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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Throughout the United States a lingering issue in public education is the achievement gaps that exist between White and minority and poor and non-poor students. White students and non-poor students have consistently outperformed minority students and poor students on achievement tests and state assessments. These gaps have existed for as long as they have been measured. The gaps have public school systems scrambling, as each is now faced with the task of assuring that all students and each subgroup of students perform proficiently or better on the annual state assessment. Prior to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandates for public education introduced by President George W. Bush in 2001, school systems were responsible for assuring that the overall state assessment scores of students were proficient. Under the current legislation, a percentage of all students and the same percentage of students in each subgroup must show proficiency.

Though many schools experience the traditional achievement gaps between the subgroups, there are schools that have decreased the gaps immensely or even eliminated them. Schools that have been successful in eliminating the achievement gaps have been more successful on state assessments than those who have not. The NCLB legislation uses one assessment measure in determining if the school is effective and makes Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Using one measure to determine a school’s level of effectiveness has left schools with significant numbers of minority and/or poor children failing to meet the mark. The goal of this dissertation is to examine the school
effectiveness of three middle schools in a Pennsylvania school district designated as "Making Progress", as perceived by the students, parents, and teachers of each of the schools. These stakeholders, who report to the schools on a daily basis and have a vested interest in the overall success of the school, do not have a voice in the state's determination of the effectiveness. The results of this dissertation will provide educators and other stakeholders with the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers of the effectiveness of their schools and a comparison of these perceptions with the perceptions of the state.

Background of the Problem

A tremendous amount of research has been conducted on the state of education for minority and poor children in America's schools. Although some American public schools have been able to effectively educate poor and minority students, most school systems do not. The disparity in performance between poor and minority students and their less disadvantaged counterparts has been researched for more than 40 years. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 demanded an investigation into the availability of equal educational opportunities at public educational institutions. The Coleman Report (1966) studied 600,000 children in 4,000 schools throughout the nation and found that most children attended schools where they were the majority race. Another finding was that there was no noticeable difference in the physical qualities between Black and White schools and that the teacher salaries and work conditions were virtually the same at both schools. Coleman et. al. also found that minority children lagged behind White children in grade school and that the gap widened even further by the time students entered high
school. He concluded that Black children could benefit from being in racially integrated schools.

Pettigrew (1971) re-analyzed The Coleman Report and found that although there was a distinct gap between Black and White students, Black students who attended mostly White schools averaged higher achievement by two grade levels than Black students in mostly Black schools. Pettigrew also found that White students performed about the same whether in integrated or segregated schools. There were some federal policy implications as a result of this study. Head Start, a comprehensive child development pre-school program that serves low-income families, was made widely available to low-income families with pre-schoolers. Also, busing of students from their neighborhood schools to schools in other areas to racially integrate all schools was implemented. Mosteller and Moynihan (1972) researched the impact of these mandates on students and schools. He found that Black students who were bused did not improve academically relative to their non-bused Black peers but were more likely to go on to college. “White Flight” was also a ramifications of forced busing. As minority students entered White schools, Whites who could afford to, left in droves. Large, urban cities saw drastic changes in their racial and economic makeup. As Whites moved out, so did the economic stability of businesses and industries. Cities that were meccas for industry and commerce became poor, dilapidated ghettos.

The Coleman report (1966) presented the performance of poor and minority students as inferior to their peers. As public school systems were forced to acknowledge and take steps to eliminate this trend, the late 1960s and 1970s saw education policies
that stemmed from the Civil Rights movement. These policies included racial integration and busing as previously described, but also additional controversial issues such as affirmative action and banning of school prayer. In 1983 The U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education published the report *A Nation At Risk* (1983). This groundbreaking report revealed the state of education in America to the entire world. The report found that reforms were necessary and critical for the United States to continue as the super power of the world. The federal government gave recommendations, which later became mandates for improvement, namely:

Recommendation A: Content-State and local high school graduation requirements be strengthened and that, at a minimum, all students seeking a diploma be required to lay the foundations in the Five New Basics of English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science.

Recommendation B: Standards and Expectations—schools, colleges, and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher expectations, for academic performance and student conduct, and that 4-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission. This would help students do their best educationally with challenging materials in an environment that supports learning and authentic accomplishment.

