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Presentation

• Background information about the HKSCS staff and parent surveys
  – Development and content
  – Administration procedures

• Level of participation (response rates)

• Strategies for improving participation
Takeaway Messages

• Encouraging and enabling participation absolutely essential to obtain representative, useful data
• Staff participation more challenging than student
• Parent participation more challenging than staff
• There are pros and cons to online surveying of parents and staff — best approach to make both available

What can you do?
Encouraging Participation Essential

• Though voluntary, high participation is needed to ensure data is representative and of value for program decision making.
  • Higher the better to have confidence in data value
  • Minimum 60% response rates; 80% preferred
  • National SSHS suggests c. 70% for staff when tied to program funding
• Lower response rate doesn’t mean the data not valuable — but representativeness uncertain
Overview to the HKSCS

• Three comparable instruments:
  – Student, elementary (grade 5), middle, high school (since 1999)
  – Staff, K-12 (since 2004)
  – Parent, K-12 (since 2010)
• Customize with added questions.
  – Not just surveys but a data collection system
• Online and paper versions
  – Students/staff separate scannable answer sheets
  – Parent scannable (OMR) booklet
• Developed under funding from the California Dept of Ed
The HKSCS In California

• Comprises the California School Climate Health and Learning Survey System (Cal-SCHLS).
  – AKA California Healthy Kids Survey

• The largest effort in the nation to provide schools/communities statewide with local data from students, staff, and parents to:
  – Identify and meet the needs of students and promote academic achievement, positive development, and well-being.
  – Improve school climates, teacher satisfaction and retention, and parent involvement

• Identified as a model by ED (Successful, Safe, & Healthy Students)
The HKSCS In California

• Biennial administration of student and staff required by CDE 2003-2011 in compliance with NCLB Title IV.
  – 850 districts, 7K schools, 1M students, 100K staff
  – Results reported at district, county and state levels. Publicly posted.
  – 60% of districts request school-level student reports
  – Datasets available for analysis

• Parent survey new and voluntary (additional cost)

• All three surveys required of S3 participants
Cal-SCHLS Services Provided

• Survey instruments, detailed administration guidebooks, webinars, and instructions
• Phone consultation in survey planning and administration
• Data processing and reporting
  • District, county, and state
• Data Use Guidebook
• Data *Workbook to Improve School Climate and Close the Achievement Gap*
• Online access to student data (Query CHKS)
Cal-SCHLS District Responsibilities

• Administer surveys ($0.30/student fee covers both student and staff surveys)
• District coordination and survey scheduling
• Distribute survey instructions and materials provided
• Train proctors & ensure student/staff administered in environment that ensures confidentiality
• Encourage participation
• Monitor completion
• Return paper answer sheets for processing
Other Major Users

• Safe Schools Healthy Students Grantees, nationally
  – Staff: 2,500 per year since 2006
  – Partnership with National Evaluation Team

• Building Capacity in Military-Connected Schools Consortium
  – 148 schools (K-12) in southern California annually, 2011-2015
  – Student, staff, and parent
  – Developed special modules to better assess needs of schools serving students in families in the military.

• School Turn-around Center, WestEd
  – Staff, parent

• West Virginia S3
  – 48 schools: student, staff, parent
The Staff Survey
Development Goals

• Keep it simple — low burden on schools
• Keep it short — not time consuming
• Make it meaningful to staff and school mission
  – Districts required to administer but staff participation voluntary
  – Assess factors key to successful learning, school improvement, and teacher satisfaction/retention

• Focus on environment
Development Goals

• Comparison data to student results
  – How do staff perceptions compare to student report?

