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Participating schools were those that participated in UIL academic activities for at least two of the last four years, according to the UIL Participation List published annually by UIL. Random samples consisting of approximately 40 participating and 40 non-participating schools were compared. To answer the research questions, entire populations were compared.

Comparing overall 1997 TAAS mastery levels, percentage of mastery was found to be significantly higher for middle schools that competed in UIL academic programs compared to those that did not. UIL participating middle schools scored an average of 8.3
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Small-size elementary and middle schools were found to be most likely to participate in UIL, as well as most likely to have the highest accountability ratings. Other studies are recommended to determine the impact of extracurricular academic activities on individual students who participate. Additional findings and conclusions are described in the study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Founded in 1910 with a membership of 28 public school districts, the University Interscholastic League (UIL) has grown into the largest interschool organization of its kind in the world, serving 98 percent of the 1059 school districts in Texas with extracurricular academic, athletic, and music activities. Under the direction of University of Texas at Austin president, Dr. S. E. Mezes, the University Interscholastic League (UIL) began as a declamation league, forming the first Debating League of Texas through the University of Texas at Austin Extension Department in 1910. The primary objective of the League was the improvement of public speaking and debate among schools in Texas. Only high school boys were initially allowed to compete.

In 1912, a junior and senior division of the Debating and Declamation League of Texas was formed and 128 public schools participated in competition throughout the state. In 1913, the League expanded to include track competition, which had previously been sponsored by the Texas Interscholastic Athletic Association. Competition was then divided into three conferences: high school, middle school, and academy. The organization had only three rules: (1) A contestant could not be over 21 years old; (2) he had to be a “bona fide” student; and (3) he must be passing three subjects.
Beginning in 1914, girls were allowed to compete in declamation and a new county spelling contest. At this time football, basketball and baseball were instituted as League contests for boys. In 1916, essay writing, a forerunner to today’s Ready Writing Contest, was introduced, and by 1917 the University Interscholastic League (UIL) had become the nation’s largest interscholastic league organization (Hawthorne, 1985).

Today, UIL offers 22 high school and 17 elementary school and middle school academic events, in addition to 19 athletic and 9 music contests. The constitution has expanded from the three original rules to 239 pages of rules, regulations and interpretations. Appendix A provides a complete list of academic contests offered for elementary through high school and a table of contents for the *UIL Constitution and Contest Rules*.

The overarching goal of academic competition, however, remains similar to that established by the charter members—the improvement of public schools and individuals through the pursuit of excellence in academic competition. The main purpose as now stated in the 1997-98 *UIL Constitution* belief statement follows:

The University Interscholastic League believes:
that most students enjoy the pursuit of excellence and seek opportunities to test themselves against their own accomplishments and those of their peers;
that such opportunities are best provided through properly conducted and equitably administered competitive activities;
that the classroom is enriched by the flow of student energy into the more intensified arena of competition and back into the classroom; therefore, we reaffirm that all students are the focus of our endeavor and deserve an opportunity to:
refine physical and mental aptitudes;

- nurture self-realization and build self-confidence;
- feel a sense of pride and dignity;
- experience teamwork and develop a sense of fair play;
- develop the ability to lead and the willingness to follow;
- foster self-discipline and perseverance;
- appreciate that rules, consistently applied, create order and discipline;
- learn to accept graciously the decisions of judges and officials;
- affirm self-worth in times of disappointment as well as adulation;
- cultivate lifetime skills;
- complement their class work with practice and performance;
- have fun;
- experience the joy of achieving their potential in a wholesome environment;
- discover that the true meaning of winning is doing one’s best (UIL Constitution and Contest Rules, 1997, p.11).

From its inception, the League has existed as a voluntary-member non-profit organization to serve public schools with guidelines for academic, athletic and music competition. Although 96 percent of all public high school campuses pay membership fees, individual elementary school and middle school campuses that are feeder-schools to member high schools may elect not to participate, and alternative campuses designed for students with disciplinary problems are not allowed to
participate. Membership fees paid by a high school grant every regular, magnet or charter elementary school and middle school campus in that feeder-school area free membership into the League, regardless of size and number of campuses that feed into that high school.

Free membership grants that each participating campus receives, at no cost, an *A+ Handbook*, by merely returning a participation card that is sent to each campus at the beginning of the school year. This resource handbook provides detailed instructions on forming a district tournament, preparing for each of the 17 contests and conducting each event in a tournament. In addition, sample test questions for each contest and all UIL rules for individual and campus participation are included in the complimentary mailing. During the 1996-97 school year, 2974 of the 5341 eligible elementary and middle school campuses elected to participate in UIL academic activities.

District superintendents and campus principals, who chiefly determine whether their schools will compete, have given the following reasons for electing not to participate:

- "We have to 'do' TAAS, so we can't 'do' UIL";
- "There isn't enough time to get ready for TAAS and get ready for UIL, too";
- "My teachers don't want to spend the extra time it would take to prepare for UIL academic competition."

Contests provided through UIL are written by professionals in each field of study and are intended to be inclusive of curricula above the grade level of the
participant. For example, the middle school Mathematics Contest consists of arithmetic operations involving whole numbers, integers, fractions, decimals, exponents, order of operations, probability, statistics, number theory, simple interest, measurements (English and metric) and conversions normally covered at these grade levels. In addition, the tests include geometry problems, including applications of the Pythagorean theorem, polygon/polyhedra, circles/spheres; and approximately 25 percent of the test includes Algebra I problems that may be studied in a high school curriculum. UIL contests serve to test the success of the enriched curriculum provided by a school. Appendix B provides the information found in the A+ Handbook describing the content and administration of the middle school Mathematics Contest.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if there are differences between elementary school and middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities and similar campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities, as measured by the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) and the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests in reading and mathematics for students in grades three, four, five, six, seven and eight; in writing for students in grades four and eight; and in social studies and science for students in grade eight.
Purposes of the Study

The eight purposes of this study were (a) to provide comparative Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) data for schools participating in UIL academic activities and schools not participating in UIL academic activities; (b) to compare the overall Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) ratings for campuses that do participate in UIL academic activities with those that do not; (c) to compare the attendance rates of elementary school and middle school students on campuses that do compete in UIL academic activities, versus those that do not; (d) to compare AEIS accountability ratings of UIL participating and non-UIL participating elementary school and middle school campuses that house 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged students; (e) to compare the AEIS levels of mastery on the TAAS for elementary school and middle school campuses before they began participation in UIL academic activities with their TAAS mastery level increases after they begin participation; (f) to compare TAAS percentage mastery scores of elementary school and middle school campuses that competed in UIL academic activities from 1993 through 1997 with those that did not participate during the same four-year period; (g) to determine comparative success levels, as indicated through accountability ratings, for all small-size, mid-size and large-size public elementary schools and public middle schools in Texas; and (h) to provide useful information to campus and district administrators to use in making a choice regarding participation in UIL academic activities.
Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be addressed descriptively and analytically:

1. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

2. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

3. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for similar elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

4. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of
mastery for similar middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

5. Attendance rates for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.

6. Attendance rates for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.

7. Campus accountability ratings for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for elementary school campuses that do not participate.

8. Campus accountability ratings for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for middle school campuses that do not participate.

9. The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the two prior years of non participation will be significantly higher than similar non-participating campuses for the same time period.

10. The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the two prior years of non participation will be
significantly higher than similar non-participating campuses for the same time period.

11. Percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year period.

12. Percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year period.

Research Questions

1. Are large, mid-size or small-size elementary school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?

2. Are large, mid-size or small-size middle school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?

3. Do large, mid-size or small-size elementary school campuses have the highest accountability rating?

4. Do large, mid-size or small-size middle school campuses have the highest accountability rating?
Significance of the Study

This study is significant in that data have not been compared regarding the success of elementary and middle schools that participate in UIL academic activities with those that do not participate in UIL academic activities. Such a study could provide valuable information for making decisions concerning the benefits of providing students with the opportunity to challenge their peers in UIL academic competition by supplying statistical evidence that shows whether small-size, mid-size or large schools that participate achieve higher TAAS scores and post a better attendance rate and campus accountability rating than schools that do not participate.

Basic Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that:

1. Schools have accurately reported demographic data, inclusive of numbers of students in attendance and numbers of students qualifying for free or reduced lunches or other public assistance.

2. Schools have accurately stated participation status in the UIL academic program.

3. Results will be generally applicable to similar populations within the state.
Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study include:

1. The population is limited to campuses that include any grade combination from Early Education (EE) through grade 6 for elementary school comparison and any campus that includes any combination of grades 7 and 8 for middle school comparison. The study includes 449 campuses that comprise some combination of grades 9 through 12. Although TAAS percentage mastery figures for these grades are not considered in the study, the overall accountability rating of the campus and the attendance rate, which are provided in only one figure on the AEIS reports, may have had a bearing on these outcomes. Because 325 of these 449 campuses participate in the UIL academic elementary school and middle school programs, their inclusion was deemed essential to the statistical findings.

2. The study compares overall campus Academic Excellence Indicator System data and does not examine or account for differences among individual pupils.

3. The study does not provide data about individuals or teams of students that actually participated in UIL academic contests.

4. The data provide no qualitative rationale for participation or non-participation in UIL academic activities.
Definition of Terms

Following are definition of terms used in this study.

**Academic Excellence Indicator System** (AEIS) is a system used by the Texas Education Agency to assess and rate school districts and campuses on the basis of TAAS scores, dropout rates and attendance rates in comparison with schools with similar demographics.

**Accreditation/Accountability Rating** refers to the 1997 district and campus ratings assigned by the 1997 accountability system. Districts and campuses are evaluated on their performance on the TAAS, the dropout rate and the attendance rate. Districts receive an accreditation status and campuses receive an accountability rating. The four levels of accreditation status and accountability ratings are:

- *Exemplary (district and campus)*;
- *Recognized (district and campus)*;
- *Academically Acceptable (district) / Acceptable (campus)*;
- *Academically Unacceptable (district) / Low-Performing (campus)*.

**Attendance** refers to rates reported in AEIS, which are based on student attendance for the entire school year.

**Campus** is a term interchangeable with the term “school.”

**Early Education (EE)** identifies elementary school campuses that provide classes for economically disadvantaged students prior to their entry into pre-kindergarten programs.
Economically disadvantaged refers to those students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Elementary school refers to campuses that include any combination of grades EE through 6. Because some campuses include students from multiple grade levels, only those grade levels from early education through sixth grade are included in the study.