Recommendation C: Time—no significantly more time be devoted to learning the New Basics. This would require a more effective use of the existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year.
Recommendation D: Teaching—consisting of seven parts, each intended to improve the preparation of teachers or to make teaching a more rewarding and respected profession. Recommendation E: Leadership and Fiscal Support—that citizens across the Nation hold educators and elected officials responsible for providing the leadership necessary to achieve these reforms, and that citizens provide the fiscal support and stability required to bring about the reforms proposed.

Research Questions:

The questions that guide this research study follow:

What are the perceptions of the effectiveness of the three schools within one district, as reported by the students, parents, and teachers?

1. How is the school climate perceived at each of the three schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

2. How are the behaviors of school-based leaders perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

3. How are the behaviors of teachers perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

4. How is the effectiveness of the curriculum perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

5. How effectively are the students monitored and assessed in each school and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?
6. How are the patterns of student behavior and discipline perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

7. How are the staff development opportunities perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

8. How is the level of parent involvement perceived in each school and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?
Hypothesis

A hypothesis has been established for each research question. Research question number one, "How is the school climate perceived?" is derived from the Dimensions of Excellence Scales, as are questions 2 through 8. This dimension consists of eight indicators, each assessing a specific area of school climate. The indicators include: shared decision making and consensus on values and goals, academic commitment, orderly environment, high expectations, morale and school pride, attendance, facility, and communication and human relations. The hypothesis is that the climate of the school that made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools.

For research question number 2, "What are the perceptions of the behaviors of school-based leaders?" there are nine indicators assessed. They are: goal setting, school improvement, staff involvement, decision making, standard setting, instructional support, environment, staff development, parent and community involvement. The hypothesis is that school-based leaders' behavior in the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools. In response to question number 3, "What are the perceptions of the behaviors of teachers?" seven indicators are assessed. They include: involvement in school activities, planning, instruction, assessment, management, expectations, and knowledge. The hypothesis is teacher behavior in the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools.

Research question number 4, "What are the perceptions of the prescribed curriculum?" contains the following indicators: scope, sequence, and articulation;
content; development and review; and implementation. The hypothesis is that the curriculum in the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools. To the question, "What is the perception of the monitoring and assessment?", six indicators are presented. They include: communication of assessment information, appropriateness of tests, grading policy and standards, variety of assessment methods, interpretation and use of test results, and assessment records. It is expected that the monitoring and assessment of students in the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools. Research question 6 asks, "What is the perception of student behavior and discipline?" The indicators for this area are: disciplinary policy, school-parent partnerships, prevention, principal leadership, teacher role, and environment. The hypothesis is that the perception of the student behavior and discipline in the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools. For the seventh research question, "What is the perception of staff development?" seven indicators are present. They include: philosophy, purpose, participation and support, time and place, process and content, evaluation, and outcomes. It is hypothesized that the staff development at the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools. Research question 8 asks "What is the perception of parent involvement?". Four indicators are present, including communication, assessment, opportunities for participation, and commitment. The hypothesis is that the parental involvement at the school that made AYP for 2 years (School 2) will be rated higher than the other two schools.
Table 1 shows the research questions, which have been further developed into the survey statements given to the parents, teachers, and students from each school. These statements were obtained from the domains of school effectiveness found in the *Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey* published by Research for Better Schools.
### Table 1

**Research Questions and Data Used to Answer Them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data used to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given what we know about the characteristics of high-performing, what are the perceptions of effectiveness at each of the three schools?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey, Student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the school climate?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey, Student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the school-based leaders?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the behaviors of teachers?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey, Student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the prescribed curriculum and how is it managed?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of monitoring and assessment?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the patterns of student behavior and disciplinary practices?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey, Student survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of staff development opportunities available to staff?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the perception of the opportunities for parent involvement?</td>
<td>School staff survey, Parent survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to compare the effectiveness of three middle schools located within the same school district as perceived by their students, parents, and teachers. In Pennsylvania, as well as in each of the other states, public schools are designated as:

AYP—the school has met the mark for a minimum of 2 years consecutively and is deemed as being effective

Warning—the school failed to make AYP during the most recent test administration

Making Progress—the school met the AYP mark during the most recent test administration but failed to meet it the previous year

School Improvement I—the school failed to make AYP during the last two annual assessments

School Improvement II—the school failed to make AYP the year after being placed in School Improvement I

Corrective Action I—the school failed to make AYP the year after being placed in School Improvement II

Corrective Action II—the school failed to make AYP the year after being placed in Corrective Action I

Corrective Action III—the school failed to make AYP the year after being placed in Corrective Action II

Entire school districts are rated, as well, with the same overall designations as the schools based on the total performance of all of the schools. The district presented had a
designation of "School Improvement I" based on the 2005 PSSA. In 2006, the district has improved to "Making Progress", meaning that the State acknowledges that improvements in schools have been made.

