\$100,000).....  | 8  |
| Course Redesign (Phase II) .....   | 9  |
| Course Redesign (Phase I).....   | 11 |
| High School Summer Bridge Program 2008.....  | 13 |
| Intensive Summer Program 2008 .....  | 16 |
| Facilitation of Development and Implementation of College Readiness Standards..... | 19 |
| College Connections (Phase I).....   | 22 |
| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option A) .....  | 25 |
| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option B) .....  | 29 |
| Mathematics, Science and Technology Teacher Preparation Academies (Phase I).....   | 31 |
| Learning Objects Repository (Phases I and II) .....                                | 33 |
| Course Redesign (Phase IV).....  | 35 |
| Faculty Development Modules for Online Learning .....                              | 37 |
| Gates GO Centers - Houston, Texas.....   | 39 |
| Pilot Programs Low-Stakes (Less than \$100,000).....                               | 41 |
| Lexile Frameworks Analysis of Higher Education Textbooks .....                     | 42 |
| 18-Hour Graduate Certificate Pilot Program.....                                    | 46 |
| Pre-Service Practicum, Induction and Practice.....                                 | 48 |
| Local Vertical Curriculum Alignment – San Antonio Pathways.....                    | 50 |
| Standing Programs .....  | 52 |
| Texas Governor’s Schools .....   | 53 |
| African American Library/Museum .....  | 56 |
| Perkins Leadership Grants.....   | 58 |
| Perkins Basic Grants .....   | 62 |
| Perkins Tech-Prep Grants .....   | 68 |
| Regional P-16 Councils .....   | 71 |
| Statewide Preceptorship Program.....   | 76 |
| Engineering Recruitment Summer Program 2008 .....                                  | 78 |
| Technology Workforce Development Grant Program.....                                | 81 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| African American Male: Dallas Project.....   | 85  |
| Vertical Teams (Phases I and II).....  | 87  |
| Texas Success Initiative Test Alignment with College Readiness Standards (Phase I) ..... | 90  |
| College Readiness Special Advisors.....  | 92  |
| Basic Research Programs.....   | 106 |
| Minority Health Research and Education Grant Program .....                               | 107 |
| Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program .....            | 110 |
| Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP) .....                                 | 114 |

## Introduction

This report includes information on the evaluation of 33 programs funded and/or coordinated by the THECB during the 2008 fiscal year (September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008.)

These programs are organized into three types: pilot programs, standing programs, and basic research programs. The programs that fall into each of these types call for different types of evaluation strategies and various degrees of evaluation effort and resources. The types of programs and the typical type of evaluation applied to each include:

- **Pilot programs** (17) are programs funded to encourage innovation and test possible solutions to pressing problems. Evaluations of these programs are more intensive, long-term and are intended to gather evidence on best practices. Once a program has been studied and shown to be of value it may be moved into the standing programs category. High-stakes pilots have annual funding of \$100,000 or more. Low-stakes pilots have annual funding of less than \$100,000, or are provided by a single contractor.
- **Standing programs** (13) are programs funded to provide a service to higher education or postsecondary students in the state. Evaluations of these programs are primarily summative, with some formative elements to help improve the programs over time. Evaluation may be conducted by THECB staff or subcontracted in part to an external consultant.
- **Basic research programs** (3) are programs that fund basic and original research conducted at state higher education institutions. Evaluation of these programs focuses on documentation of research results and dissemination. The THECB program administrators are responsible for collecting the evaluation data and submitting the report.

Within this report, programs are organized first by type of program. Within program type, they are then organized by type of funding and program dates. The earlier the program is in the funding cycle, the more likely that program evaluation data will still be "in progress."

Program evaluations are on-going and continuous. Data on the success of THECB programs are being collected throughout the year and are reported as they are completed. Since this hard copy version of the report is only produced once per year, by necessity it is only a snapshot of a dynamic, on-going process. Another limitation of the hard copy version is space. This hard copy version only has space for the executive summaries of each program.

These limitations through a web-based, publicly accessible, reporting system. Anyone will be able to access the summaries and full evaluation reports for any THECB funded program and the individual projects within that program. Throughout the year, as evaluations are completed, reports will be updated in the online system. Starting in early 2009, these reports can be accessed by visiting the Coordinating Board's website ([www.thecb.state.tx.us](http://www.thecb.state.tx.us)) and going to the Program Evaluation page. Reports will be searchable by program title or by county.

The executive summaries for each program include: 1) a program description 2) a statement of the issues and goals that support the program 3) recommendations for the program and 4) a

table with information on the effectiveness of each of the projects funded. Projects are rated on their effectiveness and on their compliance with the program, evaluation, and financial requirements of the grant.

The way in which effectiveness is determined varies by program. The effectiveness of pilot programs are measured based on process and outcome measures specific to each programs goals and objectives. Each project within a pilot program is ranked from very effective to not effective based on how well they met the criteria established for that program. A note at the bottom of the table will indicate the basis for the ratings for each program. If a project failed to collect the required data for the program's cross-site evaluation, its rating will be "insufficient data" and their evaluation fidelity score will be a "1" indicating they did not comply with the cross-site evaluation requirements of the program.

For all three types of programs fidelity is important. The fidelity scores indicate how well a project has met its contractual obligations for the grant funds received. All programs are rated 1 through 3 in three areas – programming, evaluation and financial – where 3 equals "in complete accordance;" 2 equals "minor departures from program requirements," and a 1 equals "a serious departure from the requirements of the program."

Programs were organized into four groups for the this report:

- Pilot programs, high stakes
- Pilot programs, low stakes
- Standing programs
- Basic research support

## Summary and Recommendations

In Fiscal Year 2008, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) funded and/or operated 33 special programs, totaling more than \$87 million dollars.

Staff discovered several issues of project noncompliance with programming, evaluation, and/or financial requirements. This report includes fidelity scores indicating when a project was noncompliant in one or more of these areas. Penalties are being adopted and implemented by THECB for project noncompliance. In addition, the fidelity scores will be available to THECB program directors so that they can research an institution's fidelity when making decisions about new grant awards.

The legislative guidelines for program implementation are often very broad, enabling projects to cover a wide range of populations and an even wider range of interventions. While experimentation is good initially, the time has come to identify specific practices to be implemented and studied for their effectiveness, especially in the area of developmental education.

In the past, grant awards have been for a single year only. Staff have come to the realization that not only do we recruit more proposals for our programs when they are funded over a two or three-year period, we also are better able to study these interventions. For Fiscal Year 2009, staff petitioned and received approval from the Coordinating Board to award three-year grants for some programs.

There were 17 pilot programs directed at the goal of *Closing the Gaps by 2015* and implementation of the College Readiness Standards:

- The **Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP)** has been implemented in four phases. The final summative evaluation of this program is still in process. Each of the course redesign projects is being measured based on its ability to improve college persistence, lower the course drop-out, failure, and withdrawal rate (DFW), and lower costs. Overall, the redesign projects are successful. We have observed some meaningful trends.
  - Redesigned courses work best when they are taught by the faculty who initiated the project. Gaining full buy-in from faculty, who are two or three steps removed from the redesign, is difficult.
  - Community colleges have a difficult time reducing direct costs through redesign. They do not employ teaching assistants or other lower paid instructional staff to defray personnel costs. However, they can reduce costs by increasing persistence and course completion rates.
- The **Intensive Summer and High School Bridge** programs provide content and study skills enrichment activities for rising 11th, 12th, and first-year-in-college students.
  - Of the 11 High School Summer Bridge Programs (HSSBP) two were judged to be "very effective;" six were rated "effective;" and two were "not effective." The remaining program did not provide sufficient data to judge its effectiveness. What makes a program "very effective?" The evaluators observed that successful programs: 1) designed the curriculum specifically for high school students and for summer enrichment 2) spent more time on task, with a minimum of 5.5

hours per day for at least 4 days per week 3) were well-organized and had an active and involved advisory board 4) had well-planned instruction in learning strategies, which research has shown promotes the motivation and self-efficacy important for long-term success, and 5) embedded tutoring into the program.

- The 10 Intensive Summer Programs (ISP) were more varied in their curriculum and populations than the high school programs. Three of the ISPs were judged "very effective;" two were rated "effective; one was "somewhat effective;" and three were judged to be "not effective." One site did not supply cross-site evaluation data and could not be rated. The evaluators observed that successful programs: 1) use tutors in the classroom at a low student-tutor ratio 2) engage in planning and is well-organized, which also lead to better recruitment procedures 3) designed their own innovative curriculum such as the paired course model at Texas State University 4) included a well-organized 'learning strategy and college knowledge curriculum, which research has shown promotes the motivation and self-efficacy important for long-term success.

The THECB supported 13 standing programs that provide services to higher education institutions, students, faculty, and staff.

- The **Texas Governor's Schools** are part of a national network of Governor's schools. Their purpose is to provide a college enrichment experience for high-achieving Texas high school students from low income and/or previously underserved populations. The three Governor's Schools funded in 2008 served approximately 250 students. All three programs were effective at increasing the student's knowledge about how to academically prepare for college, apply to college and for financial aid, and to choose a college that fits them.
- The **Engineering Recruitment Summer Program** funded 11 projects in 2008 for more than 660 participants. The goal of the program is to increase the number of students completing engineering, computer science, math, and physical science bachelors, and associate's degrees. The numbers of engineering and math awards have increased some since 2000, while numbers of awards in computer science and physical science have declined. Without a full evaluation, it is impossible to say how much these projects impact student decisions to pursue degrees in these areas. We recommend moving this program under the pilot category for the next round of evaluations.

Funding for basic research at THECB is overseen by the Division of Academic Affairs and Research. Together these three research support programs – the *Minority Health Research and Education Grants*, *Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grants*, and the *Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program* – provide close to \$20 million in basic research funding to more than 140 research projects across the state.

## Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Funded Programs – Fiscal Year 2008

---

**Pilot programs:** These are programs funded to encourage innovation and test possible solutions to pressing problems. Evaluations of these programs are more intensive, long-term, and are intended to gather evidence on best practices. Once a program has been studied and shown to be of value, it may be moved into the on going programs category.

**High-Stakes** - represents a significant investment of state dollars, more than \$100,000 for the program as a whole. The RFPs are issued by THECB. In most cases there are multiple contractors. The THECB has an active role in the evaluation but may subcontract the evaluation to an outside entity through an RFP.

| Program   | Effectiveness | Total Funding | Source of Funding | Ending Month | Ending Year |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Course Redesign (Phase II)  | Effective     | \$ 128,367    | State             | August       | 2007        |
| Course Redesign (Phase I)   | Effective     | \$ 618,322    | State             | June         | 2008        |
| High School Summer Bridge Program 2008  | Effective     | \$ 524,250    | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Intensive Summer Program 2008   | Effective     | \$ 1,485,331  | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Facilitation of Development and Implementation of College Readiness Standards | Effective     | \$ 1,819,520  | State             | August       | 2008        |
| College Connections (Phase I)   | In Progress   | \$ 925,000    | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option A)   | In Progress   | \$ 2,065,019  | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option B)   | In Progress   | \$ 1,658,209  | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Math, Science and Technology Teacher Preparation Academies (Phase I)          | In Progress   | \$ 610,620    | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Learning Objects Repository (Phase I)   | In Progress   | \$ 120,000    | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Course Redesign (Phase IV)  | In Progress   | \$ 416,393    | State             | January      | 2010        |
| Faculty Development Modules for Online Learning                               | In Progress   | \$ 988,842    | State             | February     | 2010        |
| Gates GO Centers – Houston, Texas   | In Progress   | \$ 1,137,000  | Gates Foundation  | May          | 2010        |

**Pilot programs:** These are programs funded to encourage innovation and test possible solutions to pressing problems. Evaluations of these programs are more intensive, long-term and are intended to gather evidence on best practices. Once a program has been studied and shown to be of value, it may be moved into the on-going programs category.

**Low-Stakes** - Represents either 1) an investment of state dollars less than \$100,000 for the entire program, or 2) a single contractor is involved in executing the program and is responsible for evaluation.

| Program  | Effectiveness | Total Funding | Source of Funding | Ending Month | Ending Year |
|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Lexile Frameworks Analysis of Higher Education Textbooks   | Effective     | \$ 128,000    | State             | August       | 2008        |
| 18-Hour Graduate Certificate Pilot Program                 | In Progress   | \$ 69,300     | State             | January      | 2009        |
| Pre-Service Practicum, Induction, and Practice             | In Progress   | \$ 600,000    | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Local Vertical Curriculum Alignment - San Antonio Pathways | In Progress   | \$ 196,981    | State             | May          | 2009        |

**Standing programs:** These are programs funded to provide a service to higher education or postsecondary students in the state. Evaluations of these programs are primarily summative, with some formative elements to help improve the programs over time. Evaluation may be conducted by THECB staff or subcontracted in part to an outside entity.

| Program   | Effectiveness      | Total Funding | Source of Funding | Ending Month | Ending Year |
|---|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Texas Governor's Schools                          | Effective          | \$ 555,594    | State             | July         | 2008        |
| African American Library/Museum                   | Somewhat Effective | \$ 93,636     | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Perkins Leadership Grants                         | In Progress        | \$ 3,395,863  | Federal           | August       | 2008        |
| Perkins Basic Grants                              | Effective          | \$ 32,663,925 | Federal           | August       | 2008        |
| Perkins Tech-Prep Grants                          | In Progress        | \$ 8,397,736  | Federal           | August       | 2008        |
| Regional P-16 Councils                            | Effective          | \$ 435,000    | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Statewide Preceptorship Program                   | Effective          | \$ 452,145    | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Engineering Recruitment Summer Program 2008       | In Progress        | \$ 205,000    | State             | August       | 2008        |
| Technology Workforce Development Grant Program    | Very Effective     | \$ 2,091,397  | State             | August       | 2008        |
| African-American Male Task Force : Dallas Project | Effective          | \$ 9,500      | State             | September    | 2008        |

**Standing programs:** These are programs funded to provide a service to higher education or postsecondary students in the state. Evaluations of these programs are primarily summative, with some formative elements to help improve the programs over time. Evaluation may be conducted by THECB staff or subcontracted in part to an outside entity.

| Program  | Effectiveness | Total Funding | Source of Funding | Ending Month | Ending Year |
|--|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Vertical Teams (Phase I and II)  | Effective     | \$ 312,000    | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Texas Success Initiative Test Alignment with College Readiness Standards (Phase I) | In Progress   | \$ 141,467    | State             | April        | 2009        |
| College Readiness Special Advisors   | In Progress   | \$ 1,440,000  | State             | August       | 2010        |

**Basic Research Support:** These are programs that fund basic/original research conducted at state higher education institutions. Evaluation of these programs focuses on documentation of research results and dissemination. The THECB program administrators are responsible for collecting the evaluation data and submitting the report.

| Program   | Effectiveness | Total Funding | Source of Funding | Ending Month | Ending Year |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Minority Health Research and Education Grant Program                    | In Progress   | \$ 2,351,865  | State             | August       | 2009        |
| Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program | In Progress   | \$ 4,240,916  | State             | August       | 2010        |
| Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)                      | In Progress   | \$ 16,624,857 | State             | January      | 2011        |

Pilot Programs

High-Stakes  
(\$100,000 or more)

## Course Redesign (Phase II)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code requires the Board to "implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review and revise entry-level lower division academic courses" to improve student learning and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 128,367

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Projects Funded:</b> 4 |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$32,092   | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$ 19,948 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$ 50,127 |

**Program Dates:** June 1, 2007 to August 31, 2007

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP) is to have widespread adoption of course designs that promote student success, especially in the critical first year of college. The course redesign projects should both increase success in student learning while at the same time reduce the delivery cost of courses.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, introductory level, general education courses have been high-volume courses with unacceptable dropout, failure, and withdrawal (DFW) rates. These courses are also often very resource intensive for institutions. The course redesign program seeks to improve student learning and thus decrease DFW rates while at the same time use technology to reduce the cost of course delivery. The program is entering its second year when institutions will begin to pilot their course redesigns. Currently some challenges facing projects have included faculty buy-in and administrative support for the possible expansion of current projects.

**Program Operation:** Project proposals were received during spring 2007 and evaluated by Coordinating Board staff through the use of a standardized rubric and scoring system. Grant awards for selected projects were made May/June 2007.

**Results:** The projects are still in progress. After the first year of the project, participating sites' effectiveness were measured based on improvement in persistence rates and students completing the redesign courses with a C or better. Two of the four sites' initial pilot tests showed a statistically significant improvement in student completion with a C or better. A final evaluation of the pilots is in progress. Failure to demonstrate effectiveness at this early stage of the process does not mean the project will not be effective as development continues.

**Recommendations:** This phase is completed. However, participating sites are still creating learning objects from these courses for inclusion in the Learning Objects Repository.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

THECB Program Contact: Vanessa Davis, [Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us), (512)427-6223

| Course Redesign (Phase II)               |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$128,367 | 476                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| University of Texas El Paso, English     | \$21,276  | 84                        | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Del Mar College, College Algebra         | \$37,016  | 109                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Austin Community College, Spanish        | \$19,948  | 48                        | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Texas Tech University, Spanish           | \$50,127  | 235                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants reflects the number the institution proposed to serve in its initial application for the program. These numbers will be updated in late 2008 when evaluation data are submitted by the programs.

<sup>2</sup> Effectiveness is based on the ability of the project to increase persistence rates and successful student course completion compared to a previous offering of the same course taught under the traditional method.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Course Redesign (Phase I)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code requires the Board to "implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review and revise entry-level lower division academic courses...to improve student learning and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 618,322

|                                     |                                      |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Projects Funded:</b> 4 |                                      |                                     |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$ 154,581 | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$ 124,714 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$ 193,608 |

**Program Dates:** January 1, 2007, to June 30, 2008

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP) is to have widespread adoption of course designs that promote student success, especially in the critical first year of college. The course redesign projects should both increase success in student learning while at the same time reduce the delivery cost of courses.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, introductory level, general education courses have been high volume courses with unacceptable dropout, failure, and withdrawal (DFW) rates. These courses are also often very resource-intensive for institutions. The course redesign program seeks to improve student learning and thus decrease DFW rates while at the same time uses technology to reduce the cost of course delivery. The program is entering its second year where institutions will begin to pilot their course redesigns. Currently some challenges facing projects have included faculty buy-in and administrative support for the possible expansion of current projects.

**Program Operation:** Project proposals were received during fall 2006 and evaluated by Coordinating Board staff through the use of a standardized rubric and scoring system. Grant awards for selected projects were made January 2007.

**Results:** The projects are still in progress. After the first year of the project, participating sites' effectiveness were measured based on improvement in persistence rates and students completing the redesign courses with a C or better. Three of the four sites' initial pilot tests showed a statistically significant improvement in student completion with a C or better. The evaluation of the pilots second year is in progress. Failure to demonstrate effectiveness at this early stage of the process does not mean the project will not be effective as development continues.