• Type and level of student learning supports
  – Services, and practices related to student physical & mental health, safety, risk behaviors, and positive development
  – Link health/prevention programs to curriculum & instruction
Survey Content

• Instrument divided into three sections targeting different groups to reduce completion time
  – General Core
    • All staff
  – Learning Supports Module
    • Health, safety, prevention, and counseling staff
  – Special Education Supports Module
    • Staff with responsibilities for students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs).
Core Module Content (43 items/All Staff)

- Academic priorities, norms & standards
- Student motivation & readiness to learn
- Relationships: student/staff & intra-staff (collegiality)
- Staff supports, participation & professional development needs
- Student & staff safety
- Impact of student behaviors, mental health, & discipline
- Equity
- Communication & enforcement of rules/policies
- Parent involvement
## Scales & Reliability (Natl SSHS Eval)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive learning and working environment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale: Staff/Student Relationships</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale: Student Learning-Facilitative Behaviors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale: School-level Norms and Standards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and student safety</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale: Problems w/student violent behaviors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale: Perception of school as safe place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, consistent communication/enforce of policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived problems w/ ATOD Use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Supports Module (22 items)*

- Discipline, safety, and crisis management
- Youth development, character ed, mental and physical health services & programs
- Violence and harassment prevention programs
- Substance use prevention/intervention efforts
- School-community collaboration

*for staff in health, prevention, safety, counseling
Special Education Supports Module (21 items)*

Provides data to better understand issues involving:

Meeting the needs of students with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) — Expectations and supports

Personnel supports

Recruiting and retaining special education teachers

Programmatic barriers and supports, especially for collaboration between special and general education

Reports disaggregate results by special ed status

*For staff who have responsibilities for teaching or providing related support services to students with Individualized Education Programs
Administration in CA

- Districts *required* to administer in same schools/time as student survey
- All teachers, administrators, other certificated and certified staff, k-12
  - Staff who work across schools can fill out one for each school
- Voluntary and anonymous
- Online or paper (few)
- No fees for basic online survey.
  - Covered by $.30 per student fee schools pay for student survey.
- Fees to process paper surveys, customization (e.g., adding questions), and special reports/analyses
Online Administration

• For simplicity, single login & password per school
• School distributes 1-page master letter *for each school* containing instructions for filling out survey online and emphasizing its importance.
• 30-day survey window
• Online tracking of completion rates
  – Re-encourage higher participation if needed
• Online report of results in real time
Welcome to the California School Climate Survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate. We value your feedback.

Please login by using the login and password provided by your district CHKS coordinator and clicking the login button. Questions about the survey may be answered at the Frequently Asked Questions web page.

If you have other questions about the survey, please contact your district CHKS coordinator.

If you have problems accessing or completing the survey, contact the CHKS Regional Service Center.
Sample Page from the Online Survey

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about this school. If the question is not applicable to your job, and you could not know enough to answer it, mark “Not Applicable.”

This school ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. is a supportive and inviting place for students to learn.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. sets high standards for academic performance for all students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. promotes academic success for all students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. emphasizes helping students academically when they need it.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. provides adequate counseling and support services for students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. emphasizes teaching lessons in ways relevant to students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. is a supportive and inviting place for staff to work.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. promotes trust and collegiality among staff.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. provides the materials, resources, and training (professional development) needed to do your job effectively.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. provides the materials, resources, and training (professional development) needed to work with special education (IEP) students.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. encourages opportunities for students to decide things like class activities or rules.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. gives all students equal opportunity to participate in classroom discussions or activities.</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Online Report Page.

Results generated at the school, district, county, and state level, depending on a person’s access.

District and higher level by school configuration (Elem, MS, HS, Alt)

Paper reports: Tables organized by topic linked to Survey Content Guide
# Districts