Middle school refers to campuses that include any combination of grades 7 and 8. Middle school grades may reside on campuses with other grade levels, such as grades 1 through 8, or grades 7 through 12; however, only grades 7 and 8 would be considered middle school.

Large-size schools are elementary school or middle school campuses with a population of 601 or more students, as reflected in Academic Excellence Indicator System demographic data.

Mid-size schools are elementary or middle school campuses with a population of between 201 and 600 students, as reflected in Academic Excellence Indicator System demographic data.

Small-size schools are elementary or middle school campuses with a population of 200 or fewer students, as reflected in Academic Excellence Indicator System demographic data.

PEIMS is the abbreviation for Public Education Information Management System, the computer system used for the compiling of pupil and campus data for Texas public school districts. This data is reported on the AEIS reports.
TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) is a criterion-referenced test that measures student achievement in reading and mathematics at grades 3-8 and 10, writing at grades 4, 8, and 10, and science and social studies at grade 8.

The tests are administered in the spring of each year.
CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

The following review of the research and theoretical foundations regarding the inclusion of academic extracurricular activities in the school program has three major purposes: (a) to examine the literature regarding the relationship between successful schools and the inclusion of extracurricular academic programs; (b) to examine the results of previous research on student participation in UIL extracurricular activities; and (c) to illustrate through individual examples and testimonials the impact that extracurricular academic activities has had on students.

The Relationship Between Successful Schools and the Inclusion of Extracurricular Academic Programs

Goodlad notes that schools and classrooms are often dull and uninteresting places for students who are unable to cope with the standards set by school leaders or the structure of the school environment (Goodlad and Keating, 1994). Some schools become preoccupied with a narrow standardization of the curriculum, such as teaching to the TAAS, often to the exclusion of recognizing differences in students' experiences and the need to be challenged (Soder, 1996).

According to Lezotte (1982) and Edmonds (1982), noted researchers of successful school practices, a successful school is one where a proportion of students
from the lowest socioeconomic class in the school evidences minimum mastery of the essential curriculum in equal proportions to the levels of minimum mastery evidenced by the higher socioeconomic class in the school. The definition connects two educational goals: to provide everyone with a quality education and to provide everyone with an equal education opportunity.

Based on this definition, reforms in Texas education resulted from research conducted by the Select Committee on Public Education in 1984. Most importantly, researchers noted that effective schools best achieve the overarching goal by creating a positive environment in which all students learn. Part of that environment is created by providing a variety of curricular and extracurricular activities in which the talents of a diverse student body may be tapped and enhanced, self esteem may be built and encouragement to master all subject matter is supported.

In Green’s research, 13 characteristics of a nurturing school were identified. These characteristics parallel the stated purposes of UIL academic competition.

When schools are nurturing places:
1. Students feel a sense of self-worth and acceptance;
2. Students feel safe and involved in their education;
3. There is mutual trust and positive interaction between teachers and students;
4. A sense of community, family, and collaboration exists in the school;
5. Everyone values individual difference, and the self one brings into the environment is respected and nurtured;
6. There is a sense of caring among individuals and collective sense of responsibility for student success;
7. The need for self-actualization is respected;
8. There is recognition of a wide range of talents and the need for empowering all individuals;
9. Teachers have an in-depth knowledge of students;
10. The school models the values of the community and involves the community in the education of students;
11. Teachers model caring attitudes for students;
12. Teachers demonstrate a love for their subject matter and continuously search for competence;
13. Students value themselves and others (Green, 1997, pp. 19-20).

One of the most important elements in establishing a culture for learning involves communicating high expectations. Much research has been conducted, especially as it relates to achievement levels by students traditionally underserved by the schools. For example, the teacher's judgments about the academic potential of individual students have a documented effect on their academic behavior (Irvine, 1990; Rist, 1970; Rosenthal, 1973). In addition, providing students with "authentic" work experiences and hands-on activities, inclusive of personal writing, are major themes of educational journal writing about strategies for success in schools (Grant, 1992).

Caine and Caine suggest in reports on their studies of brain-based learning that society places an impervious limit on what human beings and human society can do and become, by not trusting in the strength that the human brain possesses to
adapt and assimilate knowledge. Students are often underchallenged because of the perception that some activity may be too difficult for them to handle. The teachers' lower expectations for a student impede learning. The value of stringent extracurricular writing activities, such as those provided by the Texas University Interscholastic League in Creative and Ready Writing competition, is emphasized as one means of providing students with mind-strengthening authentic learning experiences (Caine and Caine, 1997).

A June, 1994 report from the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented examined three sets of standards developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics: (1) Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics (1989); (2) Professional Standards for Teaching Mathematics (1991); and (3) Assessment Standards for Mathematics (1993). The importance of multiple measures, beyond traditional tests, which relate to the needs of gifted mathematics students was emphasized. Researchers noted that observations, student interviews, open-ended questions, portfolios, differentiated assignments, core curriculum, pull-out programs, extracurricular programs and competition are important for a comprehensive and successful gifted/talented program in mathematics (Sheffield, 1994).

The importance of creating a positive learning environment, enriching and extending the curriculum and equalizing educational opportunities has been well
established in pedagogical research. These components of successful schooling parallel the purpose of UIL academic extracurricular activities and are found to be among the practices of schools that provide challenging curricular and extracurricular programs. Previous research findings on student participation in extracurricular activities follows.

**Previous Research on Student Participation in UIL Extracurricular Activities**

Although little research data are available at this time regarding the impact of extracurricular academic programs on elementary school and middle school students and their overall campus performance, some data does exist concerning the success of such programs in high schools. The information available relates primarily to individual student achievement scores and motivation factors.

A 1984 study of 56,140 randomly selected students by the Texas Education Agency revealed that 23% of those who were involved in extracurricular activities failed one or more courses in the fall semester, compared with 46% of those who were not involved. High schools in Texas, Minnesota and Iowa reported a significant difference in the overall grade averages of students who participated in extracurricular activities compared to those who did not participate (Swift, 1985).

The subjects of another study done through Texas Tech University consisted of a random sample of 501 eighth graders from seven junior high schools of
a west Texas school district. The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of participation in extracurricular activities to academic performance and educational aspirations and whether these relationships varied according to participants’ socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity or intelligence quotient. It was concluded that participation in extracurricular activities, including athletics, academics and social organizations, was associated with high GPA and high educational aspirations. The patterns and relationships, however, varied according to the participants’ gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity and intelligence quotient. There was no evidence that extracurricular participation was associated with lower GPA or lower educational aspirations for any group (Parish, 1984).

In *The Case for High School Activities*, published in 1987 by the National Federation of State High School Associations, extracurricular activities were noted to enrich a student’s high school experience. The Department of Education’s Center for Statistics found that high school students in extracurricular activity programs tended to earn better grades. Information compiled by the National Federation and the Center for Statistics showed that extracurricular activities support the academic mission of schools, are inherently educational and foster success in later life (*National Federation News*, 1987).

In research conducted by the United States Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement, seniors attending small schools
participated in extracurricular activities at higher rates than those attending large schools — 45 versus 30 percent for varsity sports and 29 versus 13 percent for journalistic activities. Students who ranked high on four related performance measures (course credits, hours of homework, test scores and grade average) tended to be more involved in extracurricular activities. In fact, the more activities students were involved in, the higher they ranked (Department of Education Study, 1987).

In “The Hidden Curriculum of Success,” Baldwin points out the importance of parents helping their children succeed by providing opportunities outside the classroom for each child to experience and accept failure as part of success and to use setbacks as learning experiences. He stresses the importance of not just providing extracurricular activities, but encouraging children to stick with it in order to learn healthy achievement motivation that can make things happen “through persistence, hard work, acceptance of adversity, and the successful surmounting of obstacles” (Baldwin, 1988, p. 8).

Monaco and Goodner (1990) illustrate the importance of assimilation and transfer of learning for gifted students in their article entitled, “The ‘Extra’ in Extracurricular Activities for Gifted.” They point out that students can gain much from well-designed extracurricular activities because these class-associated extracurricular opportunities provide hands-on learning experiences, develop social relationships and improve student motivation. The available literature regarding
extracurricular academic activities at the high school level indicates that benefit is derived from competition, not only for the identified gifted students, but also for students who are from low-income families or others who are at risk of dropping out of school (Ballard, 1993).

Nine of the 17 academic contests offered by UIL to elementary and middle schools are fine arts contests. According to a four-year study, begun in 1992 by the Partnership for Arts, Culture and Education, Inc., studying painting, music and drama along with other subjects was found to help students do better on standardized tests. The study included six teachers and more than 600 students at Rosemont Elementary School in Oak Cliff, a campus located in the south Dallas area. The study indicated that students tended to do better on tests like the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills after being taught a curriculum that incorporated the fine arts across other disciplines. An example of the implementation of this cross-curricular study was having students learn about nature and insects by painting landscapes and writing stories. Rosemont Elementary participated in UIL Creative Writing, Music Memory, Art, and speech programs during the last two years of this study (Suhler, 1996).

Although statistical data is sparse concerning elementary and middle school participation in academic extracurricular activities, enough high school data exists to provide viable and transferable evidence of these programs' positive impact on
academic progress, personal growth and success of students. The testimonials that follow provide individual case and campus documentation of the benefits of UIL extracurricular academic activities.

Examples of Testimonials Concerning the Impact of Extracurricular Academic Activities on Students

A 1992 report by the Texas Education Agency found that students involved in extracurricular activities were among those less likely to drop out of school. In elaborating on the Texas Education Agency report, *Austin American Statesman* staff writer, Claire Osborn, recorded comments from various teachers and school administrators in the Austin area. Educators noted that as demanding as these out-of-class pursuits can be, participation can lead to improved in-class performance.

"Extracurricular activities teach students discipline, improve their focus and give them a feeling of being connected with their schools" (Osborn, 1995, p. B3).