**Recommendations:** This phase is completed. However, participating sites are still creating learning objects from these courses for inclusion in the Learning Objects Repository.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

THECB Program Contact: Vanessa Davis, [Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us), (512)427-6223

| Course Redesign (Phase I)                    |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site     |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                                 | Funding   | Participants <sub>1</sub> | Effectiveness <sub>2</sub> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                       | \$618,322 | 485                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| University of North Texas, U.S. History I    | \$193,608 | 48                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| University of Texas, Calculus                | \$175,000 | 92                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Le Croy Center, (DCCCD), English Composition | \$125,000 | 206                       | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Texas Tech University, English Composition   | \$124,714 | 139                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants reflects the number the institution proposed to serve in its initial application for the program. These numbers will be updated in late 2008 when evaluation data are submitted by the programs.

<sup>2</sup> Effectiveness is based on the ability of the project to increase persistence rates and successful student course completion compared to a previous offering of the same course taught under the traditional method.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## High School Summer Bridge Program 2008

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0762 of the Texas Education Code, entitled "Programs to Enhance Student Success," was created by the Third Special Session of the 79th Texas Legislature. This section requires that the Coordinating Board by rule develop programs designed to enhance the success of students at institutions of higher education and decrease the need for developmental education. Paragraph (1) under Section 61.0762 provides for summer higher education bridge programs in the subject areas of mathematics, science, and English/Language Arts (ELA).

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$524,250

|                                      |                                    |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Projects Funded:</b> 11 |                                    |                                   |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$43,687    | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$18,250 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$79,000 |

**Program Dates:** June 2-August 8, 2008

**Program Goals:** 1) Promote high academic expectations leading to college readiness or completion; 2) Encourage student motivation, academic efficacy, and persistence; 3) Create or expand social and academic support systems and; 4) Promote effective public or higher education teaching.

**Issues and Challenges:** In Texas, only 20 percent of the approximately 79,000 2008 high school graduates who took the ACT test met or surpassed the College Readiness Benchmarks in all four subject areas (English, math, reading, and science). In the fall of 2000, 28 percent of entering freshmen in public and private two- and four-year colleges in the U.S. were enrolled in one or more developmental education courses. According to an analysis by the Alliance for Excellence Education (2006), the state of Texas alone would save \$88.5 million per year by eliminating the need for developmental education.

**Program Operation:** The 2008 High School Summer Bridge Program (HSSBP) targets rising 11th and/or Rising 12th grade students who have attained a score of  $\geq 2000$  in ELA and mathematics on the 10th or 11th grade TAKS test but  $< 2200$  in ELA with a writing score of 3 and  $< 2200$  on mathematics. Funds went to institutions of higher education (IHEs) who collaborated with LOCAL independent school districts (ISDs).

**Results:** Overall, this program is effective. From the program evaluation, we learned: 1) Intensive summer bridge programs for this target population can be successful in improving the college readiness of participants in mathematics. 2) Intensive summer bridge programs for this target population can be successful in improving participant awareness about and use of learning and study strategies related to skill, will, and self-regulation components of strategic learning. 3) Two sites (Palo Alto and Victoria College) demonstrated medium to large positive effects on the mathematics post-TAKS and demonstrated medium-large positive gains in at

least 8/10 learning and study strategies assessed by the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI). 4) The three sites (Palo Alto College, Texas State Technical College-Harlingen, and Victoria College) demonstrated medium to large positive effects on the post-TAKS used a variety of approaches to curriculum and instruction, and 5) Four of the five sites (Richland College, the University of Texas at El Paso, University of Texas Pan American, and Victoria College) that demonstrated consistent medium-large positive gains in at least 8/10 learning and study strategies assessed by the LASSI had college-going instruction built into the curriculum. Each of these sites approached the problem somewhat differently, but all utilized regularly scheduled time for the instruction.

**Recommendations:** 1) Curriculum and instruction should be specifically designed for high school students and should not be the traditional developmental or dual enrollment curriculum offered by the college. 2) The curriculum should include planned instruction and activities designed to improve the learning strategies addressed by the LASSI. Research has shown these skills promote motivation and self-efficacy and are important for success. 3) Sites should be urged to promote a college-going culture by encouraging students to enroll in dual credit courses in the fall. 4) Instructional time should be a minimum of 5.5 hours per day at least 4 days/week for a minimum of 4 weeks. 5) Sites should actively involve an advisory council composed of ISD personnel, college personnel, parents, and community representatives to plan, oversee, and evaluate the program. One key task of the advisory council would be to make recommendations for improvement in the program. 6) Tutors should be embedded in the classroom.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** The University of Texas Arlington, David L. Stader

**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us), (512)427-6120

| High School Summer Bridge Program 2008   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$524,250 | 627                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| Blinn College                            | \$79,000  | 107                       | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Costal Bend College                      | \$63,250  | 79                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Richland College                         | \$18,250  | 20                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 1          | IP        |
| Palo Alto College                        | \$31,000  | 39                        | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Sul Ross State                           | \$53,500  | 65                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 2          | IP        |
| Texas A&M Corpus Christi                 | \$40,750  | 45                        | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| TSTC-Harlingen                           | \$31,000  | 36                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 3          | IP        |

## High School Summer Bridge Program 2008

### Effectiveness of Program by Project Site

| Project Site     | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                  |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| TSTC- Waco       | \$46,750 | 47                        | Insufficient Data          | 3                            | 1          | IP        |
| UT El Paso       | \$36,250 | 43                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 2          | IP        |
| UT Pan American  | \$43,000 | 52                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 3          | IP        |
| Victoria College | \$46,000 | 56                        | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants reflects the number the institution proposed to serve in its initial application for the program. These numbers will be updated in late 2008 when evaluation data are submitted by the programs.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based on the project's ability to achieve statistically significant improvement in participants Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) scores and scores on the Learning Strategies and Skills Inventory (LASSI), both pre/post and against a control group.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Intensive Summer Program 2008

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0762 of the Texas Education Code, entitled "Programs to Enhance Student Success," was created by the Third Special Session of the 79th Texas Legislature. This section requires that the Coordinating Board by rule develop programs designed to enhance the success of students at institutions of higher education and decrease the need for developmental education. Paragraph (1) under Section 61.0762 provides for summer higher education bridge programs in the subject areas of mathematics, science, and English/Language Arts.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,485,331

|                                      |                                    |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Projects Funded:</b> 10 |                                    |                                   |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$61,507    | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$24,750 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$99,750 |

**Program Dates:** June 2, 2008, to August 15, 2008

**Program Goals:** 1) Promote high academic expectations leading to college readiness or completion; 2) Encourage student motivation, academic efficacy, and persistence; 3) Create or expand social and academic support systems; 4) Promote effective public or higher education teaching.

**Issues and Challenges:** In the fall of 2000, 28 percent of entering freshmen in public and private two- and four-year colleges in the U.S. enrolled in one or more developmental education courses (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2003). In Texas, only 20 percent of the 2008 high school graduates who took the ACT test met or surpassed the College Readiness Benchmarks in all four subject areas (English, math, reading, and science). According to an analysis by the Alliance for Excellence Education (2006), the state of Texas would save \$88.5 million per year by eliminating the need for developmental education.

**Program Operation:** The 2008 Intensive Summer Bridge Program (ISP) included first-time college students identified as at-risk of dropping out defined as having a SAT or ACT score equal to or less than the national mean, awarded a Pell grant, at least 20 years old at time of enrollment, or has enrolled as a part-time student. Funds went to institutions of higher education (IHEs) who collaborate with school districts (ISDs).

**Results:** Overall, this program is effective. From the program evaluation, we learned: 1) Intensive summer programs for this target population can be successful in improving the college readiness of participants in reading and mathematics. 2) Intensive summer programs for this target population can be successful in improving participant awareness about and use of learning and study strategies related to skill, will and self-regulation components of strategic learning. 3) The use of tutors in the classroom at a low student-tutor ratio appears to help increase overall learning. 4) More effective sites seemed to be able to recruit, plan, and organization better. Some of the lower ratings came from sites who seemed to have problems

with the quick turnaround from award announcement to having the program implemented. 5) Using pre-developed curriculum instead of attempting to derive new curriculum or learning strategies was not effective for this target population. Not every new technique worked, but it should be noted that only those sites with innovative curriculum and instruction demonstrated success.

**Recommendations:** 1) Future participants should be urged to promote a college going culture by helping students with registration for fall courses as part of the program (Cedar Valley College, El Paso Community College, and Trinity Valley Community College). 2) A college skills class or student success class is necessary for these borderline students (Cedar Valley College, El Paso Community College, UT-El Paso, Trinity Valley Community College). 3) Administrators should review student progress data weekly at a minimum (El Paso Community College, Texas State University-San Marcos). 4) Tutoring should be mandated, or continue to be mandated, as part of the program (San Antonio College, Texas A&M International, Texas State University-San Marcos, Trinity Valley Community College). 5) Extensive recruiting seems to lead to greater success (Texas A&M International, San Antonio College).

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** The University of Texas Arlington, David L. Stader  
**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us), (512)427-6120

| Intensive Summer Program 2008            |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$1,485,331 | 679                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| Austin Community College                 | \$46,715    | 52                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 2          | IP        |
| Cedar Valley College                     | \$37,500    | 53                        | Not effective              | 2                            | 2          | IP        |
| El Paso Community College                | \$99,750    | 131                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| San Antonio College                      | \$24,750    | 35                        | Insufficient data          | 2                            | 1          | IP        |
| Texas AM International University        | \$57,750    | 80                        | Effective                  | 2                            | 3          | IP        |
| Texas Southern University                | \$92,300    | 116                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 2          | IP        |

**Intensive Summer Program 2008**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                       | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                    |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas State University             | \$98,059 | 70                        | Very Effective             | 2                            | 3          | IP        |
| Trinity Valley Community College   | \$24,750 | 34                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| University of Texas at Brownsville | \$99,750 | 58                        | Not effective              | 1                            | 2          | IP        |
| University of Texas at El Paso     | \$33,750 | 50                        | Not effective              | 2                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants reflects the number the institution proposed to serve in its initial application for the program. These numbers will be updated in late 2009 when evaluation data are submitted by the programs.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based on the project’s ability to achieve statistically significant improvement in participants Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) scores and scores on the Learning and Study Strategies Inventory (LASSI), both pre/post and against a control group.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Facilitation of Development and Implementation of College Readiness Standards

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The 79th Texas Legislature, Third Called Session, passed House Bill 1, which included the addition to the Texas Education Code Section 28.008, entitled "Advancement of College Readiness in Curriculum."

**Annual Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,819,520

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** June 21, 2007 to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The goals of this program are 1) To facilitate the development of a comprehensive set of College Readiness Standards (CRS) for the state of Texas (Phase I); 2) to validate those standards through an alignment analysis in which they were compared with the content of actual entry-level, credit-bearing courses at Texas colleges and universities (Phase II); and 3) to ascertain what are the common components of entry-level courses that are well aligned with the CRS and highly representative of common practice (Phase II).

**Issues and Challenges:** To date, there have been no unanticipated challenges. The standards development process included a tight timeline, but the vertical teams reached agreement and met all deadlines. The standards were then released for public comment, and had high average agreement rates (91 percent for ELA; 88 percent for mathematics; 91 percent for sciences; 88 percent for social studies; and 97 percent for the cross-disciplinary standards). During the validation phase, both the response rate (960 syllabi were submitted) and levels of alignment (ranging from 85 percent to 100 percent) exceeded expectations.

**Program Operation:** This program technically falls under our definition of a low-stakes, pilot program. It is included under the high-stakes category because of its significance to the goals of the THECB and the amount of time and energy devoted to its successful completion. Phase I: Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) facilitated meetings of the vertical teams (VTs) charged with developing college readiness standards that specified the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed in entry-level courses at Texas colleges and universities. These teams, composed of secondary and postsecondary faculty, met four times between March and October 2007 and completed interim online homework assignments independently to reach agreement on the standards. At its October 2007 meeting, Board members approved posting of the draft standards for public comment. Over 1,000 comments were received, and these were reviewed when the VTs prepared their final drafts. The final drafts of the Texas College Readiness Standards (CRS) were approved unanimously by the THECB in January 2008 and sent to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education for incorporation into the TEKS in April 2008.

Phase II: EPIC undertook an alignment analysis to determine how the CRS compare to what is currently being taught in 20 entry-level college courses at Texas institutions of higher education. The 20 course titles were selected by the THECB because they had high enrollment

statewide among entry-level students or because they were “gatekeeper” courses that are prerequisite requirements for different majors. College Readiness Special Advisors, liaisons between the THECB and the advisors’ postsecondary institutions, were asked to submit nominations of entry-level courses at their colleges and universities that best represented the CRS. Nominated course instructors were then asked to submit syllabi and self-ratings of how necessary relevant CRS were to preparing students for success in their courses.

A total of 813 instructors of entry-level courses submitted 960 syllabi and self-ratings in which they described the importance of each of the relevant college readiness standards for preparation for their courses. Expert reviewers were used to examine the accuracy of the self-ratings. Results indicated high matches between instructor self-ratings of courses against the CRS and the expert reviewer confirmation of the ratings.

**Results:** Phase I: The results of Phase I are the Texas College Readiness Standards themselves. The CRS can be found on the THECB website at <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/collegereadiness/TCRS.cfm>. These standards are the foundation of the THECB’s and TEA’s future college readiness work.

Phase II: Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) used the instructor data collected through the process described above to determine how the CRS compare to actual common practice in entry-level college courses in Texas and to ascertain what are the common components of entry-level courses that are well aligned with the CRS and highly representative of common practice. Results from the analysis revealed that the CRS are well aligned with entry-level, credit-bearing courses in Texas. Rates of alignment by subject area were: 99 percent in social studies; 97 percent in English/language arts; 87 percent in mathematics; and 85 percent in science. One hundred percent of the cross-disciplinary skills are aligned with at least one course in all four subject areas. These findings validate the content of the CRS by demonstrating that the standards accurately reflect the current instructional practices in entry-level credit-bearing college courses. In addition, by ascertaining the common components of entry-level credit-bearing courses, EPIC has laid the groundwork for the development of “reference courses” in Phase III of this project (see recommendations section).

**Recommendations:** This project will continue through August 2010. In Phase III, design teams composed of postsecondary-level content experts will develop composite “reference courses” based on the course data collected and analyzed in Phase II. These reference courses will represent the content and rigor of courses in which entering college students should be prepared to succeed. Once reference courses are developed, EPIC will facilitate meetings vertical teams composed of secondary and postsecondary-level content area experts who will create high school senior assignments, scoring guides, and accompanying instructional materials, all based on the reference courses.

In Phase IV, in conjunction with the TEA, EPIC will recruit and train high school teachers who will pilot the assignments created in Phase III and provide feedback for further refinement. The vertical teams will use this feedback to make final modifications before the materials are distributed statewide. These assignments will be used to enhance college readiness and to determine the degree to which high school seniors and incoming college students are meeting the CRS.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** David T. Conley, Educational Policy Improvement Center, Eugene, Oregon

THECB Program Contact: Evelyn Hiatt, [Evelyn.Hiatt@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Evelyn.Hiatt@theeb.state.tx.us), (512)427-6106

| Facilitation of Development and Implementation of College Readiness Standards<br>Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Project Site  | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$1,819,520 | 4,064                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of participants in the vertical team and syllabus review processes.

<sup>2</sup>This program’s effectiveness was determined by the THECB program director.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## College Connections (Phase I)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0762 of the Texas Education code, entitled "Programs to Enhance Student Success" was created by the Third Special Called Session of the 79th Texas Legislature. This section requires that the Coordinating Board develop programs designed to enhance the success of students at institutions of higher education and decrease the need for developmental education. Section 61.0762 (Appendix A) also states that to implement the P-16 College Readiness and Success Strategic Action Plan (Appendix B) and to enhance the success of students, the Coordinating Board is authorized to develop and implement programs that support the participation and success goals of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$925,000 (biennium)

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 15 (10 implementation and 5 planning)</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$90,000<br>implementation;<br>\$ 5,000 planning | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$21,934<br>implementation;<br>\$ 5,000 planning | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$100,000 implementation;<br>\$ 5,000 planning |

**Program Dates:** August 15, 2007 to August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** The goals of the College Connection Program are to: 1) build awareness among high school seniors of the importance of a college education and 2) increase rates of participation by guaranteeing admission to the participating college for all seniors in a participating high school and by providing free pre-college services including, but not limited to, admission, financial aid, and enrollment services – including college readiness assessment – on the high school campus, as a means of achieving or exceeding the participating institutions' targets for the participation goal of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*.

**Issues and Challenges:** Over 90 percent of new jobs that will be available to students in the 21st century require some postsecondary education. We cannot afford to have any student unprepared for his reality. This project is one strategy for creating a college-going culture in public high schools to encourage all students to achieve some postsecondary education.

**Program Operation:** Special consideration was given to postsecondary institutions that partners with HB 400 schools, 77th Texas Legislature, codified under Texas Education Code, Section 29.904. Each participating postsecondary institution agrees to provide, at minimum: 1) College Connection Program overview, 2) assistance with admissions application, 3) college readiness assessments as needed at no charge to the student, 4) assistance with financial aid application (FAFSA or TASFA), and 5) documentation of acceptance into postsecondary education for each graduating senior.

The school district partners: 1) guarantee access to their seniors for a minimum amount of time, 2) appoint a coordinator, and 3) award college acceptance letters along with diplomas at high school graduation ceremonies.

**Results:** The evaluation of this program includes an analysis of the services provided to seniors in the partnering high schools, as well as a pre-/post-analysis of the increase in the number of FASFA/TASFA completed and enrollments in postsecondary education for each high school by project site. These data will not be available for analysis until spring 2009.

**Recommendations:** This program is still in progress. Additional funding for expansion has been received from the U.S. Department of Education, College Access Challenge Grant program.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Chris Alvarado, [Chris.Alvarado@thechb.state.tx.us](mailto:Chris.Alvarado@thechb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6207

| College Connections (Phase I)<br>Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Project Site  | Funding              | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$925,000 (biennium) | 46,147                    | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| Houston Community College System  | \$100,000            | 2,000                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| South Texas College   | \$100,000            | 3,800                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Del Mar College   | \$100,000            | 3,118                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Alamo Community College District  | \$100,000            | 26,500                    | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 2         |
| Blinn College   | \$100,000            | 1,270                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Tarrant County College District   | \$99,948             | 2,000                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Richland College  | \$99,203             | 2,000                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 2         |
| Odessa College  | \$99,319             | 1,500                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Lee College   | \$88,596             | 2,000                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Weatherford College   | \$21,934             | 1,959                     | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | 3         |
| Paris Junior  | \$5,000              | NA                        | In Progress                | NA                           | NA         | NA        |

| College Connections (Phase I)<br>Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |         |                           |                            |                              |    |    |
|---|---------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----|----|
| Project Site  | Funding | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |    |    |
| College   |         |                           |                            |                              |    |    |
| Northeast Texas Community College   | \$5,000 | NA                        | In Progress                | NA                           | NA | NA |
| Cisco Junior College  | \$5,000 | NA                        | In Progress                | NA                           | NA | NA |
| Cedar Valley College  | \$5,000 | NA                        | In Progress                | NA                           | NA | NA |
| Victoria College  | \$5,000 | NA                        | In Progress                | NA                           | NA | NA |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants reflects the number the institution proposed to serve in its initial application for the program. These numbers will be updated in late 2008 when evaluation data are submitted by the programs.