**ABC Unified (1954212)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California School Climate Survey October 2008 and Later</th>
<th>Reports: All Schools Elem</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Non-Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Schools With Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Started</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha Elementary (6010862)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia High (1930361)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg Elementary (6071369)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente Middle (606706)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centros Elementary (6068234)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centros High (1930059)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott (William F.) Elementary (6010987)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gahr (Richard) High (1092145)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales (Joe A.) Elementary (6008017)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskett (Earl F.) Middle (6061220)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Elementary (6010920)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juarez (Renato) Elementary (6071361)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee (Frank C.) Elementary (6066609)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne (Bill P.) Elementary (6010912)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niemers (John H.) Elementary (6010948)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon (Patricia) Elementary (6009464)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palma Elementary (6010901)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross (Wayne) Middle (6057442)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowers (Cecil B.) Elementary (6056716)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablaff (Martin B.) Middle (6057450)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitney (Sherman) High (1951880)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Elementary (6010995)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittmann (Helen) Elementary (6099447)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Online Response Rate History CA

• Fewer schools do staff than students survey, despite required
  - 5,500 vs. 6,500
• Mean RR 50%
  • 35% of schools above 60%
  • 48% below 40%
• High schools: Mean 5 points lower then elementary
  - 25% above 60% RR vs. 38% elementary
• Wide RR variation across schools
  - Some survey more staff than expected
  - Some blow off
    – Range <1% to 100% plus
    – Consistent since 2005
Staff Online Response Rate History CA

• Variation within 159 districts with multiple high schools:
  - 26% all high schools RR <40% and 18% all high school RR >60%
    - District effect (44% low variation)
  - Almost half of those with one RR >60% (n=81) had one high school <40%
    - School effect

• Outreach to superintendents and principals both important
SSHS Staff Online Response Rates

• National Evaluation
  – Grant median RR 75% (range 5% to 100%+)
  – School median RR 81% (range 1% to 100%+)
  – Not all schools comply
  – Improvement over time

• SSHS California
  – Mean RR 14 points higher than state average (64%)
  – Range 65% for elementary to 60% high schools, with 72% for alternative schools
Why RR Better for SSHS?

• Tied to grant funding

• Monitoring by National Evaluation Team
  – Weekly online monitoring
  – Onsite visits if needed
  – Federal monitor intervention

• S3 might expect similar online rate of 70% with similar monitoring
  – CA requiring 60% school RR for S3 funding eligibility
Paper Administration

• Many schools get higher staff response than online
  – Don’t assume all schools have an infrastructure to support online staff survey.
  – Easier to do at once at staff meeting
    • Issue of how “voluntary”

• Several S3 districts in CA switching to paper to meet the requirement of minimum 60% RR for funding.
The LAUSD Teacher Survey

• 29% RR for online confidential survey using teacher number to access
• 64% RR for paper/online option anonymous
  – Only 1% selected online
• Conclusion: RR improvement likely due to both switching to paper and removing anonymity concerns as issue
The Parent Survey
Features

• Newest survey, just beginning
• Shortest (34 questions)
• Voluntary and anonymous for parents (one per school)
• Online and/or paper
  – Same online instructions as with staff survey
  – Paper 1-page Optical Mark Recognition booklet
  – Survey staff combine data into one file if both used
• Translated into 26 languages
  – Reach 99% of California parents and caregivers
  – Online and OMR instruments now only English and Spanish
  • Other OMR in process
Users

• California: Required of Cal S3; voluntary for others (extra cost)
• West Virginia S3
• Military-Connected School Consortium
Content Goals

• Comparability with student and staff data
• Level school outreach to and involvement of parents
• Parent perceptions of learning environment and school supports for students.
• Information parents would want to give and likely to know
Content

- School welcoming/informative to parents
- Parental involvement in education of children
- Students cared for and treated fairly, respectfully
- Equity of opportunities, regardless of race or ethnicity
- Students held in high expectations
- Problems at school from student behavior (AOD use, violence, bullying, truancy, etc.)
- Clarity and equity of discipline
- Perceived school safety
## Parent Survey Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of parental involvement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Supports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive student learning environment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for meaningful participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural sensitivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline and Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and equity of discipline policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived school safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of Learning-Related Student Behaviors</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

A Information from single-item measures not shown.