Osborn further reported that a third-grade teacher in the central Texas area said that generally when students are involved in activities with their peers, they feel good about themselves. Extracurricular academic activities boost self-esteem, and students do better both at home and at school. Likewise, an elementary school principal noted that extracurricular activities build self-confidence and teamwork skills that transfer into the classroom (Osborn, 1995).
There can be no better illustration of the successful schools nurturance characteristics than that revealed in the personal testimonies of UIL academic scholars. Senior students receiving Texas Interscholastic League foundation scholarships were asked to write about their experiences with academic UIL. One student wrote:

Playing with math problems started out as just a way to keep busy. Night by night my knowledge increased. Even though I was pitiful when I started, I stuck to it. Over the years, my inferiority complex disappeared. In fact, I noticed that I had confidence—not an ego, but self-confidence. I became a new person. It is thoroughly shocking how much an activity can change a person, but then again, such a didactic activity as UIL Math is bound to reshape a person’s mind (Leaguer, 1994, p.5).

Another high school senior expressed the impact that participation in UIL academic activities has had on him:

My involvement in UIL academics has changed my perspectives of life and our world. Anyone who has competed in Debate and Extemporaneous Speaking knows that the critical thinking skills and process of evaluating alternate perspectives on issues acquired in these activities opens up a world of exploration for their participants. Likewise, UIL Journalism and Current Issues and Events contests have enabled me to develop my writing technique and have helped me to become a better student and citizen. UIL Academics truly make a world of difference (Leaguer, 1996, p. 4).
Casey believes that implementation of academic intramural competition in Texas high schools has been based on student diversity and that it provides immediate recognition, fun and meaningful prizes to students. Also, participation in UIL academic activity competition provides student motivation through acknowledgment of achievements (Casey, 1989).

Bies further illustrates how extracurricular activity programs are educational tools for life. He points out that academic extracurricular activities do not just reinforce classroom instruction, but they provide practical application, as well as the life skill of working together effectively with those whom one does not necessarily like very well (Bies, 1987).

Hayden (1972) likewise illustrated the significance of extracurricular programs in his documentary, *Children in America's Schools: Savage Inequalities*, based on a book of the same title by Jonathan Kozol. Narrated by Bill Moyers, educators throughout Ohio commented on what works and what does not to encourage success in a school. In addition to adequate funding of facilities, schools that provided a variety of extracurricular activities for their students were more successful. Extracurricular activities were reported to teach students responsibility that carried over into their academic classrooms.

In a response article to statements published by Bill Hobby concerning his belief that the fine arts are "non-substantive" courses, Mollie Tower, writer and
consultant for the UIL Music Memory Contest and Austin Independent School
District Elementary Director of Fine Arts, emphasized the importance of including
the arts in the curriculum. She, along with educators Waggoner and Marstaller, noted
that the “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” mandates that states ensure student
competencies in challenging subject matter, including the arts as an integral segment of
the core academic curriculum. The performing and visual arts, therefore, are curricular
as well as extracurricular. The emphasis on fine arts instruction is aligned with the
objectives and priorities of the academic areas. They note that research data confirms
that participation in fine arts courses enhances student performance in the classroom
and substantially decreases student dropout rates (Waggoner, Tower and Marstaller,
1994).

Arts education also enables students to succeed in the work place and in
their adult lives by developing character traits such as self-discipline, high self-esteem,
the capacity for problem-solving, the ability to work as a team member and effective
communication skills. Most importantly, these educators believe that fine arts
experiences enrich the lives of students by awakening their imagination and
stimulating their creativity. In addition, Tower provided information that indicated
that children who participate in some kind of music program achieve higher SAT
scores than those who do not have some kind of an enriching music program in their
lives (Nelson, 1994).
Actor Richard Dreyfuss commenting on the inclusion of fine arts curriculum (such as UIL. One-Act Play, Art, Music Memory and Creative Writing) to Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, stated that fine arts activities are part of a “complete” education.

It is not only so a student can learn the clarinet or another student can take an acting lesson. It is that for hundreds of years we have known that teaching the arts, along with history and math and biology, helps to create the well-rounded mind that western civilization and America have been grounded on. We need that well-rounded mind now. For it is from creativity and imagination that the solutions to our political and social problems will come (Dreyfuss, 1995, p. 1).

Likewise, a math teacher in an open letter to all UIL math and science participants published in the Texas Math and Science Coaches Association News, said that

every single person can gain tremendous benefits from the UIL program...I have not seen another program all across the world that allows students to develop and practice their skills like UIL does (Sridhara, 1992, p. 3).

A north Texas independent school district superintendent recorded statistics on attendance, failures, discipline problems, and honor roll in his school district and came up with data that strongly favors participation. Over 90 percent of the school district’s students participate in UIL programs. The attendance rate for this participating group was 97.8 percent in 1991-92, while the non-participating group
attendance rate was 89.7 percent. In the participating group of students, 4.5 percent failed one or more subjects for a six-week period, while 65 percent of the non-participating group failed one or more subjects for at least one grade period during the 1991-92 school year. Participating students who spent at least one half day in in-school suspension or received more stringent punishment were only half of one percent; while in the non-participating group, 65 percent of the students had received disciplinary measures of at least a half day of in-school suspension (Owen, 1992).

The superintendent noted that extracurricular programs have continued to come under scrutiny and have often been made the scapegoats for the failure of students in Texas public schools in improving attendance rates, dropout rates, drug usage, and serious discipline problems. He believes that UIL extracurricular programs serve as one of the best tools for solving these problems. He wrote in an article published by the National Federation that extracurricular activities have helped to reduce the drop-out rate in his school, improve the attendance rate, and provide an excellent program for discipline management. This superintendent strongly encouraged other school administrators to advertise their winning statistics brought about by the inclusion of UIL extracurricular programs.

In summary, individual testimonials shed light on the positive impact of UIL academic activities on students from various and specific campuses. In all cases, persons reporting on extracurricular activity participation concluded that benefit was
gained by students. Many implied that enrichment of the entire school experience was achieved through participation. Determining whether similar UIL participating campuses, when viewed together, have experienced comparable and statistically measurable student benefits will provide instrumental data for use in further research on successful school programs.
CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to determine whether elementary and middle school campuses whose students participate in University Interscholastic League academic extracurricular activities perform better on Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) measures of achievement than campuses whose students do not participate. Stratified samples of campuses that participate in University Interscholastic League academic extracurricular activities and those that do not participate were used to determine whether campus achievements were higher according to statistics reported in the Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System data for the school years 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97. To answer portions of the research questions that required a count of participating and non-participating campuses to determine both achievement comparisons and numbers participating, the entire accessible population was used.

Included in this chapter is an explanation of the design and methodology used in this study. The explanation includes characteristics of the targeted and accessible populations, a detailed description of the sampling methodology, a description of the instrument used in the research and a concise description of the data analysis procedures.
Characteristics of the Targeted and Accessible Population

During the 1996-97 school year 2974 (approximately 56%) of the 5341 eligible public elementary school and middle school campuses participated in University Interscholastic League academic activities. In the 1995-96 school year 2588 of the 5055 eligible elementary and middle school campuses participated in University Interscholastic League academic activities. All regular, magnet and charter school campuses are eligible to participate if their feeder high schools have paid campus membership fees to UIL. Alternative school campuses are not eligible to participate. Students in grades two through eight who attend member schools are eligible to participate. For the purpose of this study, only campuses that contain eligible student populations were included, and only campuses that participated in both the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years were included in the participating population.

Academic Excellence Indicator System data for all public school campuses that house Early Education (EE) through grade 6 elementary school students and all public school campuses that house grades 7 and 8 students were supplied by the Texas Education Agency Department of Statistics. The population included any campus that consisted of students in grades 2 through 8, even if that school also consists of other grade levels. Samples for the two categories studied (a. UIL eligible students in grades 2 through 6 and b. UIL eligible students in grades 7 and 8)
consisted of approximately 40 campuses randomly selected to represent the population being studied. Some research hypotheses and questions required data analysis using the entire population. Sample elementary school and middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities and sample elementary school and middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic extracurricular activities were compared to determine success relative to TAAS scores and Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) ratings.

The targeted population included stratified random samples from the entire public school population and are identified as follows:

- All campuses housing grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1995-96 and 1996-97;
- All campuses housing grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students that did not participate in UIL academic activities for more than one year since 1994;
- All campuses housing grades 7 and/or 8 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1995-96 and 1996-97, and
- All campuses housing grades 7 and/or 8 students that did not participate in UIL academic activities for more than one year since 1994.
- Campuses housing grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1995-96 and 1996-97 but did not participate in 1993-94 and 1994-95;
• Campuses housing grades 7 and/or 8 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1995-96 and 1996-97 but did not participate in 1993-94 and 1994-95;

• Campuses housing grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97;

• Campuses housing grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students that did not participate in UIL academic activities in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97;

• Campuses housing grades 7 and/or 8 students that participated in UIL academic activities in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97;

• Campuses housing grades 7 and/or 8 students that did not participate in UIL academic activities in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97;

Sampling Methodology

Using the most current PEIMS data available through the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) reports, the TEA Department of Statistics provided all AEIS reports for Early Education (EE) through grade 12 campuses. The samples come from the 5341 public elementary and middle school campuses that are eligible to participate in University Interscholastic League academic activities, including magnet and charter schools, and excluding designated disciplinary alternative schools.
All campuses were divided into two subgroups:

(1) campuses that participated in UIL academic activities
(2) campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities

Each subgroup was divided into two categories:

(1) campuses that house grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and/or 6 students
(2) campuses that house grades 7 and/or 8 students

Some campuses in the subgroups include combinations of the populations to be studied. In drawing random samples from these combined population groups, only the designated grade levels were used to compute statistics. For hypotheses one and two, which compare overall percent mastery scores for the two subgroups within the two categories during the 1996-97 school year, samples of approximately 40 schools in each subgroup and in each category were stratified randomly by numerical representation.

For hypotheses three and four, only schools with 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population were included in the samples. Overall percent mastery scores for the two subgroups within the two categories were compared using approximately 40 schools in each subgroup and in each category.

For hypotheses five and six, which compare attendance rates for the two subgroups within the two categories, samples of approximately 40 schools in each subgroup and in each category were stratified randomly by numerical representation.
Since only one attendance percentage rate was provided in the database for an individual campus, schools consisting of a combination of elementary and/or middle school populations along with high school grades 9 through 12 reflect the rates of all populations housed on that campus.