<sup>2</sup>This program is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Course Redesign (Phase III, Option A)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code requires the Board to "implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review, revise entry-level lower division academic courses...to improve student learning, and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$2,065,019

|                                      |                                    |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 10</b> |                                    |                                    |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$187,729   | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$55,054 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$256,445 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP) is to have widespread adoption of course designs that promote student success, especially in the critical first year of college. The course redesign projects should both increase success in student learning while at the same time reduce the delivery cost of courses.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, introductory level, general education courses have been high volume courses with unacceptable drop-out, failure and withdrawal (DFW) rates. These courses are also often very resource intensive for institutions. The course redesign program seeks to improve student learning and thus decrease DFW rates while at the same time use technology to reduce the cost of course delivery. The program is entering its second year where institutions will begin to pilot their course redesigns. Currently some challenges facing projects have included faculty buy-in and administrative support for the possible expansion of current projects.

**Program Operation:** Option A programs agreed to work with the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) and follow their course design, evaluation and advising process. Project proposals were received during summer 2007 and evaluated by Coordinating Board staff through the use of a standardized rubric and scoring system. Grant awards for selected projects were made August 2007. Key project staff have participated in two workshops on course redesign provided by NCAT. Project directors are expected to submit biannual reports to Coordinating Board staff that include progress towards the project's goals as well as updated expenditure reports. Coordinating Board staff conducted site visits during spring 2008.

**Results:** The evaluation of these projects is still in progress.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that program be continued for its remaining year. During spring/summer 2009, recommend that project directors receive training on how to convert course redesign materials for inclusion in the Texas Learning Objects Repository.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** National Center for Academic Transformation

| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option A)  |                    |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |                    |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding            | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |                    |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>   | <b>\$2,065,019</b> | 1,874                     | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| National Center for Academic Transformation  | \$379,000          | NA                        | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| University of North Texas/North Central Texas College Developmental Math/College Algebra | \$190,927          | 280                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Woman's University Developmental Math/ Computer Science                            | \$114,771          | 100                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at El Paso Developmental English                                     | \$61,588           | 300                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at El Paso English Composition II                                    | \$55,054           | 259                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Richland College Developmental Writing   | \$122,752          | 75                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Le Croy Center (DCCCD)/ Texas Tech University English Composition                        | \$256,445          | 100                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option A)  |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Le Croy Center (DCCD)/ Eastfield College/ Richland College Spanish                               | \$140,737 | 150                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at Brownsville/ Texas Southmost College Statistics                           | \$249,730 | 330                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at Brownsville/ Texas Southmost College Developmental Reading and Government | \$249,645 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at Brownsville/ Texas Southmost College Developmental Math                   | \$244,370 | 280                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available. The number of participants reflects students participating in redesigned pilot courses through fall 2008. The NA for UT at Brownsville indicates that this site has not yet conducted a pilot test. The NCAT was contracted to evaluate and provided services to the other sites, therefore a participant count for NCAT is not applicable.

<sup>2</sup>This program's evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the

extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Course Redesign (Phase III, Option B)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code requires the Board to "implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review, revise entry-level lower division academic course to improve student learning, and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,658,209

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 6</b> |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$218,063  | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$173,570 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$349,287 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007- August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP) is to have widespread adoption of course designs that promote student success, especially in the critical first year of college. The course redesign projects should both increase success in student learning while at the same time reduce the delivery cost of courses.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, introductory level, general education courses have been high volume courses with unacceptable drop-out, failure and withdrawal (DFW) rates. These courses are also often very resource intensive for institutions. The course redesign program seeks to improve student learning and thus decrease DFW rates while at the same time use technology to reduce the cost of course delivery. The program is entering its second year where institutions will begin to pilot their course redesigns. Currently some challenges facing projects have included faculty buy-in and administrative support for the possible expansion of current projects.

**Program Operation:** Option B projects are not following the National Center for Academic Transformation design and advising processes. However, they agreed to collect the same assessment and cost data as the Option A projects. Project proposals were received during summer 2007 and evaluated by Coordinating Board staff through the use of a standardized rubric and scoring system. Grant awards for selected projects were made August 2007. Key project staff participated in two workshops on course redesign provided by The National Center for Academic Transformation. Project directors are expected to submit biannual reports to Coordinating Board staff that include progress towards the project's goals as well as updated expenditure reports. Coordinating Board staff conducted site visits during spring 2008.

**Results:** Collection of evaluation data on program effectiveness is still in progress.

**Recommendations:** Recommend that program be continued for its remaining year. During spring/summer 2009, recommend that project directors receive training on how to convert course redesign materials for inclusion in the Texas Learning Objects Repository.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

| Course Redesign (Phase III, Option B)   |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site  |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding     | Participants <sub>1</sub> | Effectiveness <sub>2</sub> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$1,658,209 | 2,577                     | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| Austin Community College Biology  | \$279,545   | 637                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Mountain View College   | \$173,570   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University/ West Texas A&M University                                 | \$349,827   | 1,940                     | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Del Mar College   | \$253,479   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at San Antonio  | \$264,900   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas / Texas A&M International University /Grayson College | \$336,888   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available in time for this report.

<sup>2</sup>This program’s evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Mathematics, Science and Technology Teacher Preparation Academies (Phase I)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 21.462 of the Texas Education Code, entitled "Mathematics, Science and Technology Teacher Preparation Academies," was created by the 80th Texas Legislature. According to the statute the THECB shall establish teacher preparation academies at institutions of higher education to improve the instructional skills of certified teachers and to train students enrolled in teacher preparation programs to perform at the highest levels in mathematics, science, and technology. Additional requirements are outlined in Coordinating Board rules, Texas Administrative Code §§5.111-5.115.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 610,620

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 2</b> |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average Award:</b><br>\$305,310  | <b>Smallest Award:</b><br>\$300,620 | <b>Largest Award:</b><br>\$310,000 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2008 , to August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** To promote effective public and higher education teaching and increase the percentage of teachers who have advanced training in mathematics, science and/or technology by creating learning communities of teachers who can continue to expand their expertise in teaching and learning.

**Issues and Challenges:** Research has shown that the content knowledge of teachers impacts the learning outcomes of students. There is a shortage of teachers who have advanced content and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, science and technology.

The start of this program was delayed because the awards required approval from the Coordinating Board, which was not secured until July 2008.

**Program Operation:** Awarded projects are required to offer two of the following: 1) Teacher Certification Programs focusing on increasing the number of student teachers pursuing education degrees in mathematics, science or technology, 2) Master's Teacher Programs designed to strengthen the content knowledge and skills of experienced teachers by providing programs in which they will obtain their Master's Teaching Certificate in mathematics, science or technology, and 3) Master's of Education Programs designed to strengthen the content knowledge and skills of Master's Teachers in mathematics, science, and/or technology by providing a program that enables them to obtain their Master's of Education Degree in mathematics, sciences, or technology.

**Results:** Since the start of the program was delayed, the program evaluation is still in progress.

**Recommendations:** There are no recommendations at this time.

Evaluation Subcontractor: Todd Sherron, Texas Collaborative, Austin, Texas

THECB Program Contact: Susan Barnes, [Susan.Barnes@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Susan.Barnes@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6563

| Mathematics, Science and Technology Teacher Preparation Academies (Phase I) |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                                    |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$610,620 | NR                        | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| University of Texas at El Paso  | \$310,000 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | IP        |
| Texas State University San Marcos   | \$300,620 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available in time for this report.

<sup>2</sup>This program’s evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Learning Objects Repository (Phase I & II)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code requires the Board to "implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review, revise entry-level lower division academic courses...to improve student learning, and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$120,000 (Phase I)      \$257,603 (Phase II)

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** This project has been funded in two phases:

- Phase I, May 2007 – December 2007
- Phase II, September 2007 – August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** Phase I - Demonstrate a proof-of-concept learning object repository's capability to leverage redesigned course content for reuse and repurposing. Phase II - Lay a solid technical, organizational, and policy foundation for a near-production ready Texas Course Redesign Learning Object Repository.

**Issues and Challenges:** The use of online resources in teaching opens the possibility of sharing learning resources/objects. Higher education faculty need a low-cost accessible means through which to share resources. The Learning Objects Repository (LOR) is being developed to respond to that need.

All Phase I objectives were completed by the end of FY 2007, except for work on the U.S. History I course content because it was not available by the end of FY 2007. Phase II has been running smoothly and work has begun on most of the objectives. There have been some technical challenges due to release of a new version of the digital repository platform on which the LOR is based. Additionally, development of the XML user interface tool planned for use has been more complicated than first envisioned. A further delay has involved access to completed Phase I and Phase II course redesign materials for inclusion in the Repository.

**Program Operation:** The current project has two phases. In Phase I, the contractor at The University of North Texas implemented an open source software platform to create a learning objects repository platform. They then worked with disaggregating materials created for THECB funded course redesign projects in the state to create learning objects for inclusion in the repository.

**Results:** Phase I has been completed and the contractor is continuing to work on Phase II. There are no outcomes results to report since the full system has not yet been released for faculty use.

**Recommendations:** We have expanded the development for statewide use and have contracted with UT TeleCampus. Migration and further development will take place over the next 3 years. Continue development and implementation of the LOR. As soon as feasible,

conduct a usability study of the system. Once the system has been launched, implement an outcomes study to determine its impact on improving teaching and learning.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** William E. Moen, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Vanessa Davis, [Vanessa.Davis@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Vanessa.Davis@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6223

| Learning Objects Repository (Phases I and II) |                        |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site      |                        |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                                  | Funding                | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |                        |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                        | \$120,000<br>\$257,603 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available in time for this report.

<sup>2</sup>This program's evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Course Redesign (Phase IV)

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0763 of the Texas Education Code, requires the Board to “implement a project under which institutions of higher education selected by the Board will review and revise entry-level lower division academic courses to improve student learning and reduce the cost of course delivery through the use of information technology.”

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$416,393

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** February 28, 2008, to January 1, 2010

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Texas Course Redesign Project (TCRP) is to have widespread adoption of course designs that promote student success, especially in the critical first year of college. The course redesign projects should both increase success in student learning while at the same time reducing the delivery cost of courses.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, introductory level, general education courses have been high volume courses with unacceptable dropout, failure, and withdrawal (DFW) rates. These courses are also often very resource intensive for institutions. The course redesign program seeks to improve student learning and thus decrease DFW rates while at the same time use technology to reduce the cost of course delivery.

**Program Operation:** Project proposals were received during fall 2008 and evaluated by Coordinating Board staff through the use of a standardized rubric and scoring system. Project directors are expected to submit reports to Coordinating Board staff that include progress towards the project’s goals as well as updated expenditure reports.

**Results:** Pilot testing of the redesigned courses has not started. The evaluation is still in progress.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that this program be continued for its remaining two years. It is also recommended that project directors receive training on how to convert course redesign materials for inclusion in the Texas Learning Objects Repository.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Vanessa Davis, [Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6223

| Course Redesign (Phase IV)<br>Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>   | \$416,393 | NR                        | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| Angelo State University, Chemistry                                     | \$145,503 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | IP        |
| Texas Tech University, Chemistry                                       | \$149,996 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University Texarkana, Engineering                            | \$120,894 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | IP         | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available in time for this report.

<sup>2</sup>This program's evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Faculty Development Modules for Online Learning

**Type of Program:** Pilot, High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 61.0762 of the Texas Education Code, gives the Coordinating Board the charge to develop, in part, “professional development programs for faculty of institutions of higher education on College Readiness Standards and the implications of such standards” as well as “other programs as determined by the Board that support participation and success goals in *Closing the Gaps*, the state’s master plan for higher education.”

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$988,842

**Number of projects funded:** 4

**Program Dates:** August 2007 to February 2010

**Program Goals:** The goal of the Professional Development Modules project is to create readily available, online professional development opportunities for faculty to learn the most effective strategies and best practices for improving teaching and student learning. The project has awarded grants that target the following areas: critical thinking, reading comprehension, foreign language instruction, and college mathematics instruction.

**Issues and Challenges:** Traditionally, faculty receive little training during their graduate education that addresses pedagogy and teaching skills. As a result, faculty may enter the classroom as content experts but without the hard and soft skills that make effective teachers. The modules created by these grants will provide faculty around the state with professional development opportunities that will be readily accessible through online delivery.

**Program Operation:** The first project, University of North Texas college mathematics, was funded as a part of the Phase III Course Redesign grant cycle. A subsequent RFP focusing exclusively on professional development for second language instruction, reading comprehension, and critical thinking was issued in spring 2008. Coordinating Board staff reviewed grant proposals and awarded three grants—The University of Texas at El Paso for reading comprehension, The University of Texas at Austin for second language instruction, and The University of Texas at Austin for critical thinking. Coordinating Board staff began conducting site visits in fall 2008 and will complete site visits during spring 2009.

**Results:** This program is still in progress. Evaluation results will be posted to the online system when they are available.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that the program be continued. A request for proposals for faculty development modules for online and hybrid instruction was issued in fall 2008 and awards are expected to be made by January 2009.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Vanessa Davis, [Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Vanessa.Davis@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6223

## Faculty Development Modules for Online Learning

### Effectiveness of Program by Project Site

| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                                     | \$988,842 | NR                        | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| University of North Texas/College Mathematics              | \$244,256 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at El Paso/Reading Comprehension       | \$245,389 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at Austin/Critical Thinking            | \$249,602 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Texas at Austin/Foreign Language Instruction | \$249,595 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates that participant counts were not available in time for this report.

<sup>2</sup>This program's evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Gates GO Centers – Houston, Texas

**Type of Program:** Pilot/High-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation award to the College for All Texans Foundation in support of a 2-year project to create partnerships between eight Houston ISD high schools and area institutions of higher education.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,137,000

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** June 1, 2008 to May 31, 2010

**Program Goals:** This program has two specific goals in line with the THECB overall goal of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*: 1) To increase the college-going rates of students from participating schools in 2009 and 2010 by 20 percent from the 2007 baseline; 2) To create a college-going culture that will have influence on current graduating classes and those beyond 2009-2010.

**Issues and Challenges:** The Houston Independent School District (HISD) is the seventh largest district in the nation, and ties as thirteenth nationally for the lowest graduate rates. Its average college-going rate in 2006 was only 36.3 percent, approximately 28 percent below the state average. The project got off to a late start in fall 2008 due to the damage caused by Hurricane Ike in September 2008.

**Program Operation:** The HISD is operating College Going/GO centers based on the THECB GO Center model in all HISD schools beginning in 2008 thru 2009. The Gates Foundation has supplied funding to augment the staffing and services provided in eight HISD high schools. In addition, Gates is funding an evaluation study of these eight high schools to determine what works best in developing a college-going culture and assisting high school student to make the transition to college.

**Results:** The program began in the fall of 2008. The evaluation plan is in place, but it is too soon to produce results.

**Recommendations:** Continue program, implement evaluation study design, and disseminate best practices throughout the state.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Education Research Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Chris Alvarado, [Chris.Alvarado@theccb.state.tx.us](mailto:Chris.Alvarado@theccb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6207

| Gates GO Centers – Houston, Texas        |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$1,137,000 | 10,353                    | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of students enrolled in the eight, Houston ISD treatment schools.

<sup>2</sup>This program's evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

# Pilot Programs

## Low-Stakes

(Less than \$100,000)

## Lexile Frameworks Analysis of Higher Education Textbooks

**Type of Program:** Pilot, Low-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Sec 61.0762(5) of the Texas Education Code, Programs to Enhance Student Success, authorizes the THECB to implement "other programs as determined by the board that support the participation and success goals in *Closing the Gaps*, the state master plan for higher education."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$128,000

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** July 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The two primary goals of this study are to: 1) determine the reading demand (readability) in Lexiles of approximately 130 textbooks that are currently in use in entry level college academic and technical courses at Texas public universities and two-year colleges; and 2) using the reading demand of the textbooks as a benchmark, determine whether the reading ability of high school students in Texas (based on Exit-Level TAKS scores) is at a level that enables success in reading the texts typically found in entry-level courses. Success was defined as the ability to read the text with a forecasted comprehension rate of 75 percent.

**Issues and Challenges:** In response to the challenge to prepare students to compete in a global marketplace, policy makers have begun to conceptualize education more broadly than kindergarten through high school. A 21st century view that includes preschool to postsecondary, or P-16, is increasingly becoming the norm. The shift to a P-16 perspective has uncovered difficulties for students making the jump from secondary to postsecondary settings. In the past few years, a number of studies and reports indicate that the transition from high school to the world of postsecondary options is anything but smooth. As the Achieve study, *Out of Many, One: Toward Rigorous Common Core Standards From the Ground Up* (July 2008) points out, "...too many students across the country meet state standards, pass state tests...only to be placed into remedial courses once they enroll in college or find they are unqualified for training programs and skilled employment in the modern workplace."

The Lexile Framework<sup>®</sup> for Reading, by placing reader ability and text difficulty on the same scale, provides a unique opportunity to examine both the reading challenge that students will face when entering Texas colleges as well as Texas students' level of readiness in terms of reading ability. An empirical examination of the gap between student readiness and text demand for college courses will help inform the discussion of postsecondary preparedness and indicate future research and program directions.

**Program Operation:** The Coordinating Board engaged in discussion with MetaMetrics, Inc., in 2006 to determine the viability of extending the use of the Lexile Framework<sup>®</sup> for Reading from K-12 textbooks and other reading material to similar material at the college and university level. By conducting an analysis of higher education textbooks, the Coordinating Board could provide additional information about the gaps between public education and higher education in Texas to educators in both sectors of education, as well as parents and students. Based on the results of the reading measurement (Lexile) of the entry-level textbooks, MetaMetrics provided a

written report which included the following: 1) Lexile measures of each of the entry level college course books reviewed, describing the meaning in the context of Lexile theory, 2) A link between these measures to high school standards as measured by the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) and with exit-level textbooks adopted by the Texas State Board of Education for foundation school courses, as well as other areas such as work place and post secondary education based on MetaMetrics' prior research, 3) The average Lexile measures of high school students in Texas from the exit-level TAKS and an indication of whether or not the typical reading ability of these students is at a level that enables success in entry level college courses in Texas based upon Lexile analysis, and 4) Recommendations for further study based upon the outcome of the Lexile analysis.