The results of this study will serve several purposes. First and foremost, it will serve to determine if the students, parents, and teachers perceive the effectiveness of their school in the same way the state perceived the school. Second, it will report statistically significant differences in the perceptions of the respective stakeholders at each of the schools within the stakeholder group. The results will also show the differences in perception of each of the rated domains between the different stakeholder groups. Each of the three schools has a sizable number of minority students (African-American and/or Hispanic) and two of the schools receive Title I funding: federal dollars given to schools with a considerable number of students from low socio-economic status homes.

Bell (2001) calls high-performing, high-poverty schools "HP2 schools", and states that students' home backgrounds are almost always given as reasons for their academic weaknesses. Bell describes the 200 education leaders and 12 California HP2 schools that comprised the High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools Symposium in Sacramento, CA. This symposium was sponsored by the Statewide System of School Support (S4)-School Support and Improvement Centers with the intention of giving educational leaders the information needed to transform their schools, give an understanding of why these schools were effective, and to be a resource for the general field of education. The 10 elementary and two high schools that participated in the symposium were selected because they met the requirements of having an Academic Performance Index (API) ranking of seven or above for two years; at least half of the
high school students and 60% of the elementary qualified for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program and inclusion of a high percentage of students' test scores in the school's API over the two year period. Each school was matched with prominent researchers, working collectively to determine why these schools were successful.

Significance of the Study

In Pennsylvania, few urban middle schools are considered high-performing, high-poverty schools. High-performing, high-poverty schools have the quality of high expectations for everyone. The federal No Child Left Behind law expects that 54% of students in each school perform at the proficient or advanced level on the reading section of the FEBSA and that 45% of students perform at the proficient or advanced level on the math section. The law also requires that each subgroup of students performs at the same levels. This is the primary way that schools make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). For many years schools and districts were deemed acceptable if the mandated percentages were reached by the school overall, even if certain groups of students did not do well. This system made the scores of low-performing students nearly invisible when the entire school, overall, appeared to achieve the goal. The requirements in 2006 are that each school must make the overall targets and each subgroup of students must make the targets, as well. A 500-student, affluent school with 460 white students scoring at the 85th percentile in reading and 40 African-American students scoring in the 35th percentile in reading would not make AYP although a high overall percentage of students met the goal.
Organization of the Study

The study has been organized to give a conceptual and historical framework about the achievement gaps in general and the federal government's idea of an effective school. A survey will be used to collect quantitative and qualitative data from the student, parent, and teacher participants and to answer the research questions posed. Chapter I presents the research problem and details the problem, its background, its significance, purpose, and limitations. This chapter explicitly explains the nature of the study and its importance in this era of high-stakes testing under No Child Left Behind. Chapter II provides a detailed review of the related literature on the achievement gaps in schools. This literature gives detailed accounts of the numerous studies conducted on high-performing, high-poverty schools and the characteristics of effectiveness that so many of them have in common. In Chapter III, the design of the research is detailed, including the setting and population of the schools included in the study. An in-depth analysis of the demographics of each school are given to compare and contrast the three schools presented. Chapter IV analyzes the data. In this chapter the Responses from all of the educators, parents, and students that participated in the research study are presented. The final chapter, Chapter V, presents the findings and conclusions based on a thorough analysis of the data. This final chapter provides recommendations for policy implementation at all levels and for all stakeholders with a vested interest in eliminating the achievement gaps. Recommendations for further study are also provided.
Limitations of the Study