For hypotheses seven and eight, samples of approximately 40 schools in each subgroup and in each category were stratified randomly by numerical representation. From the random samples a comparison was made of campus accountability ratings for the two subgroups within the two categories. Additionally, a total number of accountability ratings was computed for all schools to determine percentages of each rating for the participating and the non-participating schools.

Hypotheses nine and ten compare percent mastery TAAS data of schools participating in 1995-96 and 1996-97 with percent mastery TAAS data of the same schools during the two prior years of non participation. For each category a sample of approximately 40 schools that did not participate in 1993-94 and 1994-95 but participated in 1995-96 and 1996-97 was drawn randomly by numerical representation from the stratified population. A like sample of approximately 40 schools that did not participate during the same four-year period was randomly drawn from the stratified population.

Hypotheses eleven and twelve compare percent mastery TAAS data of schools participating in 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97 with percent
mastery TAAS data of schools that did not participate during this four-year period. For each category a sample of approximately 40 schools that did not participate in the school years 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97 and a sample that did participate during each of these four years were drawn randomly by numerical representation from the stratified population.

Sample campuses were further stratified by size into small-size (200 pupils or fewer), mid-size (201-600 pupils) and large-size (601 or more pupils) groups to determine answers to questions one through four regarding the size school that is most likely to participate and the size school that receives the highest accountability rating. For this portion of the study, all participating and non participating schools in the population were included and separate results were determined for each stratified group and subgroup.

Instrument

Data collected by Texas Education Agency through the Academic Excellence Indicator System was used primarily to conduct ex post-facto comparative research on schools competing in UIL academic activities and schools not competing in these activities during the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years. Statistical data derived from AEIS reports from 1993 through 1997 was used for individual case studies of schools that did not compete in 1993-94 and 1994-95, but began competing in the 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years. Additionally, AEIS reports from 1993 through 1997 and
UIL participation data were used to compare samples of schools that competed during this four-year period with those that did not participate during the same period.

Data Analysis

This study required both descriptive and inferential statistics to address the twelve hypotheses and answer the four research questions. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to address each of the twelve hypotheses. A crosstab table was used to numbers and percentages of accountability ratings. To answer questions one through four, a crosstab table was constructed and a count of small-size, mid-size and large-size UIL participating and non-participating schools was tabulated and percentages computed.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

The results of the statistical analyses for research hypotheses one through twelve and questions one through four are presented in this chapter. Additional statistical charts are included for clarification and elaboration on the findings.

Summary of Statistical Procedures

Computer statistical analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The database of all Texas school campuses, which was furnished by the Texas Education Agency Office of Statistics, was first downloaded into an EXCEL database and individual identification numbers assigned to each campus as follows:

0 = campus not participating in UIL academic activities for more than one year in the past four years

2 = campus participating in UIL academic activities in 1995-96 and 1996-97 but not participating in 1993-94 and 1994-95

3 = campus participating in UIL academic activities for three of the four school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97

4 = campus participating in UIL for at least a four-year period beginning in the 1993-94 school year

9 = campus not eligible for this study
Campuses not eligible for this study included all those that housed no students in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8. All grade 9 through 12 campuses that did not house any grade level included in the study were labeled "9." Excluded also were campuses that are listed in the *Texas School Directory*, 1996-97 edition, as alternative or private schools. Although private schools were supposed to be omitted from the TEA database, some were included and were assigned a "9" identification to exclude them from the study. Remaining eligible campuses that had participated in UIL academic activities one or fewer years were assigned an identification number of "0."

This labeling process identified the count of all Texas school campuses as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Identifier</th>
<th>ID Number/Campus Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in UIL, or in UIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>0 = 2935 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years in UIL</td>
<td>2 = 213 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years in UIL</td>
<td>3 = 226 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years in UIL</td>
<td>4 = 1784 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>9 = 1717 campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of campuses</td>
<td>6875 campuses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UIL participating population included a total of 2223 campuses and the non-participating population included a total of 2935 campuses. Only these schools were used in the sampling procedures for the ex post-facto comparative study of Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicators, including percent TAAS mastery for all regular students, percent TAAS mastery for
camps with 40% or greater economically disadvantaged population, attendance rates and accountability ratings.

Determination of participation status was secured through UIL documentation on the "Participation List" published each year in late October. For 1995-96 and 1996-97 school years, campus administrators signed UIL academic participation cards certifying the school's participation (Appendix D). Schools that may have joined the program subsequent to November 1 of each of the four school years (1993-94 through 1996-97) are stratified among the non-participating schools in this study.

The coded EXCEL data was then downloaded into the SPSS database which assigned random numbers to all campuses that made up the stratified population to be considered in the study. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for hypotheses one through twelve to test whether the means of the populations (primarily, participants and non-participants) are significantly different. A random sample of approximately 40 campuses per subgroup were used to conduct the analyses. Because portions of the subgroups overlap in population parameters, these campuses were used in both subgroups and TAAS data drawn for only the subgroup (elementary school or middle school) being compared. For example, an EE-12 campus consists of all grade levels to be compared; therefore, data for grades 2 through 6 was used to address hypotheses for elementary campuses and data for grades 7 and 8 were used to address hypotheses for middle school campuses.

To answer question one through four, parametric and non-parametric measures were employed. A crosstabs table was used to determine the number of campuses in each of three size categories (small, medium and large) for UIL
participating and non-participating schools and percentages were computed for these campuses. Campus accountability ratings were given a numerical value of 1 to 4, 4 representing "exemplary," 3 representing "recognized," 2 representing "acceptable" and 1 representing "low performing," and a crosstabs contingency table was used to determine the number of campuses that received each rating and the population percentages for each accountability rating.

Statistical Responses to the Research Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1**

*The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.*

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73.8333</td>
<td>12.8812</td>
<td>1.9876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72.9696</td>
<td>15.5672</td>
<td>2.2953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variable in hypothesis 1, other than participation versus non-participation, is 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for elementary school
campuses. The means and the standard deviations of TAAS overall percentages of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools and a one-way analysis of variance are presented in Table 1.

The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 42 elementary school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 73.8333. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 46 elementary school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 72.9696. The overall TAAS percentage of mastery mean for UIL elementary schools was not significantly different from the overall TAAS score mean for non-participating elementary schools.

**Hypothesis 2**

*The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.*

The dependent variable in hypothesis 2, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for middle school
The means and the standard deviations of TAAS overall percentage of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools are presented in Table 2.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76.4463</td>
<td>13.6098</td>
<td>2.1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68.1500</td>
<td>19.0016</td>
<td>2.9320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: Significant at the .05 confidence level

The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 41 middle school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 76.4463. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 42 middle school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 68.1500. The overall TAAS percentage of mastery mean for UIL schools is significantly higher than the overall TAAS score mean for non-participating schools at the .05 percent level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis was retained.

### Hypothesis 3

The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities
will be significantly greater than percentage of mastery for similar elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69.0550</td>
<td>14.7741</td>
<td>2.3360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.6150</td>
<td>12.5075</td>
<td>1.9776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variable in hypothesis 3, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population. The means and the standard deviations of TAAS overall percentage of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged populations are presented in Table 3.

The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the group of elementary school campuses consisting of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 69.055. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the group of elementary school campuses consisting of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated for no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 70.615.
The overall TAAS percentage of mastery mean for UIL schools was not significantly different from the overall TAAS score mean for non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 4**

The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for similar middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.1610</td>
<td>16.1185</td>
<td>2.5173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.7026</td>
<td>12.8774</td>
<td>2.0890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variable in hypothesis 4, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population. The means and the standard deviations of TAAS overall percentages of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged populations are presented in Table 4.
The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 41 school campuses consisting of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population that participated in UIL academic activities from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 66.1610. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the random sample of 38 school campuses consisting of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 was 62.7026.

The TAAS percentage of mastery mean for UIL schools was not significantly different from the TAAS percentage of mastery mean for non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 5**

*Attendance rates for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.*

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>96.3981</td>
<td>.7285</td>
<td>.0991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96.5000</td>
<td>.6673</td>
<td>.1018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference
The dependent variable in hypothesis 5, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 attendance rate for elementary school campuses. The means and the standard deviations of attendance rates for UIL participating and non-participating schools are presented in Table 5.

The mean attendance rate for the random sample of 40 elementary school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 96.405. The mean attendance rate for the random sample of 40 elementary school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 96.5125.

The mean attendance rate for UIL participating schools was not significantly different from the attendance rate for non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 6

*Attendance rates for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.*

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95.5913</td>
<td>1.2233</td>
<td>.1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94.7795</td>
<td>2.5473</td>
<td>.3840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference
The dependent variable in hypothesis 6, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 attendance rate for middle school campuses. The means and the standard deviations of attendance rates for UIL participating and non-participating schools are presented in Table 6.

The mean attendance rate for the random sample of 46 middle school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 95.5913. The mean attendance rate for the random sample of 44 elementary school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated for no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 94.7795.

The mean attendance rate for UIL participating schools was not significantly different from the attendance rate for non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 7

*Campus accountability ratings for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for elementary school campuses that do not participate.*

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.5500</td>
<td>.6775</td>
<td>.1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7000</td>
<td>.8533</td>
<td>.1349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference
The dependent variable in hypothesis 7, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 accountability rating for elementary school campuses. In order to provide numerical statistics for computing hypotheses 7 and 8, accountability ratings were given numerical values as follows:

- Low Performing = 1
- Acceptable = 2
- Recognized = 3
- Exemplary = 4

The means and the standard deviations of accountability ratings for UIL participating and non-participating schools are presented in Table 7.

The mean accountability rating for the random sample of 40 elementary school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 2.550. The mean accountability rating for the random sample of 40 elementary school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 2.700. The mean accountability rating for UIL participating schools is not significantly different from the accountability rating for non-participating schools.

Since means of the four accountability ratings in a sample of 40 campuses provide only partial information, table 8 is provided to illustrate the number of campuses that received ratings in each category. Of the 21 total low-performing campuses found in this study, participating schools had 5 campuses fall into this category, while non-participating campuses had 16. While the 5 campuses represented .4 percent of the total participating group, the 16 low performing campuses represented .7 percent of the total non-participating group.
Table 8

TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS FOR PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS COMPARED TO THOSE OF NON-PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Non-Participating</th>
<th>Total by Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Performing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>3766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the "acceptable" category, 816 participating schools received this rating, constituting 58.8 percent of the group. In the non-participating group, 1344 elementary schools received this rating, making up 56.5 percent of this group. A majority of all schools received an acceptable rating.