**Results:** The study was completed in the allocated time and no major challenges were encountered in fulfilling the study requirements. The results of the study concluded the following:

1. On average, texts for courses at four-year institutions have a higher reading demand than texts for academic courses at community colleges. Texts for technical courses at community and technical colleges also have lower reading demands than texts at four-year institutions. However, the reading demands of texts for academic and technical courses at community and technical colleges are not significantly different.
2. Another perspective for interpreting the distributions of text measures is to view them in conjunction with standards adopted for the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), English/Language Arts (ELA), Exit Level. The TAKS Met the Standard Performance Level falls at or in the lower quartile of each of the text distributions. Thus more than 75 percent of these postsecondary texts have higher reading demand than is represented by the Met Standard. The THECB Higher Education Readiness Standard Level is above the 25th percentile of the distribution of community/technical college text measures and community college text measures and just below the 25th percentile of the distribution of text measures for four-year institutions. The THECB Readiness Standard falls just above the 25th percentile of the combined text distributions. Thus, approximately 75 percent of postsecondary texts measured for this study have reading demand higher than the THECB Readiness Standard. The TAKS Commended Performance Level is higher than the text demand of the most difficult community/technical college text and community college text. Furthermore, fewer than five percent of the texts selected from four-year institutions have reading demand higher than the Commended Performance Level.<sup>1</sup>
3. Students whose reading ability is at the TAKS Met the Standard Performance Level can be expected to experience some degree of frustration with nearly all of the books measured. They would experience some degree of confidence only with the least difficult book(s). Students whose reading ability is at the THECB Higher Education Readiness Standard Level should experience no problem with the least difficult 25 percent of community college texts selected for this study. However, such readers may experience varying degrees of frustration with the majority of texts selected from four-year institutions and approximately half of the community/technical college and community college texts. Students whose reading ability is at the TAKS Commended Performance Level will likely experience confident reading experiences with nearly all of the texts measured for this study. Only the most difficult text selected from four-year institutions is likely to challenge these readers.<sup>1</sup>

NOTE: References to textbooks at four-year institutions and academic courses at community colleges include only those considered academic and transferrable in nature. References to

textbooks for technical courses at community/technical college are technical in nature and used in courses that prepare students for immediate entry into the skilled workforce.

<sup>1</sup>Source: MetaMetrics, *Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Text Measurement and Analysis, MetaMetrics Technical Report Update, August 29, 2008.*

**Recommendations:** The results of the MetaMetrics analysis can inform educators across public and higher education about the gap between textbooks and materials written for K-12 and those written for and used in higher education. With the difference in reading comprehension levels of a high school graduate and the expected reading comprehension levels of entering college students, it is apparent that many higher education textbooks used in Texas colleges and universities are written at such a level as to be inaccessible by the student reader. The result is that the reader is unable to read and use the information, and consequently experiences frustration and reads less. Knowing the Lexile measure of a document and the range of reading abilities of these students can be useful in determining the amount of support that should be provided to ensure students are reading at appropriate levels of comprehension. This support can be in the form of illustrations, activities, support materials (e.g., glossary and charts), audio, or text from another source. Knowing the Lexile measure of a document can also be useful when recommending complementary reading material. The results of the current study may be used to guide instructional decisions and practice. Additional resources for understanding and using the results are available at [www.Lexile.com](http://www.Lexile.com). The results of the study could also be used to inform policy discussions related to the articulation of reading performance standards and expectations across educational systems serving the K–16 spectrum.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Todd Sandvik, MetaMetrics, Inc., Durham, North Carolina

**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6120

| Lexile Frameworks Analysis of Higher Education Textbooks |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                 |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                                   | \$128,000 | Statewide impact          | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>This program has a statewide impact.

<sup>2</sup>This program’s effectiveness was determined by the THECB program director based on a performance appraisal of the contractor.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a

timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## 18-Hour Graduate Certificate Pilot Program

**Type of Program:** Pilot, Low-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Sec 61.0762, part 5 of the Texas Education Code, Programs to Enhance Student Success, authorizes the THECB to implement "other programs as determined by the board that support the participation and success goals in *Closing the Gaps*, the state master plan for higher education."

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 69,300

**Program Dates:** February 1, 2008, to January 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** 1) Recruit and develop the support teams for the three-year project, 2) Prepare a cadre of math faculty for teaching via video and/or online, 3) Establish curriculum for an eighteen-credit hour graduate math certificate, 4) Recruit Independent School district faculty as students and identify teaching sites, 5) Identify resources for continuing the program into years two and three.

**Issues and Challenges:** There is a need for more educators who are qualified to teach dual credit courses in mathematics and science. Instructors for dual credit courses must meet the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requirements for faculty teaching courses for college credit. SACS requires that instructors have a masters degree with 18 hours of graduate coursework in the teaching discipline. With the increase in dual credit offerings, many high school teachers who would otherwise be qualified to teach dual credit courses, do not meet the SACS credentials requirement.

Funding and time constraints are the greatest barriers to advanced graduate instruction for educators. According to surveys of 193 area high school teachers and related interviews, many are carrying full teaching loads and most have significant family and community responsibilities outside of the classroom. There is also minimal compensation based on the completion of the coursework, making it difficult to justify the additional time and funds required based on economic considerations alone.

**Program Operation:** The planning process has taken place with the assistance of a national advisory team of mathematics and science specialists and through a local team made up primarily of mathematics faculty from the participating universities. The national team collaborated using live meeting technology and offered on-site professional development to the local team at a summer conference. The local team met both in person and via live meeting technology to develop the priorities and methodologies for the continuing grant. The planning grant laid the groundwork for a project spanning, at a minimum, two full cohorts to create up to 40 new college level math teachers for the East Texas region. During a final quarter of the grant, the team will outline an infrastructure to assure the participants' success and identify the areas of remediation most needed during the summer activities.

**Results:** Full agreement on the curriculum should be completed at the faculty team's December meeting and will be centered most upon the need to include a minimum of eighteen hours of hard math in the graduate offerings. Although the initial boot camp will include math remediation, which may provide three hours of math education credit for those wishing to add it

to their transcripts, an agreement was reached to include six hours of math foundation courses along with 12 or more advanced graduate math work. Upon the establishment of a second cohort, at least two alternative advanced classes would be substituted in the curriculum, allowing any students forced to skip any course during the first cohort an opportunity to complete the sequence. Data on the outcomes for the teachers involved and for students in the region will be available at the end of the project.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that the project move from the planning to the implementation phase beginning February 1, 2009, and operating through December 31, 2011, to allowing the completion of the coursework by a first cohort with the inclusion of one "make-up" semester. Upon the successful initiation of a first cohort, it is recommended that a second cohort be considered beginning during the summer of 2010.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Mickey Slimp, Northeast Texas Consortium of Colleges and Universities, University of Texas Health Science Center at Tyler in Tyler, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6120

| 18-Hour Graduate Certificate Pilot Program |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                               | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                     | \$69,300 | 40                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of teachers expected to be enrolled in the first cohort.

<sup>2</sup>This program is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Pre-Service Practicum, Induction and Practice

**Type of Program:** Pilot, Low-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Sec 61.0762(4) of the Texas Education Code, Programs to Enhance Student Success, authorizes the THECB to implement “professional development programs for faculty of institutions of higher education on College Readiness Standards and the implications of such standards on instruction.”

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$600,000

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** December 17, 2007 – August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** 1) Contribute in a timely, cost-effective, evidence-based way to the pre-service education, induction, and practice of middle school and secondary educators who serve Hispanic and African American middle and high-school students in mathematics and science. 2) Focus on Hispanic and African American educators. 3) Use technology to enhance quality, lower cost, and support continuous feedback and improvement in professional development. 4) Quadruple the quantity of educators in the pipeline for middle school and high school mathematics and science. 5) Improve dramatically the quality of teacher preparation in mathematics and science. 6) Improve the professional support programs for new and experienced teachers in the districts served by the participating institutions.

**Issues and Challenges:** Hispanic and African American students are disproportionately represented among the economically disadvantaged, and are disproportionately taught by teachers who have the least knowledge and experience. Studies suggest that teachers’ mathematical knowledge has a significant effect on this achievement. Many Texas teachers, particularly those at the middle and high school levels, do not have enough mathematics and science knowledge to enable them to effectively teach their students, formatively assess their learning, and adopt strategies that can assure successful instructional outcomes. The most efficient strategy to narrow the achievement gap is to improve the preparation of teachers who serve Hispanic and African American students and to dramatically increase the supply of these teachers. Research over the past decade confirms that the differences that matter the most to the success of programs of education for prospective teachers are not differences in the form or structures of the programs, but rather differences in the content of those programs.

There were initial delays in getting the project underway due to the extremely long period of time that the University of Texas at Austin’s Office of Sponsored Projects took to review and approve the contractual arrangements between the parties involved. Therefore, the initial project meetings with faculty and staff on the campuses of Texas Southern University and The University of Texas at Brownsville were delayed until January 2008 and following.

**Program Operation:** The project is a collaborative effort between: The Charles A. Dana Center at The University of Texas at Austin; Texas Southern University in the Houston area;

The University of Texas at Brownsville in the Rio Grande Valley; ISDs serving large populations of African American and Hispanic students; and technology providers. This initiative involves the use of research-based online and face-to-face tools developed in a long-term research and development initiative by the Charles A. Dana Center at The University of Texas at Austin and Agile Mind, Inc. The tools offer comprehensive support for teachers of middle school mathematics, Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, Pre-calculus, Calculus, and Statistics, as well as for the students they serve.

**Results:** To date, faculty and students have used the online services in 16 courses at The University of Texas at Brownsville; and four courses at Texas Southern University. Approximately 30 University of Texas at Brownsville students in the elementary education program in fall 2008 are considering changing their plans to complete mathematics certification. Similar participation by elementary education pre-service teachers at Texas Southern University is anticipated.

**Recommendations:** Continue the program as is and collect data on outcomes for pre-service, in-service teachers, and their students.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Gloria White, The University of Texas Austin, Dana Center, Austin, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6120

| Pre-Service Practicum, Induction and Practice |           |                              |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-----------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site      |           |                              |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                                  | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup>    | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |           |                              |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                        | \$600,000 | Faculty: 11<br>Students: 420 | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of faculty and students using the Agile Minds online services at UT Brownsville and Texas Southern University.

<sup>2</sup>This program is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Local Vertical Curriculum Alignment - San Antonio Pathways

**Type of Program:** Pilot, Low-Stakes

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 28.008 of the Texas Education Code, entitled "Advancement of College Readiness in Curriculum," was created by the Third Called Session of the 79th Texas Legislature. This section requires that the Texas Education Agency and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board establish vertical teams to "recommend how the public school curriculum requirements can be aligned with college readiness standards and expectations."

**Annual Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 196,981

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** June 16, 2008, to May 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** 1) promote high academic expectations leading to college readiness and completion, 2) help develop a pilot data collection system in Bexar County to align the public educational segments (grades 8-12, community college, and four-year universities) for the purpose of identifying and addressing issues related to student transitions, and 3) develop P-16 within-discipline faculty teams to address transition issues and develop aligned curriculum in specific fields of study for the purpose of improving instruction and student outcomes.

**Issues and Challenges:** 1) Achievement among student subpopulations is inconsistent, as indicated by high school diploma and college-going rates; 2) Curricula are not aligned across the educational segments; secondary school exit expectations do not match postsecondary entrance expectations; 3) Similar courses within and across educational segments are not equivalent; 4) Faculty are not aware of other educational segments' student outcomes, standards, curricula, placement methods, and other factors affecting student transitions across the segments; 5) Faculty operate independently, with little sense of the power of a community of educational professionals.

There have been several challenges: 1) The logistics of building and populating an inter-segmental database, linked at the student level, including: supporting data uploads to THECB, linking data, and developing reports; 2) Identifying appropriate faculty from colleges and schools to participate in inter-segmental faculty councils in English, math, science, and history; 3) Project management across and within educational segments; 4) Identifying an appropriate project coordinator who knows the local educational lay-of-the-land, is respected by participating faculty, has group management skills to facilitate and coordinate monthly faculty council meetings, and is energized and excited about the potential for the San Antonio Pathways initiative; 5) Building confidence and support for ongoing project initiatives at the local (school) level.

**Program Operation:** There are two parts to this program. First, an intersegmental database was developed to provide information on student transition and curriculum linkages across sectors. Data analysis is an iterative process conducted in partnership between the database administrator and/or research team conducting analyses and the local educational entities

engaged in the faculty councils and other educational improvement efforts. This was especially true in the early stages of system development.

Second, vertical alignment teams were formed in four subject areas: English, math, science and history. Faculty, who are instructional leaders, were identified to participate in the vertical team discussions.

**Results:** A survey of faculty council members will be conducted in spring 2009 to ascertain the impact of this initial year’s work. Goals two and three have been achieved, and goal one is in process.

**Recommendations:** 1) Continue to provide technical assistance and support to the local coordinator; 2) Continue to send experienced faculty council members from California to provide assistance and support, as well as feedback, to faculty teams in San Antonio; 3) Survey faculty council members participating in the pilot project about their experiences during the 2008-2009 academic year; 4) Ask vertical teams to identify accomplishments and goals for the following school year’s meeting.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Jordan E. Horowitz, Cal-PASS, Long Beach, CA

**THECB Program Contact:** Janet Beinke, [Janet.Beinke@theqb.state.tx.us](mailto:Janet.Beinke@theqb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6321

| Local Vertical Curriculum Alignment – San Antonio Pathways |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                                     | \$196,981 | 84                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of faculty participating in the initial vertical teams.

<sup>2</sup>This program is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

# Standing Programs

|                                 |
|---------------------------------|
| <b>Texas Governor's Schools</b> |
|---------------------------------|

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Section 29.124 of the Texas Education Code, entitled "Texas Governor's Schools," was created by the Third Special Called Session of the 79th Texas Legislature. Section 61.07621 was added by the 80th Texas Legislature wherein the authority for the Texas Governor's Schools was changed to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. According to the statute, a Texas Governor's School must be a summer residential program for high achieving high school students, and may include any or all of following educational curricula: mathematics and science; humanities; fine arts; or leadership and public policy.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$555,594

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 3</b> |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$185,198  | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$162,022 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$200,000 |

**Program Dates:** June 8, 2008, to July 26, 2008

**Program Goals:** The goals of the Texas Governor's School address the key priorities of the College Readiness and Success initiative of the THECB; to: 1) Promote effective public education or higher education teaching; 2) Provide opportunities for students to leverage resources to obtain financial assistance for education; 3) Promote high academic expectations leading to college readiness or completion; 4) Create or expand social and academic support systems; and 5) Encourage student motivation, academic efficacy, and persistence.

**Issues and Challenges:** The primary issue stated by each university was the quick turnaround for the request for proposal (RFP) the notification that the institution was selected as a Texas Governor's School site and subsequent recruitment of students. The University of North Texas and Lamar University utilized existing programs to blend the goals of the Texas Governor's Schools and were able to recruit more students. Midwestern State University had a more difficult time in getting a larger number of students to participate. Each site director utilized formal and informal means to recruit students and to address the geographic and diversity of the state of Texas.

The majority of the students who were interviewed felt that the overall goals were met although they did not believe they were given enough information about other colleges and universities in Texas and outside of Texas. The bulk of the information regarding the college experience was based on the information where the student was selected to participate. All three universities were delighted to have the students who were participating and encouraged them to consider their university when it was time to select the university.

**Program Operation:** The basic operations of each of the university sites were the same: residential stay, exposure to university level teachers, resources and materials, opportunities for enrichment. The primary differences were the themes of study the universities offered and the number of specific enrichment opportunities. Lamar University exceeded the other campuses based on enrichment courses offered for their students.

**Results:** Each university shared common curriculum that were aligned to the goals of the program but the richness of the students' exposure to various field of study proved the biggest difference. Due to the smaller participation at Midwestern University, the students were placed in more whole-group activities where Lamar University could provide more enrichment exposure. This is due to Lamar University's years of designation as a summer enrichment program and Dr. Dorothy Sisk experience in the National Governor's Schools Association. Each university met the goals of the Texas Governor's Schools and both the qualitative and quantitative data will support this.

**Recommendations:** 1) The project director's would like to have the RFPs sent out earlier so they may begin to recruit both students and faculty for the Texas Governor School Program; 2) Hold a debriefing meeting with the project directors so they may discuss their successful experiences and unsuccessful experiences; 3) Consider how the Texas Governor School could be added as an advanced measure for the Texas High School Distinguished Achievement Diploma; and 4) Provide information for accessing other universities in Texas and outside the state.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Martha (Suzy) Hagar, Senior Consultant, SH Advanced Education Solutions, Dallas, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Lynette Heckmann, [Lynette.Heckmann@theqb.state.tx.us](mailto:Lynette.Heckmann@theqb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6120

| Texas Governor's Schools                 |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$555,594 | 251                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| University of North Texas                | \$200,000 | 94                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lamar State University                   | \$193,572 | 103                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Midwestern State University              | \$162,022 | 54                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants represents students enrolled in the project during summer 2008.

<sup>2</sup>Program effectiveness is based on student's pre and post program self-assessments of college knowledge including knowing how to apply to college and for financial aid; academically prepare for college; and finding the right colleges for themselves individually.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete

all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## African American Library/Museum

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The General Appropriations Act, House Bill 1, 80th Texas Legislative Session, (Strategy E.1.4., III-42) appropriated to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for the purpose of supporting an internship program at the African American Museum of Dallas, Texas.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$93,636

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** 1) The internship program at the African American Museum was established to provide opportunities for college students/graduates to work in a unique cultural environment that preserves and presents the African American Experience through exhibitions, programs and cultural enrichment programs. 2) Another goal is to interest women and minorities in careers in museology and museum management.

**Issues and Challenges:** Funds were provided for student internships to encourage the pursuit of careers in museum work.

**Program Operation:** The internship program is open to students who are currently enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The program is advertised at colleges and universities throughout the country. Each applicant is required to submit a statement of interest, three letters of recommendation and transcripts. Most interns are employed during the summer months of June, July and August. During the school year, interns work an average of 20 hours per week. In the summer, interns work between 30-35 hours per week for an average of eight weeks.

**Results:** 1) There has been a 25 percent increase in attendance to the museum. 2) According to the Museum's report approximately eight interns have pursued careers in a service area and at least two are pursuing careers in cultural studies. However, they did not indicate what percent these interns are of all former interns surveyed.

**Recommendations:** 1) The museum should use a more useful rubric of success than museum attendance figures. While the internship program permits the museum to extend its operating hours, this does not tell us anything about how the individuals who participate in the internships benefit from the program. 2) Strengthen control over the accounting of funds for the museum.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** David Couch, [David.Couch@the.cb.state.tx.us](mailto:David.Couch@the.cb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6231

| African American Library/Museum          |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$93,636 | 14                        | Somewhat Effective         | 3                            | 2          | 2         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of interns working at the museum in Fiscal Year 2008.

<sup>2</sup> Effectiveness is based on the report prepared by The University of Texas at Dallas and the Museum. The data included in the report about the effect of the program on individuals involved in the internships is not adequate to establish its overall effectiveness for the interns.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Perkins Leadership Grants

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Texas receives federal Title I funding for the advancement of career and technical education in the state under the *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006, Public Law 109-270 (Perkins IV)*. State Leadership activities are under Title I, Part B, Sec. 124.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 3,395,863

|                                      |                                    |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 19 |                                    |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$159,669   | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$62,670 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$495,000 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** State leadership activities require statewide impact. The *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act* establishes required as well as permissible uses of the funds. The state's community, technical, and state colleges determine the activities that best help achieve their goals. In Texas, we have aligned the Perkin's goals to the goals of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*.

**Issues and Challenges:** The state has established the following assumptions: 1) Career and Technical Education (CTE) and academic education must be integrated in a more comprehensive way, 2) postsecondary and work readiness are one and the same, and 3) all students need at least some postsecondary education or training. All education spending must be tied to appropriate student outcomes.