**Source:** Data from 102 parents who completed the parent school climate survey during the 2010/11 school year.
Parent Participation

• Even bigger problem than staff
• Average RR of district-sponsored surveys about 30% using paper surveys:
  – Miami-Dade: 48%; New York City: 45% — with heavy PR investment
  – Chicago: 39%
  – LAUSD, Wake County NC, Jefferson County KY, Austin TX: 22%-28%
  – Philadelphia, New Hampshire: 13%-16%
LAUSD Parent Survey

• Did district mail-out paper survey with return mail envelop. 28% RR overall; 16% high school.
  – With lots to PR

• Now having schools send out themselves via students
  – School monitoring
  – Some giving incentives (e.g., raffle ticket for returning)
    • Same technique effective for parental consent return
Online Rates Negligible

• Chicago 20%
• LAUSD, when given option <1%
• WestEd School Turnaround Center surveys for schools: few used online option
• Needier schools, less likely
  – 25% of parents in LAUSD inner-city high school had no Internet access or working computer.
Implications

• Need to rely primarily on paper surveys but offer online as an option.
  – Maximize options to maximize participation
Improving Participation
Encouraging Participation: What to Stress

• Value and need of data for school community
  – Identifying and addressing the needs of students and school conditions that are barriers to learning and overall well-being,
  – Improving teaching conditions and parent involvement
  – Improving school attendance, academic performance, and graduation.
  – Staff: Improving school, teacher supports
  – Parents: raising academic achievement and improving student services

• The opportunity for staff/parents to communicate confidentially their perceptions of school

• Your desire to hear staff/parent voice and intent to act on it. Describe plans for using data.
What to Stress

• Emphasize the positive.
  – Survey designed not to point blame or just identify problems but also assess strengths on which to build.

• Convey confidence that you will be using their input — It’s worth their while to do the surveys.
What to Do

• Overtime, demonstrate data being used.
  – disseminate results,
  – Show pay attention to staff/parent voice,
  – take steps to meet identified needs (e.g., staff professional development)
What Else Makes a Difference?

- District/school leadership (*superintendent*, principal)
- Advance notification
- Conduct surveys around same time to generate enthusiasm throughout school community and more efficiently raise awareness
- Allay concerns over confidentiality
- Make it convenient to file out and return
  - Give many options, including both online and paper
- Online: Monitor real-time response rates and increase outreach if needed.
Survey Of Staff Participation Strategies

Twenty districts with high staff survey response rates were contacted for input on their successful administrations. Top four common responses:

- Provide staff time during an all staff meeting
- Give principal ample time to prepare staff
- Provide information about the survey in a school newsletter
- Gain principal support and “buy-in”
Parent Participation

• Stress survey convenience, simplicity, and brevity

• Make it easy to do
  – Rely most on print surveys but provide online option
  – Provide access to school
  – Give time to complete paper surveys at “back to school night,” PTA or at public meetings

• Publicize using many venues
  – Newsletters sent home
  – Parent meetings (PTA)
  – Signs at school
  – School events

• Have ALL staff support and encourage participation
Parent Participation

• Mail surveys and returns don’t necessarily improve participation.
  – Send parent survey home with student survey consent so they can see connections.
  – Make it easy to return (e.g., drop-off box at school)
  – Provide incentive for return (e.g., each student gets a raffle ticket for school supplies)

• Follow-up to encourage completion: mail, newsletters, notes home, signs at school.
Obtaining Support

• First step: Raise awareness
• District superintendent
  – meet early
  – Review survey content, purpose, goals, and value
  – ask for advice and support
  – establish protocol and timeline for updating superintendent
Obtaining Support

• Principals and teachers
  – send out letters and informational packets to principals and teachers
  – set up meetings with principals and request that they communicate importance of the survey to staff and parents
  – inform staff/parents well in advance
  – place article in school newspaper
  – allocate time at staff and PTA meetings
Survey Administration

• In Year 1, administer all three HKSCS in 300 high schools in 60 districts.

• Student and staff online or paper.

• Parent online and/or paper.