In the "recognized" category, 434 participating elementary schools received this rating, making up 31.3 percent of this group. In the non-participating elementary school group, 656 schools received a recognized rating, constituting 27.6 percent of the group population.

In the "exemplary" category, 133 participating elementary schools received this rating, making up 9.6 percent of this group. In the non-participating
elementary school group, 362 schools received an acceptable rating, constituting 15.2 percent of the group population.

Participating elementary schools received a slightly lower percentage of low-performance ratings (.4 percent compared to .7 percent for non-participating schools). Combining the recognized and exemplary ratings, participating and non-participating schools had similar percentages of these ratings (42.8 percent and 40.9 percent). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 8**

*Campus accountability ratings for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for middle school campuses that do not participate.*

**Table 9**

**AVERAGE ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS FOR PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS COMPARED TO THOSE OF NON-PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.4878</td>
<td>.6373</td>
<td>.0995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.3077</td>
<td>.5691</td>
<td>.0911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variable in hypothesis 8, other than participation versus non-participation, is the 1996-97 accountability rating for middle school campuses. The means and the standard deviations of accountability ratings for UIL participating and non-participating schools are presented in Table 9.
The mean accountability rating for the random sample of 41 middle school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities for two or more years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 2.4878. The mean accountability rating for the random sample of 39 middle school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities or participated no more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 2.3077. There was no significant difference in the means of the accountability ratings in this sample.

Table 10

TOTAL NUMBER OF ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS FOR PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS COMPARED TO THOSE OF NON-PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Non-Participating</th>
<th>Total by Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Performing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Group</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 illustrates the total number of middle school campuses that received ratings in each category. Of the seven total “low-performing” campuses, the participating group had two campuses receive this rating, while non-
participating campuses had five. The two low-performing campuses represented .3 percent of the total participating group, while the five campuses represented 1.1 percent of the total non-participating group.

In the "acceptable" category, participating middle schools had 536 campuses that received this rating, constituting 67.4 percent of the group population. Non-participating middle schools received 335 acceptable ratings, making up 72.4 percent of this group. A majority of all schools received an acceptable rating.

In the "recognized" category, 204 participating middle schools received this rating, constituting 25.7 percent of that group. In the non-participating middle school group, 75 schools received recognized ratings, constituting 16.2 percent of the group population.

In the "exemplary" category, 53 participating middle schools received this rating, making up 6.7 percent of this group. In the non-participating middle school group, 48 schools received this rating, constituting 10.4 percent of the group population.

Participating middle schools received a slightly lower percentage of low-performance ratings (.3 percent compared to 1.1 percent for non-participating schools). Combining the recognized and exemplary ratings, participating and non-participating middle schools had similar percentages of these ratings (32.4 percent and 26.6 percent). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis 9

The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the two prior years of non participation will be significantly higher than similar non-participating campuses for the same time period.

Table 11

MEAN INCREASES IN TAAS MASTERY FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN UIL FOR A TWO-YEAR PERIOD COMPARED TO THOSE THAT DID NOT PARTICIPATE DURING THIS TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean Increase</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.9715</td>
<td>10.5978</td>
<td>1.6757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.5228</td>
<td>7.4923</td>
<td>1.1846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variables in hypothesis 9, other than participation versus non-participation, are the 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery and 1994-95 percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses. The means and the standard deviations of the differences in TAAS mastery from 1995 to 1997 for random samples of 40 participating and 40 non-participating schools are presented in Table 11.

The mean percentage of difference of TAAS mastery for UIL participating schools after four years in the program is 8.9715 percentage points higher in 1997 than the average mastery for 1995. The mean percentage of difference of TAAS mastery for non-participating schools is 8.5228 percentage
points higher in 1997 than the average mastery for 1995. There is no significant
difference in these improvements in mastering the TAAS. Therefore, the
hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 10**

The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses
after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the two
prior years of non participation will be significantly higher than similar non-
participating campuses for the same time period.

**Table 12**

MEAN INCREASES IN TAAS MASTERY FOR MIDDLE SCHOOLS
PARTICIPATING IN UIL FOR A TWO-YEAR PERIOD COMPARED TO
THOSE THAT DID NOT PARTICIPATE DURING THIS TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean Increase</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.6288</td>
<td>8.4436</td>
<td>1.3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.0840</td>
<td>7.8879</td>
<td>1.2472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variables in hypothesis 10, other than participation versus
non-participation, are the 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery and the 1994-95
percentage of mastery for middle school campuses. The means and the standard
deviations of the differences in TAAS mastery from 1995 to 1997 for random
samples of 40 participating and 40 non-participating middle schools are presented
in Table 12.
The mean percentage of difference of TAAS mastery for UIL participating schools is 14.6288 percentage points higher in 1997 than the average mastery for 1995. The mean percentage of difference of TAAS mastery for non-participating schools is 17.084 percentage points higher in 1997 than the average mastery for 1995. There is no significant difference in these improvements in mastering the TAAS.

**Hypothesis 11**

*Percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year time period.*

**Table 13**

TAAS MASTERY LEVELS FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN UIL FOR A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD COMPARED TO MASTERY LEVELS OF NON-PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS DURING THIS SAME TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.0825</td>
<td>15.0482</td>
<td>2.3793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.8275</td>
<td>14.7181</td>
<td>2.3271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No significant difference

The dependent variables in hypothesis 11, other than participation and non-participation, are 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that have participated in the UIL academic program for the last four years and percentage mastery for like campuses that have not participated for more
than one year in the last four years. The means and the standard deviations of TAAS overall percentage of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools for a four-year period are presented in Table 13.

The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the elementary school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 67.0825. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the elementary school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 70.8275. The overall TAAS percentage of mastery mean for four-year UIL elementary schools is not significantly different from the overall TAAS mastery average for like non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 12

Percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year period.

Table 14

TAAS MASTERY LEVELS FOR MIDDLE SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN UIL FOR A FOUR-YEAR PERIOD COMPARED TO MASTERY LEVELS OF NON-PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS DURING THIS SAME TIME PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70.5650</td>
<td>14.4881</td>
<td>2.2908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72.1950</td>
<td>14.9256</td>
<td>2.3599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: No statistical difference
The dependent variables in hypothesis 12, other than participation versus non-participation, are 1996-97 TAAS percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that have participated in the UIL academic program for the last four years and percentage mastery for middle school campuses that have not participated for more than one year in the last four years. The means and the standard deviations of TAAS percentage of mastery for UIL participating and non-participating schools for a four-year period and a one-way analysis of variance are presented in Table 14.

The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the middle school campuses that participated in UIL academic activities from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 70.565. The mean TAAS percentage of mastery for the middle school campuses that did not participate in UIL academic activities more than one year in the school years from 1993-94 through 1996-97 is 72.195. The TAAS percentage of mastery mean for four-year UIL middle schools is not significantly different from the overall TAAS mastery average for non-participating schools. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Question 1

Are large, mid-size or small-size elementary school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?

Table 15 provides a count of participating and non-participating elementary schools that are classified in this study as small-size, mid-size or large-size, in accordance to similar size patterns established through the Texas Education Agency demographic data published in the Academic Excellence Indicator System.
reports. Percentages that fall into these classifications are represented by the participating groups, the non-participating groups and the whole population.

Table 15

COUNT AND PERCENTAGES OF SMALL-SIZE, MID-SIZE AND LARGE-SIZE PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

LEGEND: A. Count of Schools  B. Percent of Group by School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Up to 200</th>
<th>201-600</th>
<th>601+</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Count</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. % of Group by Size</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Count</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>2382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. % of Group by Size</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>3770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 282 small-size schools, participating elementary schools make up 67.7 percent (191) of this group, compared to 32.3 percent (91) of the non-participating school group. Of the 2134 mid-size schools, participating elementary schools make up 41.5 percent (886) of this group, compared to 58.5 percent (1248) in the non-participating school group. In the large-size category, 23 percent (311) of the elementary schools are participating, while 77 percent (1043) are non-participating schools. Although a larger number of schools are classified as mid-size schools, a larger percentage of the small-size elementary schools participate in
UIL academic activities. Hence, small-size elementary schools are most likely to participate in UIL academic activities.

**Question 2**

*Are large, mid-size or small-size middle school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?*

Of the 233 small-size middle schools, participating schools make up 77.3 percent (180) of the group, while the 53 non-participating middle schools make up 22.7 percent. Of the 411 mid-size middle schools, participating schools make up 74.9 percent (305) of this group, compared to 25.1 percent (103) in the non-participating group.

**Table 16**

COUNT AND PERCENTAGES OF SMALL-SIZE, MID-SIZE AND LARGE-SIZE PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS

**Legend:** A. Count  B. Percent of Group by School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL SIZE</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Non-Participating</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Count</td>
<td>B. % of Group by Size</td>
<td>A. Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to 200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-600</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601+</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>803</td>
<td></td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the large-size school category, 49.8 percent (315) of the middle schools are participating, while 50.2 percent (318) of the middle schools are non-participating. Although a larger number of schools are classified as large-size middle schools, a larger percentage (77.3 percent) of the small-size middle schools participate in UIL academic activities, and mid-size schools have the second largest percentage participating (74.9 percent). Hence, small-size middle schools are most likely to participate in UIL academic activities.

Question 3

Do large, mid-size or small-size elementary schools have the highest accountability rating?

Table 17

ACCOUNTABILITY RATING COMPARISON OF SMALL-SIZE, MID-SIZE AND LARGE-SIZE PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

LEGEND:  A. Count  B. Percent of Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size:</th>
<th>Up to 200</th>
<th>201 - 600</th>
<th>600+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Ratings</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performing</td>
<td>A 2 1.0</td>
<td>B 4 4.6</td>
<td>A 2 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>A 90 47.1</td>
<td>B 33 37.9</td>
<td>A 535 60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>A 73 38.2</td>
<td>B 35 40.2</td>
<td>A 275 31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>A 26 13.6</td>
<td>B 15 17.2</td>
<td>A 74 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>191 100</td>
<td>87 100</td>
<td>886 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 illustrates the number of small-size, mid-size and large-size participating and non-participating elementary school campuses that received low performing, acceptable, recognized or exemplary accountability ratings in the 1996-97 school year. The crosstabs distribution table also provides percentage information about the participating and non-participating groups by size.