**Program Operation:** State Leadership Funds are allocated in a competitive request for applications process and include comprehensive professional development activities, development of innovative curriculum and/or course/module redesign in high-skill, high-wage, or high-demand occupations, and activities that increase the academic performance of special population students including students in nontraditional fields of study. These projects are required by federal law to have statewide impact on career and technical education by increasing excellence in programs, teaching methodology, or student outcomes.

**Results:** Currently, no data are available to measure statewide impact or effectiveness. Some programs such as the Workforce Education Course Manual (WECM) have had statewide impact. However, many of the projects that have been supported have not been implemented statewide. Going forward, Perkin's Leadership grants will be required to include plans for statewide implementation. Appropriate measures will be negotiated for evaluation of each project.

**Recommendations:** Restore the funding split between the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to 60/40.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Susan Hetzler, [Susan.Hetzler@theccb.state.tx.us](mailto:Susan.Hetzler@theccb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6220

| Perkins Leadership Grants  |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>   | \$3,395,863 | NR                        | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| THECB - ID - Institutional Effectiveness and Evaluation  | \$334,696   |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Austin Community College Career and Technical Education  | \$495,000   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Coastal Bend College – Critical Thinking in Leadership   | \$150,000   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| DCCCD - North Lake College - Taking Technical Programs into 21st Century                                   | \$234,014   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Dallas County CCD - STARLINK   | \$122,277   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Del Mar College - Student Learning Styles Academy  | \$123,225   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Midland College - Workforce Education Course Manual (WECM)   | \$210,000   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System District - Cy-Fair College, Instructional Design for Hybrid Technical Instruction | \$95,000    | 100                       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System District - Cy-Fair College, Prescriptions for ESL Student Success                 | \$95,000    | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System District - Kingwood College -Computer Programming Gateway Course Redesign         | \$98,064    | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System District - Tomball College - Calculated Success: Dosage and Solutions             | \$100,996   | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Perkins Leadership Grants  |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Lone Star College System District - Tomball College – Learning Communities for Curriculum Development      | \$116,976 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 2          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System District - Tomball College - Contextual Learning and Integrated Curriculum (CLIC) | \$178,201 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| San Jacinto College - Rubrics Manual   | \$105,417 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 2          | 3         |
| South Texas College – Critical Thinking in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century                                    | \$78,892  | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Del Mar College - Texas State Leadership Advisory Council  | \$215,000 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Northeast Texas Community College - High Skill, High Wage, High Demand Careers                             | \$68,274  | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Northeast Texas Community College - Workforce Educ. (Non-Traditional)                                      | \$62,670  | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M Commerce - Technical Assistance to Start Two-Step Projects in Texas                              | \$150,000 | NR                        | In Progress                | 3                            | 2          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>NR indicates participant counts are not available.

<sup>2</sup>Data on “Effectiveness” are still being collected and were not available in time for this report.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial

information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Perkins Basic Grants

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006 (Perkins IV)* replaces the 1998 *Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act*. Perkins IV continues the emphasis of the former law on program improvement, but requires a renewed and stronger focus on collaboration between secondary and postsecondary education.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$32,663,925

|                                      |                                    |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 57</b> |                                    |                                      |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$537,964   | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$34,913 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$2,734,189 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The Perkins Basic Grant goal is to assist the public community, state, and technical colleges in providing relevant and rigorous academic and technical education and career preparation for all populations in Texas by raising the quality of instruction so that it meets industry standards. Meeting this goal helps the state reach its participation and success *Closing the Gaps by 2015* goals.

**Issues and Challenges:** The state has established the following assumptions: 1) Career and Technical Education (CTE) and academic education must be integrated in a more comprehensive way, 2) postsecondary and work readiness are one and the same, and 3) all students need at least some postsecondary education or training. All education spending must be tied to appropriate student outcomes.

**Program Operation:** As part of the responsibility delegated to the Coordinating Board by the State Board of Education, the Board annually awards Title I *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act* funds to the state's public two-year colleges. Funds must be expended according to federal and state rules and regulations governing Perkins activities. In addition, and as part of the Commissioner of Higher Education's work with staff in aligning all activities and resources with *Closing the Gaps by 2015*, some policy and funding changes were implemented to ensure Perkin's funds support these goals and objectives.

**Results:** Overall the program received an "Effective" rating. Of the 57 colleges funded 22 rated "Very Effective," 30 rated "Effective," 2 rated "Somewhat Effective" and 3 are rated "Not Effective. Effectiveness is based on a project meeting or exceeding 90 percent of the federally negotiated performance rate on each of the six pre-defined Perkins performance indicators (student's technical skill attainment; student attainment of an industry-recognized credential, certificate or degree; student retention in postsecondary education; student placement in military, apprenticeship or employment; student participation in nontraditional fields; and student completion in nontraditional fields), as well as meeting the THECB Institutional

Effectiveness Standards. Individual institutions within a community college district may have exceeded the state average, even though the district on average did not.

**Recommendations:** Restore the funding split between the Texas Education Agency and Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to 60/40.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Susan Hetzler, [Susan.Hetzler@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Susan.Hetzler@theeb.state.tx.us) , 512-427-6220

| Perkins Basic Grants                     |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding              | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | <b>\$ 32,663,925</b> | 346,476                   | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| Reserve                                  | \$2,000,000          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Alamo CCD                                | \$2,603,158          | 23,214                    | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Alvin Community College                  | \$118,855            | 1,902                     | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Amarillo College                         | \$754,977            | 5,949                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Angelina College                         | \$512,893            | 2,984                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Austin Community College                 | \$1,027,096          | 25,522                    | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Blinn College                            | \$314,185            | 4,054                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Brazosport College                       | \$100,353            | 2,102                     | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Central Texas College                    | \$733,008            | 16,296                    | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Cisco Junior College                     | \$206,207            | 16,296                    | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Clarendon College                        | \$81,774             | 1,662                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Coastal Bend College                     | \$290,616            | 1,488                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| College of the Mainland CCD              | \$158,665            | 2,350                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Perkins Basic Grants                     |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Collin County CCD                        | \$126,871   | 5,258                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Dallas County CCD                        | \$2,734,189 | 50,117                    | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Del Mar College                          | \$797,881   | 7,443                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| El Paso County CCD                       | \$894,377   | 6,981                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Frank Phillips College                   | \$71,219    | 424                       | Somewhat Effective         | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Galveston College                        | \$155,092   | 873                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Grayson County College                   | \$218,546   | 1,948                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Hill College                             | \$275,844   | 4,135                     | Somewhat Effective         | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Houston Community College System         | \$1,696,619 | 30,356                    | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Howard County Jr. College District       | \$268,735   | 3,203                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Kilgore College                          | \$462,798   | 2,979                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lamar Institute of Technology            | \$416,838   | 3,221                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lamar State College - Orange             | \$262,251   | 1,560                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lamar State College - Port Arthur        | \$204,039   | 1,811                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Laredo Community College                 | \$802,387   | 5,370                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lee College                              | \$450,043   | 5,378                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Perkins Basic Grants  |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                        |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| McLennan Community College                                      | \$807,844   | 4,986                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Midland College   | \$347,113   | 3,676                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Navarro College   | \$505,154   | 3,472                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| North Central Texas College                                     | \$241,511   | 2,620                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star College System (formerly North Harris Montgomery CCD) | \$810,548   | 13,706                    | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Northeast Texas Community College                               | \$163,335   | 1,070                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Odessa College  | \$384,080   | 2,707                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Panola College  | \$177,338   | 1,143                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Paris Junior College  | \$321,785   | 1,571                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Ranger College  | \$67,456    | 165                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| San Jacinto College District                                    | \$800,049   | 9,218                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| South Plains College  | \$812,955   | 6,800                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| South Texas College   | \$1,596,549 | 8,438                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Southwest Texas Junior College                                  | \$380,759   | 1,867                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Perkins Basic Grants                     |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Tarrant County College District          | \$465,275   | 10,186                    | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Temple College                           | \$216,794   | 2,146                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texarkana College                        | \$299,628   | 2,527                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Southmost College                  | \$638,510   | 6,990                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TSTC - Harlingen                         | \$829,599   | 2,955                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TSTC - Marshall                          | \$125,699   | 654                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TSTC - Waco                              | \$1,205,379 | 5,307                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TSTC - West Texas                        | \$493,590   | 1,967                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Trinity Valley Community College         | \$545,814   | 3,999                     | Not Effective              | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Tyler Junior College                     | \$643,987   | 4,582                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Vernon College                           | \$326,688   | 2,795                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Victoria College, The                    | \$300,226   | 1,849                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Weatherford College                      | \$160,883   | 1,332                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Western Texas College                    | \$34,913    | 489                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Wharton County Junior College            | \$220,947   | 2,383                     | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Participants are based on 2007 technical school enrollments from the THECB Accountability System.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based the Perkins Basic Grant 6 performance indicators and the THECB Institutional Effectiveness measure. If it met or exceeded 90 percent of the federally negotiated performance rate, a project received a score of 1 on each of the 6 pre-defined Perkins performance measures, plus a score of 1 for meeting the THECB Institutional Effectiveness

criteria, for a total of 7 points. A score of 6 or 7 = "Very Effective;" 4 or 5 = "Effective;" 3 = "Somewhat Effective", and 0, 1, 2 = "Not Effective."

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Perkins Tech-Prep Grants

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The *Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Improvement Act of 2006* was reauthorized to advance and improve career and technical education programs in the states. Tech Prep programs are Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs funded under federal authority, Public Law 109-270 of the 109th Congress (Perkins IV) for the advancement of career and technical education in Texas.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$8,397,736

|                                      |                                     |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 26 |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$311,027   | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$217,698 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$880,397 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** Federal Title II Tech-Prep funds are intended for regional Tech-Prep Consortia to support regionally developed plans that meet federal, state, and regional goals for improving career and technical education.

**Issues and Challenges:** Tech-Prep programs are intended to develop seamless transitions from secondary to postsecondary education.

**Program Operation:** Sixty-five percent of the available funds are distributed equally among the 26 Consortia as a base operating fund. The remaining 35 percent is distributed based on the grades 9-12 student population served by each consortium region.

**Results:** The Perkins Tech-Prep grants must meet or exceed 90 percent on each of nine federally negotiated performance measures. These scores were not available in time for this report. Therefore, all ratings are currently in progress.

**Recommendations:** At present, Texas has chosen to keep Tech-Prep separate from the Perkins Basic Title I Grant funds. This results in duplication of overhead costs. It is recommended that Texas: 1) find ways to share administrative functions and services without merging Tech-Prep with the Basic Grant program, or 2) increase state funds for administrative costs, or 3) set a limit on administrative costs at 30 percent of an individual Tech-Prep consortia's budget.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** THECB Internal

**THECB Program Contact:** Susan Hetzler, [Susan.Hetzler@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Susan.Hetzler@theeb.state.tx.us) , 512-427-6220

| Perkins Tech-Prep Grants                 |             |                             |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |             |                             |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup>   | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |             |                             |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$8,397,736 | 188,950+                    | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| State Administration                     | \$412,926   |                             |                            |                              |            |           |
| Alamo                                    | \$432,060   | 8,300+                      | In Progress                | 3                            | 2          | 3         |
| Brazos Valley                            | \$229,061   | NR                          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Capital Area                             | \$359,152   | 14,000+                     | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Central Texas                            | \$258,725   | 2,000+;<br>36 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Coastal Bend                             | \$266,722   | 15,000+,<br>41 ISDs         | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Concho Valley                            | \$217,698   | 3,000+,<br>41 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Deep East Texas                          | \$239,845   | 1,000+,<br>33 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| East Texas                               | \$286,125   | 1,000+,<br>70 schools       | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Global EDGE                              | \$300,497   | 17,000+                     | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Golden Crescent                          | \$222,656   | 6,000+                      | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Gulf Coast                               | \$880,397   | 37,000+                     | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Heart of Texas                           | \$237,781   | 8,000+;<br>41 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| North Central Texas                      | \$702,897   | 6,000+                      | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| North Texas                              | \$223,930   | 6,000+                      | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Top of Texas                             | \$249,577   | 8,400+;<br>55 ISDs          | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| Permian Basin                            | \$247,000   | NR                          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Rio Grande Valley                        | \$375,463   | NR                          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| South Plains                             | \$244,523   | 16,000+;<br>54 high schools | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| South Texas                              | \$237,100   | NR                          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Southeast Texas                          | \$244,404   | 2,000+;<br>18 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| STAR                                     | \$227,153   | NR                          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Perkins Tech-Prep Grants                 |           |                             |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                             |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup>   | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                             |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texoma                                   | \$281,949 | 5,500 +;<br>59 high schools | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Upper East Texas                         | \$233,987 | 17,000+;<br>39 high schools | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Upper Rio Grande                         | \$314,692 | 17,000+                     | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Weatherford Area                         | \$235,221 | 6,500+;<br>31 ISDs          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| West Central Texas                       | \$236,195 | 650+;<br>55 ISDs            | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>These numbers represent contacts reported in the project’s final quarterly report and are an estimate based on that report. NR – indicates that numbers were not reported.

<sup>2</sup> This evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Regional P-16 Councils

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The councils were created under the authority of section 61.0762 of the Education Code, which authorizes the THECB to develop "other programs as determined by the Board that support the participation and success goals in *Closing the Gaps*, the state's master plan for higher education.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$435,000

|                                      |                                   |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 21</b> |                                   |                                   |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$15,000    | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$5,000 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$30,000 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to December 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** To create a network of P-16 regional councils in order to help the THECB meet its goals for participation and success in *Closing the Gaps by 2015*. The councils are designed to foster systemic change in the manner in which educational institutions and communities work together to create and sustain a college-going culture.

**Issues and Challenges:** No full-time or part-time staff for P-16 Council; lack of funding for initiatives; data needed; training/professional development needed; need representation from community and business sectors on councils.

**Program Operation:** For FY 2008, there was no RFP process. Eleven Existing P-16 Councils were awarded funds to continue their work, and 10 new P-16 Councils were awarded grants to further the development of their P-16 Council. There were a total of 21 awards to IHEs; 19 were fully funded, and three received travel awards to attend the HB 400 Summit/P-16 Institute. The average size of award was \$15,000. The IHEs, ISDs, businesses, and communities from the following regions were served: Abilene; Big Spring; Corpus Christi; Laredo; Victoria; Nacogdoches; Austin; El Paso; Houston; Harlingen; Denton; San Antonio; Wichita Falls; Lubbock; Beaumont; Texarkana; Arlington; Tyler; Edinburg; Brownsville; Odessa; and Weatherford.

P-16 Councils carry out tasks necessary to further the development of its P-16 regional council in a good and satisfactory manner. P-16 Councils membership includes: leaders from public school districts, community colleges, and at least one public or private four-year institution of higher education; community business representatives who are members of local workforce boards or chambers of commerce; and representatives from civic and/or community organizations.

The statewide network of P-16 Councils assisted P-16 College Readiness Advisors and P-16 Field Specialists in planning regional meetings for teachers and faculty; reviewed reports and initiatives of the statewide P-16 Council and made recommendations on their implementation;

offered recommendations that encouraged the creation of a college-going and college-completion culture throughout the state; provided a network of assistance for developing P-16 regional councils; and developed a long-range statewide plan that will implement the P-16 Council College Readiness and Success Strategic Plan. The P-16 Councils work collaboratively with the THECB P-16 field specialists. The P-16 Councils invited education service centers to participate in the council's work and plan. P-16 Councils participated in the Texas P-16 Regional Council Network and developed, by June 30, 2008, long-range plans that will further the development of a college-going culture in its region and thereby support the goal of *Closing the Gaps by 2015*. The P-16 Councils also assisted in the development of their respective region's other P-16 Councils.

**Results:** Based on the P-16 Councils' long term plans, 100 percent of the P-16 Councils included in its membership leaders from local public school districts, community colleges, and at least one public or private four-year institution of higher education; community business representatives who are members of local workforce boards or chambers of commerce; and representatives from civic and/or community organizations. One hundred percent of the P-16 Councils sent three representatives from the regional council to three P-16 Regional Council Network meetings sponsored by the THECB. One hundred percent of the P-16 Councils worked collaboratively with the THECB P-16 Field Specialists. One hundred percent of the P-16 Councils of the councils that were required to submitted a long-range plan by June 30, 2008.

**Recommendations:** Alignment of P-16 Councils with State P-16 Council is highly recommended to provide structure to new, developing, and existing P-16 Councils. Professional development is also needed to further the development of councils. There is a need to establish common P-16 data indicators for P-16 Councils to assess their regional needs and evaluate their progress. The P-16 Councils also need assistance developing strategies to address the critical success factors of P-16 Councils.

**THECB Program Contact:** Priscilla Martinez, [Priscilla.Martinez@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Priscilla.Martinez@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6443

| Regional P-16 Councils                   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$435,000 | 832                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| Abilene Regional P-16 Council            | \$25,000  | 33                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

| Regional P-16 Councils  |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                                |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Coastal Bend Partners for Student Success P-16 Council (Corpus Christi) | \$25,000 | 32                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 2         |
| Council for Educational Excellence (Laredo)                             | \$15,000 | 69                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Crossroads Area P-16 Council (Victoria)                                 | \$20,000 | 26                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Deep East Texas P-16 Council (Nacogdoches)                              | \$25,000 | 20                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| E3 Alliance (Austin)  | \$20,000 | 70                        | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| El Paso Collaborative for Academic Excellence                           | \$20,000 | 12                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 2         |
| Greater Houston P-16+ Council   | \$30,000 | 50                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lower Rio Grande P-16 Council (Harlingen)                               | \$15,000 | 24                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| North Texas Regional P-16 Council (Denton)                              | \$20,000 | 38                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| P-16+ Council of Greater Bexar County (San Antonio)                     | \$25,000 | 24                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 2         |

| Regional P-16 Councils                                      |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                    |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Region 9 P-16 Council (Wichita Falls)                       | \$25,000 | 25                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| San Angelo P-16+ Partnership (Big Spring)                   | \$5,000  | 20                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| South Plains Closing the Gaps P-20 Council (Lubbock)        | \$25,000 | 118                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 2         |
| Southeast Texas P-16 Council (Beaumont)                     | \$5,000  | 19                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texarkana P-16 Council                                      | \$20,000 | 19                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington Metroplex P-16 Council | \$20,000 | 60                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Tyler P-16 Council  | \$5,000  | 14                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 2         |
| Upper Rio Grande Valley P-16 Council (Edinburg)             | \$25,000 | 34                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTB/TSC Lower Rio Grande Valley P-16 Council (Brownsville)  | \$15,000 | 25                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| West Texas Regional P-16 Council (Odessa)                   | \$25,000 | 19                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 2         |

| Regional P-16 Councils                       |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site     |          |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                                 | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Western Metroplex P-16 Council (Weatherford) | \$25,000 | 81                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>The number of participants represents the total number of regional P-16 council members.