• Minimum 60% response rate for staff and students for funding eligibility.
  – Based on feasibility given existing response rate data
  – Minimum to ensure representative

• No RR requirement for parents.
Considerations and Strategies for Family and Staff Surveys

Workshop Session 4: Measurement
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools
School Climate Technical Assistance Symposium
New Orleans, LA March 11, 2011

Eric Hirsch, Chief External Affairs Officer
when we focus on teachers
our students succeed
From instructional mentoring to school working conditions, our focus is on new teachers.
NTC Documenting Teaching Conditions Across the Country

Since 2008, we have heard from over 500,000 educators (and counting) working in 12 states and 9 districts

- NTC has produced more than 10,700 school-level data reports over the past 3 years
- Clients in 2008-2011 include Alabama, Colorado, Fairfax County (Va.), Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Vermont, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee
- NTC also received a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation as part of the foundation’s Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project where the survey was administered in select schools and districts across the country including Pittsburgh, Memphis, etc.
NTC Core Teaching Conditions Constructs

- Time
- Facilities and Resources
- Community Engagement and Support
- Managing Student Conduct
- Teacher Leadership
- School Leadership
- Professional Development
- Instructional Practices and Supports
- New Teacher Support
Teaching Conditions Constructs: The Need for Survey Data to Inform Systems

- A recent report by the Northeast Regional Lab identified 77 indicies of teacher working conditions in 11 different areas and looked at available data in Massachusetts, Vermont and Rhode Island (Lord, Cohen, Schwinden, 2009)
  - In MA – 60 out of 77 indicators with data: 44 of them through Mass TELLS Survey with coverage increased from 35% of indicators to 57% with survey data alone
  - In VT – 54 out 77 indicators with data: 41 from Vermont TLC Survey with coverage increased from 29% to 53%
  - Workload, collegiality, instructional support, scope of decision making and career growth almost exclusively from survey data
Keys to Statewide Survey Success

1. Valid and reliable survey instrument that can provide information that can be interpreted and utilized at multiple levels

2. Coalition of diverse stakeholders and policy makers who will help communicate the importance of the survey to their constituents

3. Clear understanding of the purpose of the survey and how the results will be disseminated and used (and how they should not be used)

4. Efficient and effective survey dissemination system and assistance during implementation
Assumptions Influencing Design of the NTC Approach to Assessing Conditions

• The survey must be anonymous
• Teaching conditions are about schools, not individuals
• Some method of survey security is necessary to ensure educators take the survey once
• Email is not a viable way to reach educators to access the survey and paper surveys are inefficient
• Results for schools with sufficient response should be shared with educators
Web Portal and Communications Tools

- Survey portal with school driven access codes disseminated to point of contact
- Coalition MOU
- Webinars/FAQs to raise awareness
- Real time response rates
- Help desk via IM, email and phone
- The results by school, LEA, state including full results, summary with excel download
- Reports, tools guides, etc.
- Additional resources and opportunities
## Detailed Report for Schools with Sufficient Response Rates

### 2010 North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey Detailed Results

North Carolina (88.81% responded)
District: Alexander County Schools (95.48% responded)
School: Sugar Loaf Elem (100.00% responded)

### Time

**Q2.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Sugar Loaf Elem (n=20, dk=0)</th>
<th>Alexander County Schools (n=373, dk=3)</th>
<th>North Carolina (n=104420, dk=903)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers have the time available to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 20%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 6%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 5%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 4%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions.</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 20%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 6%</td>
<td>![Bar Chart] 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary and Longitudinal Results for Schools to Download