For participating elementary schools with up to 200 students, 2 (1 percent) of the 191 small schools received a low performing rating, 90 (47.1 percent) received an acceptable rating, 73 (38.2 percent) received a rating of recognized and 26 (13.6 percent) received an exemplary rating. For non-participating elementary schools with up to 200 students, four (4.6 percent) of the 87 small schools received a low performing rating, 33 (37.9 percent) received an acceptable rating, 35 (40.2 percent) received a rating of recognized and 15 (17.2 percent) received an exemplary rating.

For participating elementary schools with 201 to 600 students, 2 (.2 percent) of the 886 mid-size schools received a rating of low performing, 535 (60.4 percent) received an acceptable rating, 275 (31 percent) received a rating of recognized and 74 (8.4 percent) received a rating of exemplary. For non-participating elementary schools with 201 to 600 students, eight (.6 percent) of the 1248 mid-sized schools received a rating of low performing, 712 (57.1 percent) received an acceptable rating, 346 (27.7 percent) received a rating of recognized and 182 (14.6 percent) received a rating of exemplary.

For participating elementary schools with 600 or more students, one (.3 percent) of the 311 large-size schools received a rating of low performing, 191 (61.4 percent) received an acceptable rating, 86 (27.7 percent) received a rating of recognized and 33 (10.6 percent) received a rating of exemplary. For non-
participating elementary schools with 600 or more students, four (.4 percent) of the 311 large-size schools received a rating of low performing, 599 (57.4 percent) received an acceptable rating, 275 (26.4 percent) received a rating of recognized and 165 (15.8 percent) received a rating of exemplary. The greatest percentage of recognized and exemplary ratings were received by small schools.

Question 4

*Do large, mid-size or small-size middle schools have the highest accountability rating?*

Table 18

ACCOUNTABILITY RATING COMPARISON OF SMALL-SIZED, MID-SIZED AND LARGE-SIZED PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING MIDDLE SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size:</th>
<th>Up to 200</th>
<th>200 - 600</th>
<th>601+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Ratings</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Non-Participating</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performing</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B .6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>A 81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 46.6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognized</td>
<td>A 67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 38.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>A 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 14.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 illustrates the number of small-size, mid-size and large-size participating and non-participating middle school campuses that received low performing, acceptable, recognized or exemplary accountability ratings. The table also provides percentage information about the size group participating and non-participating middle schools.

For participating middle schools with up to 200 students, one (.6 percent) of the 174 small schools received a low performing rating, 81 (46.6 percent) received an acceptable rating, 67 (38.5 percent) received a rating of recognized and 25 (14.4 percent) received an exemplary rating. For non-participating schools with up to 200 students, one (2.4 percent) of the 112 small schools received a low performing rating, 84 (33.3 percent) received an acceptable rating, 14 (33.3 percent) received a rating of recognized and 13 (31 percent) received an exemplary rating.

For participating middle schools with 201 to 600 students, one (.3 percent) of the 306 mid-sized schools received a rating of low performing, 194 (63.4 percent) received an acceptable rating, 98 (32 percent) received a rating of recognized and 13 (4.2 percent) received a rating of exemplary. For non-participating middle schools with 201 to 600 students, none of the 102 mid-size schools received a rating of low performing, 77 (74.8 percent) received an acceptable rating, 23 (23.3 percent) received a rating of recognized and 2 (1.9 percent) received a rating of exemplary.

For participating middle schools with 600 or more students, none of the 311 large-sized schools received a rating of low performing, 261 (82.9 percent) received an acceptable rating, 39 (12.4 percent) received a rating of recognized and 15 (4.8 percent) received a rating of exemplary. For non-participating middle
schools with 600 or more students, four (1.3 percent) of the 318 large-sized schools received a rating of low performing, 244 (76.7 percent) received an acceptable rating, 37 (11.6 percent) received a rating of recognized and 33 (10.4 percent) received a rating of exemplary. The greatest percentage of the recognized and exemplary ratings were received by small schools.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Using the Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) data and University Interscholastic League participation data for the school years 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97, ex post-facto comparative research was done to determine whether elementary and middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic extracurricular activities do better, as indicated in the AEIS reports, than like campuses that do not participate in UIL academic extracurricular activities. All schools in the 1996-97 AEIS database were coded to indicate their participation, non-participation or exclusion from the study.

Excluded from the study were schools that are ineligible to participate in the UIL elementary and middle school program. These included campuses consisting of only high school grades nine through 12; alternative schools, as indicated in the 1996-97 edition of the Texas School Directory, published by the Texas Education Agency; and campuses that included only early education, kindergarten, pre-kindergarten and grade one programs.
Campuses included in the study were regular campuses that housed any grade level between two and eight. The study includes 449 campuses that house some combination of grades nine through twelve, in addition to some combination of grades 2-8. Because 325 of these campuses were participating UIL schools, their inclusion was deemed essential to the statistical findings. The coding process produced a total of 2223 participating and 2935 non-participating campuses.

Random samples of approximately 40 campuses that participate and 40 campuses that do not participate were taken from the stratified population, and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to arrive at statistical data to address descriptively and analytically the following hypotheses and research questions:

Hypotheses

H1. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

H2. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

H3. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for elementary school campuses that consist of 40 percent or
greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for similar elementary school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

H4. The overall Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) percentage of mastery for middle school campuses that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged population and participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly greater than the percentage of mastery for similar middle school campuses that do not participate in UIL academic activities.

H5. Attendance rates for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.

H6. Attendance rates for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than for those campuses that do not participate.

H7. Campus accountability ratings for elementary school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for elementary school campuses that do not participate.

H8. Campus accountability ratings for middle school campuses that participate in UIL academic activities will be significantly higher than ratings for middle school campuses that do not participate.

H9. The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the
two prior years of non participation will be significantly higher than similar non-participating campuses for the same time period.

H10. The increased percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses after two years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to the two prior years of non participation will be significantly higher than similar non-participating campuses for the same time period.

H11. Percentage of TAAS mastery for elementary school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year period.

H12. Percentage of TAAS mastery for middle school campuses will be significantly higher after four years of participation in UIL academic activities compared to like campuses that did not participate during the same four-year period.

Research Questions Answered

Q1. Are large, mid-size or small-size elementary school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?

Q2. Are large, mid-size or small-size middle school campuses more likely to participate in UIL academic activities?

Q3. Do large, mid-size or small-size elementary school campuses have the highest accountability rating?

Q4. Do large, mid-size or small-size middle school campuses have the highest accountability rating?
A review of the literature substantiated the relationship between successful schools and the inclusion of extracurricular academic programs. Researchers noted that effective schools create a positive environment that includes a variety of curricular and extracurricular activities. The value of providing stringent extracurricular activities that extend the curriculum is established in pedagogical research.

Although previous research on specific University Interscholastic League academic participation has been primarily for the high school population, enough data exists to provide viable and transferable evidence of these high school programs' positive impact on academic progress and personal growth of students. Since high school students participate in academic events that advance from district to regional and state competitions, perhaps the notoriety of these events has encouraged more research; whereas, elementary and middle school UIL activities are held only at the district level. Noting the limited high school research, the success of students, especially at the middle school level, can be best paralleled to that of student competitors in high school academic programs.

Testimonials of superintendents, teachers, principals, news writers, fine arts enthusiasts and student participants substantiate the positive impact of UIL academic activities on student progress both academically and socially. According to those who have participated in extracurricular academic and fine arts activities, regardless of the capacity of that participation, the experience has served to enrich the entire school experience.
Findings

Public middle school campuses that participate in University Interscholastic League academic activities were found to achieve a significantly higher TAAS mastery level than that of non-participating middle schools. Elementary participating and non-participating campuses, however, showed no significant difference in overall TAAS mastery levels.

When comparing TAAS mastery levels for participating and non-participating elementary schools with 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged students, no significant difference was found in this sample. Likewise, no significant difference was found in the middle school participating and non-participating campuses with 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged populations.

Samples of both elementary school and middle school campuses indicated no significant difference in the attendance rates for participating and non-participating schools. Separate attendance rates were not provided on the Academic Excellence Indicator System reports for elementary school and middle school students housed on the same campus with high school students, as in the cases of 449 campuses in this study; therefore, attendance rates may reflect those of multiple grade levels not intended to be included in the study.

According to the sample in this study, there was no significant difference in the mean accountability ratings of participating and non-participating elementary
schools. In terms of percentages of campuses receiving ratings in each category, very few differences were found.

The mean accountability rating for UIL participating middle schools was not significantly different from the mean accountability rating for non-participating middle schools. In terms of percentages of campuses receiving ratings in each category, very few differences were found.

No significant difference was found in mean increases in TAAS mastery levels for participating elementary schools after two years of participation, compared to non-participating schools in the same two-year period. Middle schools were also found to have no significant difference in the mean increases in TAAS mastery after two years of participation, compared to middle schools that did not participate during this same two-year period.

Elementary schools that participated for four years in UIL academic activities showed no significant difference in the increase in mastery percentages compared to schools that did not participate. Likewise, after four years of participation in UIL academic activities, TAAS mastery percentages of increase were not significantly higher for middle schools compared to schools that did not participate in the same time period.

Small elementary school campuses and small middle school campuses are most likely to participate in UIL academic activities. Since campuses, not school districts, make up this study, the fact that 449 of the Texas elementary and middle school campuses are multi-level schools, primarily made up of high school grades,
could have some bearing on the size. Some campuses include all grade levels and are counted as one campus in statistical measures. Viewing campus configurations (Appendix E) may better provide insight into size relationships.

The greatest percentage of recognized and exemplary campus ratings were received by small elementary schools. Small-size middle schools also received the highest campus accountability ratings.

Conclusions

This study revealed that middle schools that participate in University Interscholastic League (UIL) academic extracurricular programs perform better on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) than similar schools that do not participate. Elementary schools tend to perform equally as well, whether participating or not participating in UIL academic activities.

UIL participation or non-participation by elementary schools and middle schools does not differentiate between schools on any of the measures used in this study, except that middle schools that participate have significantly higher TAAS scores. This is not to suggest that participation is not worthwhile; rather that the measures used here cannot be relied on to support UIL participation or non-participation. The scope of this study was too broad to measure the actual impact on individual students that participate.