<sup>2</sup>Program effectiveness is based on P-16 Councils' long term plans and fidelity scores.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Statewide Preceptorship Program

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Pursuant to Section 58.006 of the Texas Education Code, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall disburse appropriated state funds to approved organizations to operate a statewide preceptorship program in general internal medicine and in general pediatrics for medical students enrolled in Texas medical schools.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$452,145

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 3</b> |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$104,568  | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$138,440 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$175,265 |

**Program Dates:** September 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The Preceptorship Programs provide direct funding to Texas medical students to encourage them to choose primary care careers by offering a month-long experience in one of three primary care specialties: family practice, general internal medicine, or general pediatrics. The guiding premise of the preceptorship experience is that early exposure to a primary care medical specialty may positively influence future career decisions and practice patterns.

**Issues and Challenges:** Program funding has been flat for the last several biennia. In the current Agency Legislative Appropriations Request, the agency is requesting additional funding for the program. These programs provide state funding to support on-going efforts to encourage Texas medical students to choose careers in primary care.

**Program Operation:** The preceptorship program in family practice was established in 1978 and served as a model for the development in 1995 of the preceptorship programs in internal medicine and pediatrics. Since 1981, the Coordinating Board has contracted with The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston to operate the preceptorship program in family practice, and since 1996, the Coordinating Board has contracted with two non-profit organizations – the Texas Academy of Internal Medicine and the Texas Pediatric Society – to establish and operate the programs in internal medicine and pediatrics, respectively.

**Results:** In Fiscal Year 2008, a total of 447 medical students participated in a funded preceptorship experience through one of the three programs. Each of the program participation by medical school is documented below.

**Recommendations:** Support the agency request included in the Legislative Appropriations Request.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** The Coordinating Board contracts with The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston to operate the Family Medicine Statewide Preceptorship Program, The Texas Academy of Internal Medicine to operate the Internal Medicine Statewide

Preceptorship Program, and the Texas Society of Pediatrics to operate the Pediatrics Statewide Preceptorship Program.

**THECB Program Contact:** Stacey Silverman, [Stacey.Silverman@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Stacey.Silverman@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6206

| Statewide Preceptorship Program                       |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site              |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                                | \$452,145            | 447                       | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| University of Texas Health Science University Houston | \$175,265            | 244                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Academy of Internal Medicine                    | \$138,440            | 123                       | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Pediatric Society                               | \$138,440            | 80                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Total funding includes THECB administrative funds.

<sup>2</sup>Represents the number of preceptors participation in each program.

<sup>3</sup>Effectiveness was determined by the THECB program director based on each programs annual report.

<sup>4</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Engineering Recruitment Summer Program 2008

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The 80th Texas Legislature and the Governor enacted the Engineering Recruitment Programs (Texas Education Code, Chapter 61, Subchapter Q, §§ 61.791- 61.793) in 2007. The State appropriation for the program was \$1,000,000 per fiscal year for the 2008/2009 biennium. The Coordinating Board used \$800,000 for scholarships and \$200,000 for summer projects per fiscal year, after consultation with the bill sponsor Representative Morrison's office.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 205,000

|                                      |                                   |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 11 |                                   |                                   |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$18,636    | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$8,398 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$20,000 |

**Program Dates:** January 25, 2008, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The purpose of the grants are one-week, summer engineering experience, immersion programs to expose middle school and high school students to math, science, and engineering concepts. Grants seek to provide information to secondary school students about what it means to be an engineer and what educational preparation is needed to pursue a successful undergraduate degree. Programs aim to increase student interest in pursuing engineering professions.

**Issues and Challenges:** One of the *Closing the Gaps* success goals is increasing the number of students completing engineering, computer science, math, and physical science bachelor's and associate's degrees, and certificates. At present, Texas is not on target to reach this goal. The numbers of engineering and math awards have improved somewhat since 2000, while numbers of computer science and physical science awards have declined.

Many students do not have correct information about requirements for and potential of an engineering degree or an understanding of what it is like to be an engineer. Early immersion experiences can encourage students and guide them into appropriate preparatory study as well as enlighten those students early who otherwise may take up engineering under misconceived expectations.

**Program Operation:** The Technology Workforce Development Grant Program Advisory Committee advised Coordinating Board (CB) staff on drafting the Program Announcement and recommended that the budget for each one-week camp should be capped at not less than \$20,000. The CB issued the program announcement on October 26, 2007, by web posting and sent email notifications to all eligible institutions.

By the December 12, 2007, submission deadline, the CB received 16 proposals from 16 institutions, with a total request of \$317,441. One review panel of three workforce experts from academia, state, and industry discussed the proposals during one teleconference meeting in

early January 2008 using the CB developed web tool for proposal review. The panel ranked all proposals in the Fund Category I and recommended budget changes. Staff assigned funding to all proposals in rank order until the funding allocation was reached.

On January 25, 2008, the Commissioner of Higher Education announced the awards. After completion of the programs on or before August 31, 2008, institutions submit a narrative project report and a final financial report by November 30, 2008. Institutions return any unexpended funds by December 2008.

**Results:** Project Reports and final financial reports are due at the agency on November 30, 2008.

**Recommendations:** For most institutions it will be more efficient to hold two weeks of summer programs in succession and doubling of funding would allow this efficiency.

**THECB Program Contact:** Reinhold Cornelius, [Reinhold.Cornelius@thehb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinhold.Cornelius@thehb.state.tx.us)  
512-427-6156

| Engineering Recruitment Summer Program 2008                        |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site                           |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>   | \$205,000 | 665                       | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| Lamar University   | \$20,000  | 50                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Prairie View A&M University  | \$19,000  | 20                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of Houston  | \$20,000  | 50                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Arlington                               | \$8,398   | 50                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Austin                                  | \$20,000  | 280                       | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Brownsville and Texas Southmost College | \$19,331  | 20                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas-Pan American                               | \$20,000  | 40                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

## Engineering Recruitment Summer Program 2008

### Effectiveness of Program by Project Site

| Project Site                     | Funding  | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                  |          |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Tyler | \$20,000 | 50                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| South Texas College              | \$19,041 | 65                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University-Kingsville  | \$20,000 | 20                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas Tech University            | \$19,230 | 20                        | In Progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>Estimated.

<sup>2</sup>In progress: Project Reports are due November 30, 2008

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

# Technology Workforce Development Grant Program

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** The 77th Texas Legislature and the Governor enacted the Technology Workforce Development Act (Texas Education Code, Chapter 51, Subchapter X, §§ 51.851-51.860) in May 2001. In the spring of 2006, the Governor’s Office committed federal Department of Labor funds to TETC to enable the *TETC Texas Youth in Technology Demonstration Project* (TYT), which enabled the grants described here.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,899,709

|                                      |                                    |                                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 11</b> |                                    |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$172,700   | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$37,616 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$191,711 |

**Program Dates:** July 1, 2007, to August 31, 2008

**Program Goals:** The purpose of the grants is to increase both the quantity and quality of baccalaureate-level engineers and computer scientists educated in Texas universities and to increase collaborative efforts between universities, engineering, and computer science departments, and private companies in Texas.

**Issues and Challenges:** The *Closing the Gaps* success target increasing the number of students completing engineering, computer science, math, and physical science bachelor’s and associate’s degrees, and certificates is well below target. The numbers of engineering and math awards have improved somewhat since 2000, while numbers of computer science and physical science awards have declined.

To increase graduation rates in electrical engineering and computer sciences, the institutions are using strategies that improve the effectiveness of outreach, recruitment, retention, mentoring, and placement efforts as well as securing participation from under-represented groups.

**Program Operation:** The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (CB) and the Texas Workforce Commission (TWC) signed an interagency cooperation agreement for the second phase (\$2 million) on July 10, 2007 (TWC Contract 2907WSW005). The CB and TWC signed a contract amendment on November 16, 2007, for \$91,396.62 (TWC Contract 2907WSW005-1). These were unexpended funds from the first phase of the grants that were expended in the fall of 2007 by sub-recipients with satisfying expenditure histories.

The Technology Workforce Development (TWD) Grants Program Advisory Committee guided the combined competition for both phases. The TWD Advisory Committee consists of 11 distinguished representatives of industry and universities. The committee oversaw the creation of the program announcement and recommended that a) funding be capped to \$95,000 for the first phase of awarded grants, b) awards include an automatic extension for the second phase with double the allowable funding for the first phase, pending approval of follow-up funding

through TWC, and c) each Texas institution be allowed to submit two proposals from eligible engineering and computer science departments or colleges.

Program components were 1) internship programs, 2) scholarship or work study programs, and 3) recruitment, retention, and mentoring best practices programs. Project leaders were encouraged to collaborate with their local workforce development boards, community colleges, or independent school districts for outreach and recruitment of eligible students.

**Results:** Examples of successful concepts developed through TWD grant projects include:

- Using work-study to keep students (especially first-generation students) involved on campus
- Achieving a higher rate of success using peer teachers instead of traditional teaching assistants with first- and second-year engineering and computer science students
- Developing more targeted transfer agreements between community colleges and universities so that students do not lose time or credit for courses already taken
- Undertaking course and laboratory re-design to make high-tech studies more relevant to students
- Using outreach in high schools to help students understand the value of studying engineering and computer science
- Creating more effective learning communities outside the traditional campus setting, for commuter students or for students used to communicating online

**Recommendations:** TWD projects have succeeded in recruiting and retaining students and in guiding them toward graduation. A more rigorous evaluation process would enable better determination of best practices.

**THECB Program Contact:** Reinhold Cornelius, [Reinhold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Reinhold.Cornelius@thecb.state.tx.us)  
512-427-6156

| Technology Workforce Development Grant Program |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site       |                      |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                                   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                         | \$1,899,709          | 18,355                    | Very Effective             |                              |            |           |
| Prairie View A&M University                    | \$189,997            | 1,050                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University Grant A                  | \$189,988            | 2,761                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University Grant B                  | \$183,344            | 1,021                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Technology Workforce Development Grant Program**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                           | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas Engineering Experiment Station   | \$191,711            | 3,540                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin      | \$168,200            | 886                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Dallas      | \$190,000            | 4,277                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at El Paso     | \$189,953            | 774                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas-Pan American   | \$37,616             | 254                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at San Antonio | \$188,028            | 132                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 1          | 1         |
| University of Houston                  | \$180,945            | 961                       | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston-Clear Lake       | \$189,927            | 2,679                     | Very Effective             | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Funding does not include supplemental grants or administrative expenditures.

<sup>2</sup> Participants may be counted several times, if they were benefiting from separate initiatives multiple times (e.g., a student may be enrolled, receive mentoring benefits, and be employed through campus work study and would be counted three times.)

<sup>3</sup>Effectiveness was determined by the THECB program director based on each project’s annual report.

<sup>4</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the

grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## African American Male: Dallas Project

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** African American Male Advisory Committee requested that THECB fund this project called the African American Male: Dallas Project.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 9,500

**Number of projects funded:** 1

**Program Dates:** August 10, 2008, to September 10, 2008

**Program Goals:** The pilot project goals were to: 1) Recruit 30 eligible students for program, 2) Conduct Accuplacer testing to determine course placement, 3) Provide financial aid and scholarship application workshops, 4) Provide academic advising to help complete college applications, 5) Conduct team building exercises, and 6) Conduct planning meetings with college connections partners to identify next steps.

**Issues and Challenges:** Due to the time of the year, it was difficult to obtain 30 African American male students in such a short time that would fit the criterion set for the pilot.

**Program Operation:** The African American Male Initiative Pilot Program (AAMI) at Cedar Valley College was set in motion over an eight-week period during the summer of 2008. Recruitment efforts identified 30 participants. The AAMI fostered team work and encouraged African American male students to utilize campus and community resources continuously. It also focused on creating a culture of college-going, responsible and motivated students through personal growth workshops. Partners in the project include the THECB, Dallas Independent School District, University of North Texas Dallas, and representatives of the faith-based community, with the support of Senator Royce West's office.

**Results:** Based on the data collected from the student information system and surveys, all five goals of the pilot program were met. All students (100 percent) were successfully enrolled in classes by August 30th and were attending Cedar Valley College classes, having completed all steps of the enrollment and financial aid process. The sixth goal of a partners meeting is a recommended next step.

**Recommendations:** Cedar Valley College will track student completion of fall semester courses and will report fall to spring retention of the 30 AAMI participants. A debriefing meeting of the individuals who were directly involved in the implementation of the pilot needs to be held after review of this report. The program coordinator recommends the THECB continue and expand the pilot program into a more comprehensive model with additional funding. With this funding: 1) recruit and register more students in the Cedar Valley College program, 2) connect to existing retention and student success programs and activities at Cedar Valley College, 3) track the participating students to determine their rates of persistence and success from semester to semester, 4) investigate best practices to further develop the multicultural competency of faculty and staff, increase innovations within the curriculum, and employ

additional qualified African American male faculty, 5) plan for community college students who are low-income, working adults, 6) plan the program at least a semester in advance and be flexible and adaptable to meet the needs and limitations of the students, 7) increase financial aid, scholarships and financial incentives available to participants, 8) create and maintain cooperative relationships among the partners, 9) build upon existing partnerships with the University of North Texas Dallas campus.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** Remigus Ihekwa, AAMI Project Coordinator, Dallas, Texas

**THECB Program Contact:** Dewy Brooks, [Dewy.Brooks@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Dewy.Brooks@thecb.state.tx.us) , 512-427-6289

| African American Male: Dallas Project    |         |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|---------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |         |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |         |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$9,500 | 30                        | Effective                  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Represents the number of participants in the 2008 Cedar Valley summer program.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based on the results of the 2008 Cedar Valley summer program.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

## Vertical Teams (Phases I and II)

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** To ensure that students are able to perform college-level course work, Texas Education Code §28.008 directed the Commissioner of Education and Commissioner of Higher Education to form vertical teams composed of public school teachers and higher education faculty to "(1) recommend for approval by the commissioner of education and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board college readiness standards and expectations that address what students must know and be able to do to succeed in entry-level courses offered at institutions of higher education; (2) evaluate whether the high school curriculum requirements under Section 28.002 and other instructional requirements serve to prepare students to successfully perform college-level course work; (3) recommend how the public school curriculum requirements can be aligned with college readiness standards and expectations."

|                              |               |            |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| <b>Appropriation/Budget:</b> | Total         | \$ 312,000 |
|                              | FY07 Phase I  | \$ 300,000 |
|                              | FY08 Phase II | \$ 12,000  |

|                                      |                                   |                                   |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded: 36</b> |                                   |                                   |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$9,375     | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$1,500 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$15,000 |

**Program Dates:** February 1, 2007 through August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** Vertical Teams Phase I: To recommend for approval by the Commissioner of Education and the Coordinating Board College Readiness Standards that address what students must know and be able to do to succeed in entry-level courses offered at institutions of higher education. Vertical Teams Phase II: To evaluate whether the secondary Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills serve to prepare students to successfully perform college-level course work (i.e., gap analysis of CRS with TEKS to determine if they are aligned), and recommend the TEKS can be aligned with College Readiness Standards.

**Issues and Challenges:** The Coordinating Board and TEA staff were charged with the creation of Vertical Teams by the Texas Legislature to address the concern that many high school graduates from Texas public schools are not college-ready because they do not have the knowledge and skills to perform successfully in entry-level college courses. As the experts best suited to develop College Readiness Standards and the student materials and professional development necessary to increase the rigor of the high school curriculum and prepare teachers accordingly, Vertical Teams of secondary teachers and college/university faculty were established in the four content areas by the THECB and TEA staff to carry out this work.

**Program Operation:** Rules were adopted by both the Commissioner of Education and Coordinating Board setting forth the composition of each phase of the Vertical Teams (VT) in fall 2006. Composition of the Phase I Vertical Teams responsible for developing draft College

Readiness Standards (CRS) was to be 60 percent higher education faculty (six per VT) and 40 percent public education teachers (four per VT) in the four content areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies/sciences.

Board staff solicited nominations from Texas independent and public institutions of higher education in late fall 2006. At the same time, Board staff issued a Request for Proposals for the facilitation and development of the CRS. The selection of Phase I Vertical Teams was completed in February 2007. Four meetings between February and September were conducted and facilitated by the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) under contract by the Coordinating Board. Work of the Phase I Vertical Teams was completed in late fall 2007. Public comment was collected through an online process provided by EPIC. Input was received from over 1000 stakeholders and appropriate revisions to the CRS were made.

For Phases II, the lead agency for facilitating the curriculum alignment and pedagogy activities moved to the Texas Education Agency (TEA). Because of the timeframe established by the State Board of Education for review of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, TEA determined that the gap analysis and alignment work would be completed sequentially as follows:

- Mathematics in late July 2008
- English Language Arts in late September 2008
- Science in early October 2008
- Social Studies/Sciences in spring or summer 2009

Through a similar nomination and selection process to that of Phase I, Phase II Vertical Teams consisting of 10 members each in mathematics, ELA, and science were selected. The Phase II work consists of the gap analysis of CRS with TEKS and alignment recommendations was completed by the Vertical Teams and provided to TEA for each of the TEKS writing teams to prepare for State Board of Education (SBOE) consideration. Action is pending before the SBOE, but their deliberations and final action on the incorporation of the CRS into the TEKS must be completed according to the following schedule:

- ELA curricula and materials approved by the State Board of Education not later than June 1, 2009, with curricula and online materials available to high school students beginning fall 2009;
- Mathematics curricula and online materials available beginning fall 2010;
- Science curricula and online materials available beginning fall 2011, and
- Social studies curricula and online materials available beginning fall 2012.

Phase II Vertical Team members will also serve as Phase III Vertical Team members who will be responsible for developing instructional strategies and professional development materials for public school teachers.

**Results:** Phase I: The Coordinating Board adopted the Texas College Readiness Standards on January 24, 2008, followed by the conditional approval of the Standards in late spring 2008 by the Commissioner of Education. Phase II: Outcomes pending – work in progress.

**Recommendations:** For any subsequent work that would involve solicitation of nominations from IHEs, nomination forms should be very specific in terms of expected skills/experience of nominees. In addition, include a statement on the nomination form that encourages IHEs to nominate individuals that are representative of the population of Texas.

THECB Program Contact: Robin Zuniga, [Robin.Zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Robin.Zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6536

| Vertical Teams (Phases I and II)         |                      |                  |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |                      |                  |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants     | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |                      |                  |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>                   | \$312,000            | Statewide impact | Effective                  |                              |            |           |
| Phase I                                  | \$300,000            | Statewide impact | NA                         | NA                           | NA         | IP        |
| Phase II                                 | \$12,000             | Statewide impact | NA                         | NA                           | NA         | IP        |

<sup>1</sup>Funding is given to individual faculty members for release time and travel expenses. Each faculty member serves on a vertical teams related to their academic discipline.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness was determined for the program as a whole based upon an evaluation of the activities and outcomes of the vertical teams.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Texas Success Initiative Test Alignment with College Readiness Standards (Phase I)

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Under Objective 2 of the P–16 College Readiness and Success Strategic Action Plan, which has been adopted by the THECB, the state P–16 Council, and the Commissioner of Education, the THECB and TEA are to “align exit-level assessments of public education with entry-level expectations of higher education and the skilled workforce.”