This study will be limited to three large Pennsylvania middle schools (each with 500-600 students) with considerable minority and high poverty populations, all part of the same school district. The district is located in southeastern Pennsylvania and is comprised of seven elementary schools, three middle schools, a high school campus with a building for grades nine and ten and a building for grades 11 and 12, and an alternative secondary school. The three middle schools within the district have participated in the study. School number 1 is located in a township within the district’s nine municipalities. School number 2 is located in a different township within the district. School number 3 is located in a small city in the district. This study is limited by way of the federal funding each building receives. Schools 2 and 3 receive Title I funding and school number 1 does not. Another limitation is the difference in the racial makeup of each school, however, each school has a considerable minority population (with African-American and/or Hispanic students comprising the predominance of this population). The study is limited in that all of the schools are located within the same district, with a somewhat transient population. The study is also limited in that only middle schools participated in the survey. Still another limitation is that the schools are located within a moderate size district (5000-10,000 students) in the state of Pennsylvania.
Definition of Terms

*Academic Performance Index (API)* - A numeric index for California public schools, that indicates a school's performance level. All public schools are ranked and given a score. The scores range from 200-1000 with a target score of 800. Rewards and sanctions are given based on the school's ranking. A "Similar Schools" ranking is done whereby 100 similar schools are compared. Within this comparison, a rating of 7-10 is within the above average categories.

*Achievement gaps* - The disparities in achievement and income between minority and white students.

*Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)* - the requirements placed on public schools and public school systems to show that all subgroups of students have met the targeted percentages of proficiency or have shown enough improvement in that direction.


*America 2000* - former President George H. W. Bush's education initiative, introduced in 1991. It was never adopted by Congress but was embraced and supported by many states.

*Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965* - The first and largest comprehensive federal education law that provides substantial monetary funds for kindergarten through twelfth grade education. The ESEA was established by President Lyndon B. Johnson.
Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program (also called The National School Lunch Program): a federally assisted meal program operating in public and nonprofit private schools and residential child care institutions. It provides nutritionally balanced, low-cost or free lunches to children each school day. The program was established under the National School Lunch Act, signed by President Harry Truman in 1946. (USDA).

Ghettos: Areas where people from a specific racial or ethnic background or united in a given culture or religion live as a group, voluntarily or involuntarily, in milder or stricter seclusion. Ghettos are often established in urban areas.

Goals 2000: Educate America Act-Former President Clinton’s education policy that provided hundreds of millions of dollars to states to achieve national Education Goals.

High-Performing School- A school that has consistently, for a minimum of two years, had a minimum of 65% of its students scoring proficient or above on state assessments.

High-Poverty School- A school that has a minimum of 51% of its students participating in the free or reduced-price lunch’s program.

Hispanic- A person who indicated that their origin was Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, Central or South America, or Spain.

HP2- A high-performing, high-poverty school.

Majority Student Achievement Network (MSAN)- A consortium of fifteen middle and upper-middle-income districts dispersed throughout the nation, with the common goal of acknowledging the disparity in achievement between the different racial and ethnic groups and resolved to find ways to decrease the gaps.
90/90/90 school - A public school that has a 90% minority student population, 90% of its students qualify for the free or reduced lunch program, and 90% of its students achieving high academic standards.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) - The federal education legislation that reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and required new measures of accountability for all public schools, with an expectation that by the year 2014, 100% of students in America's public schools are proficient.

Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) - The state of Pennsylvania's annual assessment given to all public school students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11.

School Choice - Title I Schools identified as not making AYP for two consecutive years must afford each of its students the opportunity to attend another designated school within the district.

Socio-economic status - Socioeconomic status is the level at which family income, parent education level, parental occupation, and social status impact a family's ability to make financial decisions.

Title I - A Title I school is a school that receives Title I money, the largest single federal funding source for education. Title I funding is based on the number of poor students represented in the school.

Tripod Project - The Tripod Project is based at the Wiener Center for Social Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. It is so named because the framework requires that the three legs of content, pedagogy, and relationships must be present, in unison, to raise achievement for all and to narrow the achievement gaps.
*Turning Points Schools* - *Turning Points* Schools are middle schools that participate in a comprehensive education reform model that focuses on best practices for middle level learners.