Elementary schools with economically disadvantaged populations tend to master the TAAS tests at approximately the same level for both UIL participating
and non-participating campuses. Likewise, participating middle schools with economically disadvantaged populations tended to master the TAAS tests at about the same level as non-participating campuses. The higher TAAS scores of UIL participating middle schools may reflect socio-economic differences, given that even with the inclusion of all schools with 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged populations, middle schools had a higher rate of mastery. Since achievement has been associated with socio-economics (McCune, 1986), higher achieving schools with higher socio-economic status may be more likely to participate in UIL extracurricular activities.

The similarities in attendance rates for all campuses may be a reflection of the elementary and middle school students' dependence on their parents to take them to school, compared to decreasing parental involvement in the high school grades. Given that 449 schools included in this study consisted of high school populations, attendance rates for the 325 multi-level schools that participated and the 124 schools that did not participate in UIL academic activities may be lower than they would have been had they been considered separately from the high school population.

According to the sample in this study, there was no difference in the mean accountability ratings of participating and non-participating elementary schools and middle schools. In terms of percentages of campuses receiving ratings in each category, very few differences were found. Since approximately two-thirds of the schools in Texas received an acceptable rating (2), averaging the four ratings with this dominant factor produced similar average ratings for all schools.
Elementary schools that participated for four years in UIL activities increased their percentage of TAAS mastery; however, elementary schools that did not compete during the same period of time posted similar increases. Participating and non-participating middle schools, likewise, posted similar increases in the overall campus mastery of TAAS from the 1993-94 to the 1996-97 school year.

Small-size elementary campuses are most likely to participate in elementary UIL academic programs, as are small-size middle school campuses. A larger percentage of the small-size schools participated in the 1996-97 school year than did the mid-size and large-size schools.

Size appears to be a factor in the academic success of both elementary and middle schools, whether participating in UIL academic activities or not. In all research questions concerning size of campus and performance, the small-size school was found to perform better and achieve higher accountability ratings.

Recommendations

Educators, in studying the possibility of participating in UIL academic activities, will want to consider the fact that UIL participating middle schools in this study did perform better on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests. In addition, they may wish to consider a number of other factors, such as individual student ability and interest, that are not covered in this study.

Attention should be given to statistical factors that reveal significantly greater achievement on the state-wide academic skills tests for the UIL participating
middle school population. A majority (63 percent) of all eligible middle schools participate in UIL academic activities, and only 37 percent of all eligible elementary schools participate. Stronger recommendations for participation can be made for middle schools than for elementary schools, since participating and non-participating elementary schools tend to perform equally in all areas.

This study does not discuss other academic extracurricular activities in which some of the more affluent school districts participate. UIL provides one of the least expensive extracurricular academic programs in the state. According to the literature, UIL academic activities have been incorporated successfully into the daily curriculum. This study indicates no negative effect on overall student performance as a result of this implementation. A closer review of some of the different extracurricular programs for elementary and middle school students would be beneficial.

Whole campus data, such as that furnished in this study, does not provide performance information about the actual individual participants in elementary and middle school academic extracurricular activities. In considering participation, school administrators would want to note that participation in UIL academic activities presented no negative impact on the AEIS indicators, and according to the literature, provided very positive conditions for on-going learning. Since the literature in this study provided primarily qualitative information about academic extracurricular participation, more quantitative research is needed on individual UIL academic programs in order to better estimate the statistical benefits to students.
Since small-size campuses tend to perform better as a group, a recommendation could be made to consider placing students in smaller-school environments in order that they may achieve higher levels of success. Since small schools are most likely to participate in UIL academic activities, the added success factor should encourage non-participating small-size school administrators to consider participation in these extracurricular programs.

Recommendations for Additional Research

This study only initiates the research on the impact of extracurricular academic participation on elementary school and middle school populations. Statistical studies for individual participants, separate grade levels and subject areas are needed to more accurately compare results for participating and non-participating schools, especially at the elementary level. For example, studies in mathematics are needed to determine whether elementary and middle school students that participate in UIL Numbers Sense, Calculator Applications and Mathematics contests score higher on the mathematics portion of the TAAS test. Studies are needed concerning mathematical achievement in schools that incorporate these activities into the regular classroom compared to those classrooms that do not combine these activities with other enrichment curriculum.

Some of the research questions that may be answered in the statistical studies include (1) Do students that participate in UIL Creative Writing or Ready Writing achieve higher scores on the writing portion of the TAAS test? (2) Do
campuses that participate in Mathematics and Number Sense achieve higher percentages of mastery on the math portion of the TAAS test? (3) Do campuses that participate in UIL science activities achieve higher percentages of mastery on the science portion of the TAAS test?

Since this study unveiled a significant difference in middle school TAAS mastery for participating schools as a whole, but revealed no significant difference for schools that consist of 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged students, a closer look at all UIL participating and non-participating schools that consist of populations with fewer than 40 percent economically disadvantaged students would be beneficial. Were only these schools to be compared on AEIS indicators, results may reveal more significant differences in TAAS scores and accountability ratings.

Qualitative research is needed to determine a wider range of rationale for competing and not competing. Studies that relate perceptions of educators, parents and students could give testimonial impetus that would add to the statistical data concerning participation. Observations of the morale of students, administrators and teachers on campuses that participate and those that do not could provide qualitative information useful in determining whether participation benefits the whole-school population. Self-esteem measures of competitors and non-competitors would also be beneficial in comparing populations.

Because 325 of 429 campuses that included high school populations were classified as UIL participating campuses, studies of this group only could determine defining factors, such as the actual attendance rate of the elementary or middle school
grade levels. Since this information was not discernible through the Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System database used in this study, actual attendance figures for the specific population could prove helpful in determining whether students tend to come to school when academic extracurricular activities are offered.

Additionally, since accountability campus ratings were given for the entire campus, regardless of configuration, a closer statistical look at specific grade levels would be helpful in finding a relevant rating for use in comparing these populations. Since small-sized campuses are most likely to participate, a closer look at accountability ratings for small school districts would be helpful in presenting a more comprehensive view of the size relationship to academic achievement and the size relationship to UIL participation and non-participation.

Further studies that differentiate on the basis of district size instead of campus size may also provide additional descriptive data about participation. Would TAAS percentage mastery results be the same if computed by district instead of by campus? Would attendance and accountability ratings be similar?

From 1994 through 1997, a major University Interscholastic League focus was on the inclusion of more large-district inner city elementary and middle schools in the academic program. Exclusive studies of the achievements of these schools and other schools with 40 percent or greater economically disadvantaged students that entered the program during this time period would be beneficial in determining a success statistic for the UIL academic program.
Now that private elementary and middle schools, including some charter schools, have a Private Schools Interscholastic Association and participate in many other extracurricular academic activities as well, studies of these schools’ academic achievements should be forthcoming. This study only opens a small gate to research concerning the degree of effectiveness of extracurricular academic activities on student success.
## UIL Elementary and Junior High

### Academic Contest and Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contest</th>
<th>Elementary 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Junior High 6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Team Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculator Applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth and Life Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps, Graphs &amp; Charts</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Oratory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Act Play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storytelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1042: Contests Offered.**

The UIL offers the following contests: calculator, creative writing, dictionary skills, earth and life science, maps, graphs & charts, impromptu speaking, listening, mathematics, modern oratory, music memory, number sense, oral reading, ready writing, spelling, storytelling, and the art contest. By approval of the district executive committee, a division for each grade level may be created in a contest. Contest materials supplied by the League office will be prepared for the grade levels designated in each contest plan, although two grade levels will, in some cases, take the same test. Additional contests may be conducted in elementary and junior high meets if agreeable to the majority of the schools in the district.

Note the contests checked in the last column. Districts may opt to offer the team component of these contests. The scores of the three contestants from each school are added together to determine the school with the top overall score, the school with the second overall score, and the school with the third overall score.
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UIL High School Academic Contests

Accounting
Calculator Applications
Computer Applications
Computer Science
Current Issues and Events
Debate, Cross-Examination
Debate, Lincoln-Douglas
Editorial Writing
Feature Writing
Headline Writing
Informative Speaking
Literary Criticism
Mathematics
News Writing
Number Sense
One-Act Play
Persuasive Speaking
Poetry Interpretation
Prose Interpretation
Ready Writing
Science
Spelling and Vocabulary
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HOW TO USE THE UIL CONSTITUTION AND CONTEST RULES

To use the UIL Constitution and Contest Rules most efficiently and effectively, try the following methods:

(1) TRY THE TABLE OF CONTENTS—the table provides you with an overview of the UIL Constitution and Contest Rules.
(2) TRY THE INDEX—the index provides you with page number by subject matter.
(3) Rules on which Official Interpretations have been issued by the State Executive Committee are cross referenced to Appendix I, which contains the Official Interpretations.
(4) CALL THE UIL—Staff are identified under UIL Administration, and in Appendix III.
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Mathematics Contest Description and Samples from the UIL
A+ Handbook for Academic Activities, pages 43-46
The mathematics contest for grade levels 6, 7, and 8 is comprised of 50 problems similar to those found in current state-adopted textbooks for those grade levels, plus problems found in Algebra I. Generally speaking, any topic covered in the state approved texts is allowable on the contest. Approximately 25 percent of the contest will contain algebra problems.

The rest of the contest will contain problems covering, but not limited to, numeration systems, arithmetic operations involving whole numbers, integers, fractions, decimals, exponents, order of operations, probability, statistics, number theory, simple interest, measurements (English and metric), and conversions normally covered (feet to inches, quarts to gallons, etc.) at these grade levels. There will also be geometry problems normally covered in the middle school student's text, including applications of the Pythagorean theorem. Normal geometry problems will include finding area and volume of polygons/polyhedra and circles/spheres.

The various types of problems will be randomly distributed so be sure to have students check all the problems. A simple arithmetic problem could be the last problem.

Finally, please note that this contest is 30 minutes long and that calculators will not be allowed on this contest.