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$141,467

**Program Dates:** June 20, 2008, to April 15, 2009

**Program Goals:** The goal of this project is to determine the extent to which the Texas College Readiness Standards (CRS) are aligned with six college admission and placement exams commonly used in Texas (ACT, SAT, COMPASS, ASSET, ACCUPLACER, THEA) in terms of both content and cognitive demand.

**Issues and Challenges:** The current assessments for determining college readiness under the Texas Success Initiative (TSI) must be analyzed and aligned to the new college readiness standards to ensure accurate measurement of a student’s ability to successfully complete entry-level college coursework.

The greatest challenge faced with this project to date has been the length of time required to obtain the test items necessary for the alignment analysis from the relevant test developers (ACT, the College Board, and Pearson). Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC) has had to negotiate complex confidentiality/nondisclosure agreement with each test developer, and each test developer has needed an extended period of time to ensure that they select an appropriately representative sample of test items for the analysis. As of the time of this report, EPIC is still finalizing its agreement with the College Board and awaiting test items for the SAT and ACCUPLACER.

**Program Operation:** This three-phase project involves an alignment analysis, in which EPIC will determine to what extent the CRS are aligned with the six college admission and placement exams used in this study. The first phase of this project has focused on obtaining test items from these six exams from the relevant test developers and developing an online reviewer tool. Once all test items has been received, EPIC will upload the items to the web-based tool reviewers will use to rate the CRS and test items.

In the next phase of the project, 10 reviewers (five for English/language arts and five for mathematics) will be trained on how to use the tool and complete their ratings, and a field test will be conducted to establish inter-rater reliability. EPIC will then launch the online tool, and reviewers will have eight weeks to complete their work.

In the final phase of the project, EPIC will analyze the reviewer data to determine the degree of alignment between each of the college admission and placement tests and the CRS. A written

report and an oral presentation on the findings from this analysis will be prepared for the THECB.

**Results:** In the first phase of this project, EPIC has developed an online reviewer tool, identified and contracted with reviewers, drafted reviewer training materials, and developed a data analysis plan. Once all test items are received and reviewers complete their ratings, EPIC will conduct an alignment analysis to determine the extent to which the CRS are aligned with the six college admission and placement exams used in this study. This study will be essential to determining whether currently used admission and placement exams accurately measure a student’s ability to successfully complete entry-level college coursework, as required by Objective 2 of the P–16 College Readiness and Success Strategic Action Plan.

**Recommendations:** In the remainder of the contract period, EPIC will train reviewers to rate the CRS and test items for cognitive demand and rigor and to identify the CRS that are aligned with each test item. Once reviewers have been trained and inter-rater reliability has been established, EPIC will launch the online reviewer tool, and reviewers will complete their ratings. After completion of the reviewers’ work, EPIC will prepare a written report and an oral presentation for the THECB that detail the results of this analysis.

**Evaluation Subcontractor:** David Conley, Educational Policy Improvement Center, Eugene, Oregon

**THECB Program Contact:** Michelle Achacoso, [Michelle.Achacoso@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:Michelle.Achacoso@thecb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6221

| Texas Success Initiative Test Alignment with College Readiness Standards (Phase I) |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site   |           |                           |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site   | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|  |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>   | \$141,467 | Statewide impact          | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup> This program has statewide impact.

<sup>2</sup> This program evaluation is still in progress.

<sup>3</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project’s compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.*

|   |
|---|
| <b>College Readiness Special Advisors</b> |
|---|

**Type of Program:** Standing

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** This program was established to assist the Coordinating Board in implementing its College Readiness Initiatives, such as: Texas Education Code §28.008, Advancement of College Readiness in Curriculum, in developing, promoting, and implementing the College Readiness Standards; and Texas Education Code §61.0762, Student Success Initiatives, to enhance the success of students in higher education and reduce the number of students enrolling in developmental education.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$1,440,000

|   |                                    |                                   |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 100 (funded), 15 (undesignated) |                                    |                                   |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$15,000                                 | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$15,000 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$15,000 |

**Program Dates:** August 2007 through August 31, 2010

**Program Goals:** The purpose of the program is to provide funding to Texas institutions of higher education that have committed to support P-16 college readiness initiatives as referenced in *Closing the Gaps* and other college readiness initiatives. Postsecondary staff act as College Readiness Special Advisors (CRSAs) to THECB staff. College Readiness Special Advisors 1) provide assistance to the THECB or its contractor in obtaining information about entry-level courses at his or her institution; 2) participate in up to two meetings with THECB staff beginning in fall 2007, that will update all institutions on the implementation of college readiness standards; 3) coordinate and report to THECB staff on activities that the institution is making to assure students in its service area are college-ready when entering post-secondary institutions; 4) coordinate meetings of faculty at his or her institution on the college readiness standards and other college readiness initiatives, and 5) provide feedback to THECB staff on faculty input on forms and assessments provided by the THECB or its contractor.

**Issues and Challenges:** There is a need to increase community and educator awareness of the approved CRS, and strengthen P-16 efforts. Moreover, College Readiness Special Advisors report that their secondary partners are largely unaware of the CRS and do not have a sense of urgency to prepare for their implementation, as secondary educators do not perceive a mandate on the CRS.

**Program Operation:** College Readiness Special Advisors (CRSAs) are academic liaisons at participating institutions of higher education in Texas (115 Advisors, representing 109 public and private (unfunded) institutions, including: community and technical colleges, and universities. Each public institution, irrespective of the number of CRSAs, has received \$15,000 to be expended by August 30, 2010, to cover the costs of staffing, of participation in CRS-related meetings organized by the THECB or by its vendor, the Educational Policy Improvement Center (EPIC), of CRS-related materials to be disseminated to their communities, and of other CRS-related programming organized by the CRSAs, the THECB, or its vendor(s). Financial reports are due to the THECB within 45 days of the contract closing date: August 31, 2010.

**Results:** The CRSAs are required to attend biannual informational meetings. The fall and spring meetings of FY 2008 had the following respective participation rates: 116 participants of 114 invited (102 percent); 101 participants of 114 invited (89 percent).

The early effects of the CRSA program are seen in the variety of CRS initiatives being pursued. These initiatives vary from institution to institution. Representative activities include:

- hosting faculty meetings with academic departments to discuss the draft CRS, with department heads and submitting collected comments to the vendor facilitating the development of the standards;
- hosting a College Readiness Forum to introduce the CRS to the institution's faculty and public school administrators and teachers in its service area (300 in attendance); and
- offering small sub-grants to educators in a community college's service area to start alignment of their curriculum with the CRS; to utilize in the classroom established best practices and research in the area of P-16 initiatives; and to demonstrate in a research-based way the results of their program.

The CRSAs nominated courses at their institutions and facilitated the submission of course syllabi and materials by their faculty to EPIC, the vendor responsible for conducting the CRS validity study. Nominations were received by 91 institutions of higher education, 90 of which completed the project by submitting course syllabi and materials. Of these 90 institutions, 57 were community and technical colleges, 29 were public four-year institutions, and 4 were independent four-year institutions. Of the 1211 courses nominated, 960 were submitted, reflecting a 79 percent participation rate. This high rate of participation far exceeded expectations and was due in large part to the work of CRSAs. The low rate of participation by independent institutions may be attributable to the fact that while 14 of 37 independent institutions elected to designate CRSAs, these positions are not funded.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that incentives be developed for K-12 involvement. Possible actions include but are not limited to: public approval of the CRS by the Commissioner of Education; collaboration of the K-12 regional education service centers in the dissemination of the CRS, in the creation of professional development programming, and in the development and implementation of future CRS-based curricula; involvement of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in the planning process of all college readiness initiatives that include both K-12 and higher education; more effective collaboration of the staffs of the TEA and the THECB with regional P-16 Councils.

Additionally, to assist in addressing CRS implementation through P-16 partnerships, it is recommended that the CRSA program be continued with additional funding after the current 2010 end date. Maintenance of established partnerships between the THECB and the state's institutions of higher education (and, by extension, their P-16 collaborations) will help ensure continuity and completion of CRS development, testing, and implementation strategies including local vertical alignment.

**THECB Program Contact:** Kristen Kramer, [Kristen.Kramer@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Kristen.Kramer@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6216

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                     | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                  |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>           | \$1,440,000          | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                |                              |            |           |
| Abilene Christian University     | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Alamo Community College District | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Alvin Community College          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Amarillo College                 | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Angelina College                 | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Angelo State University          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Austin College                   | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Austin Community College         | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Blinn College                    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                             | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Brazosport College                       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Brookhaven College                       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Cedar Valley College                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Central Texas College                    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Cisco Junior College                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Clarendon College                        | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Coastal Bend College                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| College of the Mainland                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Collin County Community College District | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Concordia University                     | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                               |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Del Mar College               | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| East Texas Baptist University | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Eastfield College             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| El Centro College             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| El Paso Community College     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Frank Phillips College        | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Galveston College             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Grayson County College        | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Hill College                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Houston Baptist University    | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                      | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                   |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Houston Community College System  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Howard College                    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Jarvis Christian College          | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Kilgore College                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lamar Institute of Technology     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lamar State College - Orange      | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lamar State College - Port Arthur | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lamar University                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Laredo Community College          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lee College                       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                      | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                   |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Lone Star College System District | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Lubbock Christian University      | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| McLennan Community College        | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Midland College                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Midwestern State University       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Mountain View College             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Navarro College                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| North Central Texas College       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| North Lake College                | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Northeast Texas Community College | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                    | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                 |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Odessa College                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Our Lady of the Lake University | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Panola College                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Paris Junior College            | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Paul Quinn College              | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Prairie View A&M University     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Ranger College                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Richland College                | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Sam Houston State University    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| San Jacinto College District    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                       | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                    |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| South Plains College               | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| South Texas College                | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Southern Methodist University      | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Southwest Texas Junior College     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| St. Edward's University            | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| St. Mary's University              | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Stephen F. Austin State University | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Sul Ross State University          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Tarleton State University          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Tarrant County College District    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                          | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                       |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Temple College                        | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texarkana College                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M International University    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University - Commerce       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University - Kingsville     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University - Texarkana      | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas A&M University at Galveston     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas Southern University             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                               | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas State Technical College - Harlingen  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas State Technical College - Marshall   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas State Technical College - Waco       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas State Technical College - West Texas | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas State University                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas Tech University                      | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Texas Woman's University                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas - Pan American     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Arlington       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Austin          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Brownsville and Texas Southmost College | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Dallas                                  | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at El Paso                                 | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at San Antonio                             | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas at Tyler                                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The University of Texas of the Permian Basin                       | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| The Victoria College   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Trinity Valley Community College                                   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Tyler Junior College   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

**College Readiness Special Advisors**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                       | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                    |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| University of Houston              | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of Houston - Clear Lake | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of Houston - Downtown   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of Houston - Victoria   | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of North Texas          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of North Texas - Dallas | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| University of the Incarnate Word   | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Vernon College                     | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Weatherford College                | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| West Texas A&M University          | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

| College Readiness Special Advisors       |                      |                               |                            |                              |            |           |
|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site |                      |                               |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site                             | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup>     | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|  |                      |                               |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Western Texas College                    | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Wharton County Junior College            | \$15,000             | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |
| Wiley College                            | undesignated         | Regional and Statewide impact | In progress                | IP                           | IP         | IP        |

<sup>1</sup> Private institutions are included in the program, but do not receive funding. They are reported in the table as "undesignated." Funding is reported for FY 2008 only.

<sup>2</sup>This program has a statewide impact.

<sup>3</sup>Evaluation of this program is in progress.

<sup>4</sup> Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

# Basic Research Programs

## Minority Health Research and Education Grant Program

**Type of Program:** Basic Research

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Texas Education Code, Sections 63.301-302

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$2,351,865

|                                     |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 9 |                                     |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$261,318  | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$171,000 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$341,057 |

**Program Dates:** January 2008 to August 31, 2009

**Program Goals:** The Texas Education Code states that the THECB shall provide grants to "institutions of higher education, including Centers for Teacher Education, that conduct research or educational programs that address minority health issues or form partnerships with minority organizations, colleges, or universities to conduct research and education programs that address minority health issues." In recent competitions, THECB has funded educational and research projects that would help increase the number of minority students applying to, enrolling in, and graduating from health degree programs.

**Issues and Challenges:** Minorities are under-represented in the state's health professions. That under-representation contributes to health disparities among the state's minority populations.

The issues contributing to the problem of under-representation of minorities are multifaceted. Not all of them are captured in the scope of the grant program. However, research and educational projects funded under this grant program attempt to respond to many of the issues linked to education. Previous and current projects have focused on career exposure and exploration, educational preparation, skills assessment, curriculum redesign, and retention efforts at all levels of the K-16 pipeline.

**Program Operation:** In each legislative session, the program receives an estimated biennial appropriation based on the expected interest earnings from a permanent fund established as a result of the 1997 Multi-State Tobacco Lawsuit Settlement. After each legislative session, THECB holds a grants competition in the summer and fall of that odd-numbered year. The competition is announced in a request for proposals (RFP). Proposals submitted in response to the RFP are evaluated by academic and other professional peers in Texas based on a standard set of awards criteria. Those proposals receiving the highest peer scores and rankings are recommended to the full Board for funding. In the latest competition, two-year grant awards were made in January 2008. Grant contracts require that each grantee submit an interim progress report in September 2008 and a final narrative and financial report after the grant period ends on August 31, 2009.

**Results:** Effectiveness is based on each grantee’s interim and final reports The grants are still in progress.

**Recommendations:** No recommendations at this time.

**THECB Program Contact:** Chris Fowler, [Chris.Fowler@theeb.state.tx.us](mailto:Chris.Fowler@theeb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6217

| Minority Health Research and Education Grant Program                                    |             |                          |                            |                              |            |           |
|---|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site  |             |                          |                            |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding     | Participant <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |             |                          |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$2,351,865 | 4,390                    | In progress                |                              |            |           |
| TAMU. Health Disparities Academy  | \$293,247   | 159                      | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TTUHSC. Innovations in Competency Education   | \$338,002   | 239                      | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TTUHSC. Expanding Texas HOT Jobs Resources for Minority Students                        | \$341,957   | 557                      | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UT Dallas. Effects of Off-Campus Health Occupations Enrichment and Information Programs | \$251,686   | 131                      | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTHSC-H. Comprehensive Early Intervention and Mentoring for Student Success             | \$198,884   | 2,022                    | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Minority Health Research and Education Grant Program**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site   | Funding   | Participant <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|--|-----------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |           |                          |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| UTHSC-SA.<br>Learn, Lead,<br>Advance to<br>New<br>Opportunity  | \$183,327 | 79                       | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTHSC-SA.<br>Prospective<br>Randomized<br>Controlled<br>Evaluation of<br>Two Health<br>Career<br>Education<br>Pipeline<br>Programs | \$290,243 | 930                      | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTMDACC.<br>Science<br>Centered<br>Inquiry-Based<br>Educational<br>Activities  | \$283,519 | 232                      | In progress                | 2                            | 2          | 3         |
| UTSWMC-<br>Dallas.<br>Randomized<br>Controlled Trial<br>of a Summer<br>Pre-<br>Matriculation<br>Program                            | \$171,000 | 41                       | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Participant counts are based on information provided in interim reports.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based on each grantee's interim and final reports. The grants are still in progress.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program

**Type of Program:** Basic Research

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Texas Education Code, Sections 63.201-202 as amended by Senate Bill 992, 80th Texas Legislature.

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$ 4,240,916

|                                      |                                    |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 13 |                                    |                                      |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$326,224   | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$66,345 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$1,270,897 |

**Program Dates:** Program rules allow the THECB to award one-, two- and three-year grants. THECB conducted three grants competitions in Fiscal Year 2008. As a result of those separate competitions, 13 grants were awarded between January and March 2008. Eleven of the 13 are two-year grants, ending August 2009. Two of the 13 are three-year grants, ending August 2010.

**Program Goals:** The Texas Education Code states that the THECB shall provide grants to “public institutions of higher education that offer upper-level academic instruction and training in the fields of nursing, allied health, or other health-related education.” However, the statute has been amended since 2004 to redirect all available grant funds to support initial licensure nursing education at hospitals, public and private universities, health-related institutions, and community colleges.

**Issues and Challenges:** All funds were directed to initial RN licensure programs and to nursing faculty who would be teaching in those programs. Projects that are funded under the Program are expected to test new models for increasing enrollment capacity and student success in nursing education. The ultimate goal is to produce more graduates and help relieve the state’s current and projected nursing shortage.

**Program Operation:** In each legislative session, the program receives an estimated biennial appropriation based on the expected interest earnings from a permanent fund established as a result of the 1997 Multi-State Tobacco Lawsuit Settlement. After each legislative session, THECB holds one or more grants competitions within the first fiscal year of the biennium. The competition is announced in a request for proposals (RFP). Proposals submitted in response to the RFP are evaluated by academic and other professional peers in Texas based on a standard set of awards criteria. Proposals receiving the highest peer scores and rankings are recommended to the full Board for funding. In the latest competition, 12 of the 13 grant awards were made in January 2008. One other grant was awarded in March 2008. Of those thirteen grants, 11 are two-year grants that require each grantee institution to submit an interim progress report and a final narrative and financial report after the grant period ends. Institutions with the two, three-year grants are required to submit interim reports in September

2008 and 2009, and a final narrative and financial report after the grant period ends on August 31, 2010. An external consultant evaluates three-year grant projects.

All grant findings will be collected and reviewed through a nursing research group that was established for the current grant cycle. Findings are shared with all of the state’s nursing programs through a THECB-sponsored conference that is held every two years.

**Results:** Effectiveness is based on each grantee’s interim and final reports. The grants are still in progress.

**Recommendations:** No recommendations at this time.

**THECB Program Contact:** Chris Fowler, Chris.Fowler@theccb.state.tx.us, 512-427-6217

| Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program         |             |                           |  |                              |            |           |
|---|-------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Effectiveness of Program by Project Site  |             |                           |  |                              |            |           |
| Project Site  | Funding     | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup>   | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|   |             |                           |  | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  | \$4,240,916 | 1,071                     | In progress  |                              |            |           |
| Alvin CC. Partnership in Academic and Clinical Excellence                       | \$66,345    | 46                        | In progress  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| ASU. Transforming LVN-RN Education Through Hospital Partnerships (3-year grant) | \$1,270,897 | 102                       | In progress (Separate evaluation conducted by out-of-state consultant) | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Austin CC. Student Tracking and Retention Project                               | \$196,903   | 182                       | In progress  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|---|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |           |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Lee C. Streamlined Track of Academics for RN-Transitional at the Workplace          | \$273,144 | 93                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Lone Star C - Kingwood. Course Redesign for Self-paced Nursing Students             | \$298,561 | 65                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| SFASU. Research Model for Identifying and Intervening with At-Risk Nursing Students | \$265,970 | 218                       | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TTUHSC. West Texas Nursing Education Portal Project                                 | \$298,411 | 22                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TTUHSC. We Can Do It Together: A Mosaic of Partnerships. (Conference grant)         | \$94,809  | IP                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| TWU. Reinventing Nursing Education  | \$249,777 | 30                        | In progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Nursing, Allied Health and Other Health-Related Education Grant Program**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Funding   | Participants <sup>1</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>2</sup>   | Fidelity Scores <sup>3</sup> |            |           |
|---|-----------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |           |                           |  | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Victoria C Preparing Certified Clinical Instructors.              | \$150,324 | 80                        | In progress  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UT-A. The LEARN Project. (3-yr. grant)                            | \$577,287 | 35                        | In progress (Separate evaluation conducted by out-of-state consultant) | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTPA. Academic Retention Model for Baccalaureate Nursing Students | \$278,781 | 159                       | In progress  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| UTMB-Galveston. Statewide Collaborations in Clinical Placement.   | \$219,707 | 39                        | In progress  | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Participants based on information provided in interim reports.