### Summary Results

2010 North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey Summary Results

North Carolina (88.81% responded)
District: Alexander County Schools (95.10% responded)
School Level: NC Elementary Schools (91.28% responded)
School: Sugar Loaf Elem (100.00% responded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Loaf Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about the use of time in your school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Class sizes are reasonable such that teachers have the time available to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Teachers have time available to collaborate with colleagues.</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Teachers are allowed to focus on educating students with minimal interruptions.</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. The non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Efforts are made to minimize the amount of routine paperwork teachers are required to do.</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Teachers have sufficient instructional time to meet the needs of all students.</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facilities and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities and Resources</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sugar Loaf Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1</td>
<td>Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your school facilities and resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials.</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Teachers have access to reliable communication technology, including phones, faxes and email.</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copiers, faxes, prints, etc.</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gathering Data on Teaching and Learning Conditions: Challenges

• Survey audience – knowledge of the conditions assessed
• Survey design – validity, reliability, length, customization, unit of analysis, etc.
• Limitations on what can and should be asked – knowledge of respondents, language, appropriateness, politics, etc.
• Survey implementation – when to administer, anonymity, to whom
• Response rate – getting full participation, response bias/survey error depending on approach
• Data availability – FOIA, what results should be available, to whom, and when
• Additional data sources - little data to triangulate survey findings and to utilize in addition to survey data for assessing conditions
Consider Support and Impact on Effectiveness Across Schools

Negative Outlier: more intensive facilitation, support and assistance as the conditions do not exist for improvement

Typical School: provide tools and prioritize importance with clear standards and structures

Positive Outlier: further research, tap expertise and assess strategies for scale up
Data Use and Support

• **Positive Outliers:** Case studies to identify promising practice, drawing upon educators to assist other similar schools, conference profiling success

• **Typical Schools:** Online tools and guides, webinars, community of practice and other push out supports to assist schools in understanding and utilizing data for school improvement

• **Negative Outliers:** Direct support, ongoing facilitation to identify areas of reform and research-based strategies (face to face and virtual) etc.
### District Teaching Conditions Dashboard – Schools with Most Positive Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions Composite</th>
<th>2009-2010 AYP Status</th>
<th>School NCLB Status</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Requesting Transfer</th>
<th>Total Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>% FRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.432289</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>68.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.515098</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>88.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.521937</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>94.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.526566</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School Improvement II</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>96.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.531453</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Making Progress: in School Improvement II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.583919</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>74.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.589605</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.609001</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.614531</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>68.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.632611</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>81.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.670111</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.748149</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.001227</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>72.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## District Teaching Conditions Dashboard – Schools with Most Challenging Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Conditions Composite</th>
<th>2009-2010 AYP Status</th>
<th>School NCLB Status</th>
<th>Number of Teachers Requesting Transfer</th>
<th>Total Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>% FRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.21539</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action I</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>87.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.03923</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action II 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>75.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.72456</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School Improvement I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>98.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.68024</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action II 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>41.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.62374</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>86.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5757</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School Improvement II</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>88.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.51394</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Making Progress: in School Improvement II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>34.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.43676</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action II 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.42063</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>89.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.40505</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>79.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.38318</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action II 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>74.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.38304</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>89.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.34888</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>School Improvement II*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>92.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.25094</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Made AYP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.24976</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Corrective Action II 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses and Tools Online Customized Across Client States

- Parent Guide to School Improvement
- Activity Guide for School District Leaders
- Revisions to School Improvement Guide
- Evaluation Guide
- Case Studies
- Research Briefs
  - Current Trends, DSSF, Principal WCs, Redesigned High Schools, Evaluation Pilot Districts, Achievement
Considerations that Influence Cost of Assessing and Utilizing Results

• **Survey Customization and Implementation:** Considerations include customization, stakeholder engagement, communication plan, addressing survey security issues, etc.

• **Analyses and Reporting:** Considerations include types of analyses, customization of reports (GIS maps, district dashboards), etc.

• **Data Use and Support:** Considerations include tool development, training entities(s), integration into existing infrastructure, intensity of support for outliers, etc.
Assessing and Utilizing Staff Surveys in States: Considerations

• How much should be appropriated? By Whom? For what?

• What, if anything, should be put in statute or regulations addressing data gathering and using results?

• How much should be voluntary and how much mandated? How much local control should districts have to meet any requirements?
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