Sample Mathematics Problems Below

1. What is 26% of 300?
   A) 52  B) 78  C) 156  D) 326  E) Not Given

2. If the area of a square is 121, then its perimeter is what?
   A) 49  B) 52  C) 44  D) 36  E) Not Given

3. Linda recorded the number of miles she ran each week. Use the following data to find the average number of miles she ran per week: 14, 13, 12, 10, 15, 14, 9, 14, 8, 12
   A) 11.8  B) 12.4  C) 12.1  D) 13  E) Not Given

4. Find the slope of the line containing the following pair of points: (7,3) and (5,4)
   A) 2  B) -2  C) 1/2  D) -1/2  E) Not Given

5. Find the distance between (4,1) and (1,5) on a coordinate plane.
   A) 5  B) 3  C) 6  D) 4  E) Not Given

6. Find the units digit of $4^5$
   A) 0  B) 2  C) 3  D) 6  E) Not Given

7. Two peaches and one pear cost $1.15. Three peaches and three pears cost $2.40. What is the cost of one peach?
   A) $0.35  B) $0.45  C) $0.27  D) $0.55  E) Not Given
8. If two line segments intersect as shown, then \( a^\circ + b^\circ = ?^\circ \)
   
   A) 80   B) 100   C) 150   D) 180   E) Not Given

9. Solve the following equation:
   
   A) 12   B) 8   C) 32   D) 60   E) Not Given

10. 36 has how many positive prime divisors?
    
   A) 1   B) 2   C) 3   D) 4   E) Not Given

11. \((-3) \times (-4) = \)
    
   A) -12   B) 12   C) -7   D) 7   E) Not Given

12. Ben practices piano for three hours three times a week. On Fridays he practices for two hours. He practices for one hour on other days. How many hours does he practice per week?
    
   A) 14   B) 13   C) 12   D) 10   E) Not Given

Answers

1. B   7. A
2. C   8. B
3. C   9. C
5. A   11. B
6. E (4)   12. A

Selected Solutions

1. \( .26 \times 300 = 78 \)
4. \( m = \)
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MATHEMATICS
INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CONTEST DIRECTOR

The following guidelines include and expand upon information found in the Constitution and Contest Rules.

BEFORE THE MEET

Room.
Secure a room of adequate size for the number of contestants expected and chairs and desks or tables of proper height. Auditorium seating or fold-up desk tops are not recommended.

Contestants.
Three students in grades 6, 7 and 8 from each school may enter the Mathematics Contest. If the district has elected to score the contest using the team option, the total scores of the three team members from each school constitute the team score. A district may also elect to have individual grade-level teams. A school must have three participants to compete in the team competition.

Materials and Equipment.
1. The contest packet which contains the tests and answer keys.
2. A copy of the current Constitution and Contest Rules or a copy of the rules for this contest.
3. The contest roster may be filled out with contestants' names from entry forms prior to the contest.
4. Red markers or pens for grading.
5. An accurate clock or stopwatch.
6. Pencil sharpener for use by contestants.
7. The contest director should provide contestants with blank scratch paper.

Personnel.
1. Contest Director. The contest director may be a coach of contestants in the contest.
2. Assistant. A person, who may be a coach, may be appointed to assist the contest director.
3. Judges. At least three competent graders, who may be coaches of the contestants, should be selected by the contest director or district director. Be sure each is familiar with contest rules as stated in the Constitution and understands the guidelines for scoring.

CONDUCTING THE CONTEST
1. Check Tests. In the presence of coaches, open the test envelope. Check tests for errors or omissions.
2. Clear Room. Contestants and coaches should be informed of the time and place of the verification period. Coaches and parties other than the contest officials and contestants should then leave the room.
3. Number Contestants. Instruct contestants to place assigned number in the upper right hand corner of the test.
4. Distribute Tests. Instruct contestants not to open the test until the signal has been given to begin. Answers must be on answer sheet to be counted.
5. Stop Signal. After the stop signal has been given, contestants should be directed to place their pencils down, and all tests, answer sheets, and scratch paper should be collected.

GRADING THE PAPERS
1. Briefing Graders. Brief graders on the procedure to be used for grading.
2. Scoring. Award five points for each problem solved correctly. Deduct two points for problems incorrectly solved. There is no deduction for problems skipped.
3. Ranking. Rank tests from highest to lowest scores. Places shall be determined and recognized through sixth place in each division.
4. Ties. If two papers have the same score, then a tie exists. If a tie exists for first place, there is no second place. If a tie exists for second place, there is no third, etc.
5. Team Score. The sum of the three contestants' scores from a school constitutes the team score. The team with the highest score shall be named top team; the team with the second highest score shall be named second place team; and the team with the third highest score shall be named the third place team and be awarded points according to the point table provided in the appendix.
6. Points. Points are awarded through sixth place in the individual competition and through third place in the team competition. Tied contestants or teams split the total points equally for the two or more places in which a tie exists. Points are awarded according to Section 1042 (see page 104 for a table of points).
ANNOUNCING THE WINNERS AND RETURNING PAPERS

1. Verification Period. Contestants and coaches shall be allowed a time not to exceed 15 minutes to examine their own tests and answer keys before the official results are announced. If errors are found, either in the grading or recording of scores, these should be reported to the contest director at this time. The contest director is authorized to make a change on the key before the results are announced.

2. Official Results. Once the verification period has expired and all test papers are collected by the contest director, official results shall be announced. Official results, once announced, shall be final.

3. Places. Places shall be determined and recognized through sixth place in each division in the individual contest and through third place in the team contest.

4. Points. Points shall be awarded through sixth place for the individual contest, and if the district has elected to participate in the team component, points shall be awarded through third place according to Section 1042 (see page 104 for a table of points).

5. Report to district director. Give the list of winners and their schools and the number of contestants participating to the district director immediately after the contest. Furnish the district director with any pertinent comments or suggestions for improving the contest.

6. Returning the Tests and Answer Sheets. Contestants’ tests and answer keys should be mailed to their schools after May 1.

Check your district contest packet. You should receive

1. Tests
2. Answer Keys
3. Contest Roster

Return tests, keys, and any other applicable contest materials to participating schools after May 1.
APPENDIX C

Texas Education Agency Academic Excellence Indicator System
1995-96 Campus Performance Sample
## Texas Education Agency
### Academic Excellence Indicator System
#### 1995-96 Campus Performance
#### Accountability Rating: Recognized

**Section 1 - Page 1**

**Total Enrollment:** 365

**Grade Span:** KG - 04

**School Type:** Elementary

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAAS % Passing Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1995</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 1995</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tests 1995</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TAAS % Passing Sum of 3-8 & 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading 1996 | 80.4% | 84.3% | 87.5% | 80.7% | 84.1% | 100.0% | 85.5% | - | - | 88.8% | 88.8% | 100.0% | 80.0% |
| Writing 1996 | 82.6% | 87.8% | 88.1% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Math 1996 | 83.4% | 87.0% | 84.1% | 84.5% | 92.1% | 100.0% | 94.3% | - | * | 83.0% | 81.5% | 100.0% | 80.0% |
| All Tests 1996 | 67.1% | 70.1% | 80.7% | 84.1% | 73.3% | 100.0% | 85.5% | - | * | 78.6% | 88.8% | 40.0% | 28.5% |

| TAAS % Exempted Sum of 3-8 & 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reading LEP 96 | 3.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | * | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Sp. Ed. (ARD) 96 | 6.3% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 3.0% | 15.3% | * | 0.0% | - | - | 3.8% | 2.1% | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| Writing LEP 96 | 4.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | * | - | - | - | * | - | 0.0% | 7.4% | 23.0% | 69.8% |
| Sp. Ed. (ARD) 96 | 6.3% | 5.0% | 5.0% | * | - | - | - | * | - | 0.0% | 7.4% | 23.0% | 69.8% |
| Math LEP 96 | 3.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | * | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Sp. Ed. (ARD) 96 | 5.9% | 4.8% | 5.7% | 5.3% | 0.0% | - | 0.0% | - | - | 0.0% | 2.1% | 11.1% | 8.8% |

---

Students taking Spanish TAAS were LEP-exempt in 95, but not in 96, therefore 95 LEP data are not comparable and are not shown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator:</th>
<th>% Attendance</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Campus Group</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian/Pac.Is.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Econ. Disadv.</th>
<th>Special Educ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994/95</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/94</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.0%</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C-3

**Texas Education Agency**  
**Academic Excellence Indicator System**  
**1995-96 Campus Profile**

**Section II - Page 1**

**Total Enrollment:** 355  
**Grade Span:** KG - 04  
**School Type:** Elementary

---

#### STUDENT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Campus Group</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21,743</td>
<td>10,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,740,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students By Grade:**

- **Early Childhood Education:**
  - Pre-Kindergarten: 0 (0.0%)
  - Kindergarten: 104 (29.3%)
- **Grades 1-6:**
  - Grade 1: 104 (29.3%)
  - Grade 2: 102 (28.7%)
  - Grade 3: 107 (30.1%)
  - Grade 4: 4 (1.1%)
  - Grade 5: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 6: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 7: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 8: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 9: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 10: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 11: 0 (0.0%)
  - Grade 12: 0 (0.0%)

**Ethnic Distribution:**

- **African American (a):** 65 (18.3%)
- **Hispanic (a):** 25 (7.0%)
- **White (a):** 258 (72.7%)
- **Asian/Pacific Islander:** 5 (1.4%)
- **Native American:** 2 (0.6%)

**Mobility (1994-95):**

- **Economically Disadvantaged (a):** 48 (13.5%)

**Retention Rates by Grade:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Campus Group</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Indicates this variable was used to assign campuses to demographic groups.
APPENDIX D

UIL Participation Card Sample
SAMPLE

UIL Academic Participation Card
Elementary, Middle and Junior High School

Baytown Zip
1996-97 Campaign
Elementary, Middle and Junior High School

Name of School:
Henry Junior

School Mailing Address:
1919 E. Archer Rd.

Area Code/Telephone:
713/420-4590

School Name:

Principal's Name:

UIL Coordinator's Name:

Circle Grades in Your School:

Approximate Enrollment of Your Campus:

Signature/Title:

PLEASE RETURN BY OCTOBER 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Span</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>UIL (recoded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 03</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 05</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 - 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 05</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 - 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 04</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 09</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 - 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 06</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 07</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 - 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 06</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 - 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 08</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 - 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 08</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Public Schools</td>
<td>UIL (recoded)</td>
<td>Not in program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Span</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 - 12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - 08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - 09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 - 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 - 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 02</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 03</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 04</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 05</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - EE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - KG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - PK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 04</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 05</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 06</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 09</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG - KG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 02</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 04</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 05</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 06</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - KG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK - PK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td>2223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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