<sup>2</sup>Effectiveness is based on each grantee's interim and final reports. These grants are still in progress.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program.

## Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)

**Type of Program:** Basic Research

**Legislative Citation and/or External Funding Source:** Created by the 70th Texas Legislature in 1987 - Texas Education Code, Chapter 142

**Appropriation/Budget:** \$16,624,857

|                                       |                                    |                                    |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of projects funded:</b> 121 |                                    |                                    |
| <b>Average award:</b><br>\$137,000    | <b>Smallest award:</b><br>\$12,000 | <b>Largest award:</b><br>\$150,000 |

**Program Dates:** May 15, 2008 through January 31, 2011, (*This assumes carry-forward authority to the next biennium. If not, September 1, 2009, would be the end date.*)

**Program Goals:** The program supports basic research at institutions of higher education and funds research projects deemed to be the highest level of research. Additionally, the institutions may use funding provided under the NHARP to attract students and faculty to their institution. Students and faculty supported in labs with NHARP projects are trained to become scientists and engineers and are often retained in Texas. Results of the projects provide the foundation of knowledge needed for innovative and applied research projects.

**Issues and Challenges:** The Advisory Committee on Advanced Research (ACORP) helps provide program oversight and advice on research efforts in Texas. These high-level researchers have identified that research efforts should be focused to emphasize funding of young researchers, debated limiting the number of proposals submitted from eligible public universities, believe that better tracking of student impacts will result in greater understanding of the program, consider whether selecting priority areas for future project supports, which may improve the leveraging ratio, and explore ways to increase the number of collaborative projects.

**Program Operation:** The NHARP is a competitive peer-reviewed program. The most recent program operation implemented an eight-step process to select projects for funding. The process was designed to ensure that each proposal was reviewed in a competent, fair, and unbiased fashion.

**STEP 1:** The ACORP oversaw creation of the guidelines for the proposals, established submission limits for the institutions based on reported research expenditures, set a maximum award amount, determined funding to be allocated to each research area, and provided oversight for the review process.

**STEP 2:** Program guidelines were approved by the Coordinating Board at its quarterly meeting on July 7, 2007, and posted on the [www.arpatp.com](http://www.arpatp.com) web site.

**STEP 3:** In October 2007, 1,925 pre-proposals were submitted electronically through the institutions' Offices of Sponsored Projects.

STEP 4: Nine review panels were appointed. The chairs and panelists were recruited from academia, national laboratories, and U.S., and Texas companies. The majority of reviewers were from out-of-state higher education institutions. No reviewers were associated with a Texas university. Working independently, the reviewers selected 527 pre-proposals to continue to the full proposal stage.

STEP 5: In January 2008, 520 full proposals were submitted and reviewed electronically.

STEP 6: Two large review panels met onsite and seven other panels met through a series of conference calls to produce ranked lists of the most outstanding proposals for each research area. An electronic tool developed by Coordinating Board staff expedited their work of evaluation, scoring, and ranking. The proposals recommended at this point were considered by the panelists to be equal to or better than those funded in national competitions.

STEP 7: Coordinating Board staff allocated funding to proposals in rank order determined by the review panels. Funding was allotted to 121 proposals before the money allocated to each research area was depleted. As mandated by the enabling legislation, no more than 70 percent of funds were slated for award to institutions from The University of Texas and Texas A&M Systems. The final allocations were reviewed by ACORP at its meeting on April 21, 2008.

STEP 8: The Coordinating Board, at its meeting on April 24, 2008, approved the selection of projects and allocation of funds.

Principal investigators are required to submit a progress report for each year a project is active and a final report when the project ends. Institutions are required to submit a final financial report at the end of a project.

**Results:** From the 2008 progress reports only, Referred Journals:

In Preparation – 115                      Submitted - 72  
 Accepted – 41                                Published - 121  
 Invited - 9

| Type                    | Student Participation |                        |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
|                         | Supported by Grant    | Not supported by Grant |
| Undergraduates Students | 70                    | 77                     |
| Graduate Students       | 231                   | 118                    |
| Post Doctoral Trainees  | 30                    | 32                     |

The program is meeting its goals by adding to the knowledge base and providing research experiences to students.

**Recommendations:** See the ARP Impact Study, the last merit review for the program at <http://www.researchintexas.com/ARPImpactStudy.pdf>.

**THECB Program Contact:** Stacey Silverman, [Stacey.Silverman@thechb.state.tx.us](mailto:Stacey.Silverman@thechb.state.tx.us), 512-427-6206

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| <b>Overall Program</b>  |   | \$16,624,857         | 148                       | In Progress                |                              |            |           |
| The University of Texas at Dallas                             | A new streamlined paradigm for 3-D imaging of oil and gas reservoirs with seismic data          | \$120,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | A Novel and Cost-Effective Approach to Reduce the Exposure of Texans to Ozone                   | \$115,180            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | A Perceptual Metrics Guided Computational Paradigm for Expressive Talking Face Generation       | \$107,024            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Activity-Based Protein Profiling Using Small Molecule Microarrays As A Biomarker Discovery Tool | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Antenna Design for Non-Radiative Wireless Power Transfer   | \$111,760            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Dallas, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas, and Univeristy of North Texas | Antibody-conjugated carbon nanotubes for selective photothermal ablation of human tumors             | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | Antimicrobial Peptides and Cancer  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University, and Sam Houston State University  | Applications of Algebraic Geometry to Algebraic Statistics and Geometric Modeling                    | \$144,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Assessment and prediction of coastal erosion and morphological changes in the Upper Texas Gulf coast | \$137,900            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas Tech University   | Assessment of Airborne Anabolic Hormones from Confined Animal Feeding Operations                | \$80,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin and Texas Tech University   | Atmospheric Stability Considerations in the Design of Wind Turbines against Fatigue Failure     | \$128,940            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | Batch-Fabricated Nanowire Plasmonic Probes for Near Field Imaging of Single Molecules and Cells | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University and Texas Engineering Experiment Station | Bayesian hierarchical Models for integrating multi-resolution information                       | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth | BMP Regulation of TGF-b2 in the Human Optic Nerve Head  | \$100,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas State University - San Marcos   | Caccetta-Haggkvist Conjecture and Related Conjectures                                   | \$67,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas                               | Cancer progression of normal human colonic epithelial cells                             | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas and The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Computer-aided Diagnosis for Gastrointestinal Bleeding using Wireless Capsule Endoscopy | \$149,944            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Constructing Intelligent Agents in Simulated Worlds                                     | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Woman's University  | Construction and Analysis of Aqueous Enzyme Phase Diagrams                              | \$74,298             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Correlating Energetics and Structure in Protein-Ligand Interactions                     | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site   | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Austin                            | Correlating the structure and function of bimetallic nanoparticles for catalysis                    | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington                         | Cross-immunity and geographical invasion in the transmission of <i>Trypanosoma cruzi</i>            | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at El Paso and Texas Tech University | Database Development of Wind Erosion Source Areas in the Southern High Plains and Chihuahuan Desert | \$108,100            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                            | Determination of a Cell's Metallome   | \$125,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University - Commerce                              | Determining the Equation of State of Neutron-Rich Nuclear Matter and its Astrophysical Impacts      | \$134,300            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| University of Houston and The University of Texas at Austin | Development of Active and Durable Nanostructured Pt alloy Catalysts for High Powerdensity Fuel Cells | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston                                       | Development of Copper-catalyzed C-H Activation Reactions   | \$146,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                           | Developmental Robotics: Learning Hand-Eye Skills   | \$149,800            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston                                       | Diesel Engine Optimization and Control Adaptation for Biofuel Usage                                  | \$146,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                           | Directed identification of genes causing neural tube defects.  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston                                       | Dynamics and Function of Feed Forward Networks   | \$148,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                         | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                      |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| University of Houston                | Dynamics of Complex Networks and Random Matrix Theory   | \$56,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin    | Efficient Algorithms for Complex Machine Learning Tasks   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Engineering Experiment Station | Enabling Delay-Sensitive Multihop Wireless Communications   | \$145,400            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin    | Energy-conserved On-chip Nano-scale Opto-Electronic Interconnects for Silicon High Performance VLSI | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin    | Engineering the Next Generation of Antibody Therapeutics  | \$140,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin    | Enhancing ethanol production in Chlamydomonas by genetic modification                               | \$75,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site   | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas State University - San Marcos  | Epikarst Controls on Recharge, Water Quality and Ecosystem dynamics in Central Texas Hill Country | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston and The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston | Facial Expression Analysis Using 6D Data: Application to Autism                                   | \$149,751            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin  | Finding the Brightest Supernova Ever  | \$118,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at San Antonio   | Formal Methods in Access Control Policy Analysis and Design                                       | \$145,999            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth                      | Generation of Protective Immunity against Listeria monocytogenes                                  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University and University of North Texas                                 | Graded Hecke Algebras and Deformations  | \$93,546             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Dallas and The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Guiding Brain Plasticity via Vagus Nerve Stimulation                                | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi and The University of Texas at Austin                         | Habitat Fragmentation in Marine Ecosystems: Impact of habitat loss to marine fishes | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | High-Mobility Channel MOSFETs   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at El Paso  | High-pressure neutron spectroscopy studies of phosphate-based solid acids           | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Identification and Characterization of Diels-Alderases in Nature                    | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Identification of factors involved in the functional activity of telomerase            | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Identifying the neural circuits controlling a complex behavior                         | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | In Vivo, High-Resolution Imaging of Retinal Ganglion Cells and Vasculature in Glaucoma | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Intersection between bacterial pathogenesis and eukaryotic signal transduction systems | \$140,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio and The University of Texas at San Antonio | Intra-arterial Revascularization and Local Brain Cooling in Acute Stroke Treatment  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington and Texas A&M University - Commerce                                | Inverse Scattering and Spectral Problems in Human Speech                            | \$104,500            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center   | Investigations of a novel mechanism for nucleic acid damage and tumor initiation.   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Is Water Table a "Material" Free Surface?   | \$120,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Laser-Ablation and Computational Studies of Novel Charge States at Oxide Interfaces | \$120,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| University of Houston   | Latency and Jitter Control for Telesurgery and Telemedicine Using Asymmetric WDM Burst Switching | \$149,800            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas   | Macromolecular associations of DevR, a hypoxia adaptation mediator in m. Tuberculosis.           | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington                            | Magnetic Detection of DNA Nanoarrays   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas   | Mechanisms of ERK1/2 action and potential for therapeutics in diseases of cilia dysfunction      | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Dallas and University of North Texas | Metal-Organic Field Effect Transistors (MOFETs)  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                               | Microreplication of Three-Dimensional Tissue Analogues   | \$114,700            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| University of Houston   | Molecular Analysis of Environmental Sensor in Bacteria   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth | Molecular characterization of a melanoma specific ligand for Natural Killer cell receptor 2B4(CD244) | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center                  | Molecular mechanisms of regulation by calcium of gap-junctional hemichannels formed by connexin 43   | \$148,887            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston and University of Houston - Downtown    | Multidimensional Conservation Laws: Training and Dissemination                                       | \$54,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | Multifunctional Metal-Oxide Organic Frameworks (MOOFs)   | \$120,818            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Arlington and The University of Texas at San Antonio | Nanofabrication of Novel Sensors via Self-Assembly of Anisotropic Epitaxial Oxides                 | \$118,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | Nanofabrication of Novel Sensors via Self-Assembly of Anisotropic Epitaxial Oxides                 | \$30,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | Nanoscale Patterned Magnetic Recording Medium: Device Physics and Fabrication of Imprint Templates | \$149,981            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | New Science for Carbon Nanotube Nets Enabling Big Technology Breakthroughs                         | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth                   | New Surface Plasmons Enhanced Detection of DNA/RNA Hybridization.                                  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas Tech University   | Novel Drug Immobilization and Delivery Platform Based Upon Molecular-Level Mechanical Entrapment     | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | Novel In Situ Crystallization Patterning of 3D Hydrogels for Regeneration of Branched Nerve Networks | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Novel MRI nanosensors for imaging tissue oxygenation   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at San Antonio                        | Novel Multidisciplinary Strategy to Optimize Stem Cell Function Pertinent to Bone Tissue Engineering | \$149,500            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University   | One Step Cellulosic Ethanol Production   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                      | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|                                   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas Tech University             | One-Step Pickering Emulsion Polymerization: A Novel Way to Bridge Organics and Inorganics          | \$110,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Dallas | Opportunistic and Cooperative Methods for Cognitive Radios   | \$121,500            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin | Optical Gating in Semiconductor Spintronics  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University             | Origin of Enhanced Reactivity and Depressed Tg for Network Polymers at the Nanoscale               | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University              | Phosphonate Mimics of Tetrahedral Intermediates as Potent Inhibitors of Enzyme Catalyzed Reactions | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston             | Physical Mechanisms of Biological Rotary Motors  | \$110,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Arlington  | Plasmonic metamaterials for nonlinear-optical signal processing                                    | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of North Texas and The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Primary Cilia in the Birth, Function, and Survival of Neurons                                      | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at El Paso  | Probabilistic Models for Inversions in Viral RNA Sequences   | \$117,780            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Dallas   | Probing Dynamic Conformational Ensemble of HIV-1 TAR RNA by Femtosecond Time-Resolved Spectroscopy | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center  | Production, Purification and Characterization of a Novel C. difficile Endolysin.                   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas State University - San Marcos and The University of Texas at Austin | Profiling Bacterial Species' Interactions in Mixed Cultures                                     | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Pulsating White Dwarfs as Dark Matter Detectors   | \$146,534            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Quantum Plasmonics  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas Engineering Experiment Station                                      | Radiation Heat Transfer and Its Effect on NO Formation in Diesel Combustion with Biodiesel Fuel | \$47,129             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Randomness Extraction and Distributed Computing   | \$148,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin   | Reviving the breath of life in malignant cells as a novel strategy to kill cancer               | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas Engineering Experiment Station                          | Robust Algorithms in Support of Vehicular Ad Hoc Network Applications                    | \$149,162            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston   | Role of Angiotensin II AT2 Receptor in Blood Pressure Regulation in Obesity and Diabetes | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | Role of FoxO4 in Inflammatory Bowel Disease  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Separating Membrane Proteins for Proteomics  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | Smart Active Context-based Surveillance System   | \$135,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at San Antonio                        | Sound pattern recognition in the auditory midbrain                                       | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site                                      | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| Texas A&M University                              | Stable isotopes of mollusk shells as proxies for river discharge and hypoxia on the Texas shelf | \$101,924            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston                             | Stealth Targeted MR Molecular Probes for Cancer Detection                                       | \$149,234            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University System Health Science Center | STEMIN, a Serum Response Factor mutant converts fibroblasts into stem cells                     | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                 | Study of single nanoparticle catalysts using electrocatalytic amplification                     | \$126,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University                              | Subfemtosecond laser pulse compression by coherent oscillations in Raman-active crystals        | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center | Targeted therapy for metastatic breast cancer   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                   | The Hobby-Eberly Telescope Dark Energy Experiment (HETDEX)  | \$142,984            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University                                | The impact of orbital variations of insolation during intervals of high atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> | \$137,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University System Health Science Center   | The Molecular Mechanisms Underlying Atrial Septal Defect  | \$75,000             |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston                               | The Role of Heterotrimeric G(o) in Drosophila Associative Memory Formation                          | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site  | Project Name  | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|   |   |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas | The role of the inhibitory receptor gp49B1 in B lymphocyte development and activation | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | Three-dimensional imaging of brain oxygenation  | \$ 50,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin                             | Time-resolved structural analysis of RNA folding mediated by a chaperone protein      | \$123,345            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington                          | Tissue-engineering Enabled Biomimetic Corneal Stroma                                  | \$120,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Total Synthesis of Guaianolide Natural Products                                       | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| Texas A&M University  | Toward Matterwave Chemistry   | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Arlington                          | Transient Computational Model for Thermal Stability of Gas-Lubricated Bearings        | \$133,996            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

**Norman Hackerman Advanced Research Program (NHARP)**

**Effectiveness of Program by Project Site**

| Project Site   | Project Name   | Funding <sup>1</sup> | Participants <sup>2</sup> | Effectiveness <sup>3</sup> | Fidelity Scores <sup>4</sup> |            |           |
|--|--|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------|-----------|
|  |  |                      |                           |                            | Programming                  | Evaluation | Financial |
| The University of Texas at Austin  | Trapping of Atomic Hydrogen Isotopes   | \$120,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston and Texas AgriLife Research | Unraveling the mystery of Lyme disease and Southern Tick-Associated Rash Illness (STARI) in Texas    | \$148,197            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston  | U-Pb age and Hf isotope composition of detrital zircons, Ouachita Orogenic Belt, Marathon Uplift, TX | \$125,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| The University of Texas at Austin  | Using a Drosophila model to identify UBE3A substrates relevant to Angelman syndrome                  | \$150,000            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |
| University of Houston and Texas Southern University                                  | Video-Based Surveillance in Distributed Environments   | \$149,944            |                           | In Progress                | 3                            | 3          | 3         |

<sup>1</sup>Funds are awarded to individual investigators. The total includes only awarded funds. Expenses for administrative and accountability processes are not included.

<sup>2</sup>The total number of participants includes lead researchers and collaborators on the 121 different projects.

<sup>3</sup>The evaluation of individual awards is still in progress. Awards were made in May 2008 and progress reports for these awards will be due in May 2009.

<sup>3</sup>Fidelity scores measure a project's compliance with their grant contract in three areas: Programming refers to the extent the project met the stated programming requirements of the grant. That is, did they do what they were paid to do? Evaluation refers to the extent to which the project followed the cross-site program evaluation requirements. That is, did they complete all of the required evaluation instruments and submit all required data? Financial refers to the extent to which the project followed all budget and other financial requirements of the grant. That is, did they use the funds for what they were intended and file all financial information in a timely and accurate manner? Fidelity Scale: *a score of 3 = in complete accordance; 2=minor departures from requirements noted, and a 1= serious departure from the requirements of the program*



This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Website: <http://www.thecb.state.tx.us>

**For more information contact:**

**Robin Zuniga, Senior Program Evaluator**

Planning and Accountability

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

P. O. Box 12788

Austin, Texas 78711

(512) 427-6536 FAX (512) 427-6147

[robin.zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us](mailto:robin.zuniga@thecb.state.tx.us)