*War on Poverty* - President Johnson's comprehensive plan to address the American people living in poverty. A component of the program addressed educational policy, creating programs such as Head Start and the allocation of large resources to meet the needs of educationally deprived children.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Current Reform Efforts

Current reform efforts in this country began with the unveiling of the state of public education in America based on the findings from *A Nation at Risk*. In 1991, President George H. W. Bush introduced an education initiative entitled *America 2000*. Though it was never passed by Congress, by the end of 1992 through, strategic involvement of communities, 48 states committed to achieving the National Goals it set. In 1993, President Clinton introduced *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Hundreds of millions of dollars were provided to states for programs designed to achieve National Education Goals. Currently, the *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act of 2001 implemented by President George W. Bush, is in full swing. It is the revised *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, and holds states, districts, and schools accountable for student performance. The original *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA) was implemented under President Lyndon B. Johnson’s *War on Poverty*. This Act allocated large resources to meet the needs of educationally deprived children. The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* established that children from low-income homes required more educational services than other children and mandated that those additional services be provided. President Bush’s reauthorization of the original Act attaches an unprecedented accountability piece. Schools are now required to disaggregate data and receive rewards and sanctions based on the performance of all students and all subgroups of students.
In this age of accountability, several researchers report on the positive effect that accountability-based reforms should have on student achievement. Reeves (2000) names five necessary principles for effective school-based accountability systems. They include:

1. Congruence—accountability is the central catalyst for rewards, consequences, and staff evaluations.
2. Specificity—know exactly what works.
3. Relevance—direct relationship between the strategies used by schools and student improvement.
4. Respect for Diversity—educators must remember that all children can learn but they are not the same.
5. Continuous Improvement—immediate, relevant feedback is consistently given to students.

Richard F. Elmore (2005), of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, states that accountability for student achievement is one of the two or three—if not the most—prominent issues in policy at the state and local levels. But not all researchers are totally sold on these ideas. Gold, Simon, and Brown (2002) report on Reeve’s and Elmore’s ideas of accountability as bureaucratic or professional. They refer to bureaucratic accountability as a school’s responsibility to administration and professional accountability as the school staff’s role. They believe that the influence of each of these forms, even taken together, is limited. Gold, Simon and Brown (2002) found that a third
accountability, community-organizing groups, played a critical role in urban school reform and call this public accountability.

_No Child Left Behind and Disaggregation of Data_

Ferguson (2002) reports that for the first time in America’s history, disaggregating data to look more closely at the achievement of racial and ethnic minorities and the poor are explicit policy goals of the federal government. For many years school systems, specifically those in suburban areas, have lauded their schools as the best and brightest because of graduation rates, performance on college entrance exams, and acceptance into prestigious colleges for the majority of their students. The _No Child Left Behind Act_ of 2001 requires all schools, even the ones that are achieving outstanding success overall, to take a close look at how minority and poor students within their walls are performing. With this mandate, schools are no longer able to ignore the groups of students who traditionally underperformed, no matter how small their numbers. The requirements are such that a school with 90% of its students performing well on state assessments could be labeled failing if in disaggregating the data, it is found that specific subgroups of students are underperforming.

_Widening of the Achievement Gap_

The late 1980s saw a marked decrease in the achievement gaps between minority and White and middle class and poor students, however, in more recent times the gaps continue to grow. The gaps have grown so wide, according to the Education Trust (2006), that African-American 12th graders perform at the same level as White eighth.
graders in mathematics. It also reports that only 12% of African-American fourth graders reach proficient or advanced levels in reading as 61% of them fall below the basic mark. The Education Trust (2006) also reports that half of Latino eighth-graders are below basic in math. Researchers have noted the severe decline in achievement gains of late, specifically at the middle school level (Lira, Lewis, Tsuehida, & Songer, 2000). Several researchers and educational institutions give their account of reasons for the re-emergence of the gap. Some have found that children with well-educated parents from high-income families show great achievement while these from high-poverty homes do not (Bracey, 1999; Payne & Briddle, 1999). Payne (2005) explains that many poor students are students of color and have not learned how to navigate in the middle class. Because America’s public schools were founded on White, middle class ideologies, many poor students do not subscribe to the middle class value system, that is, reading for knowledge and/or pleasure, completing homework daily, goals of attending college. The University of Chicago News Office (2005) attributes the re-emergence of the gaps to early learning environments. It reports that Blacks now have less time and fewer resources, in real dollars, for their pre-school children compared to in 1980. Berliner (2005) presents five critical points of poverty that perpetuate the achievement gap between poor and middle class students. His contends that: poverty in the US is greater and longer than in other industrialized nations, students in poverty score lower than white, middle class students; poverty restricts expression of genetic talent at the lowered end of the socio-economical scale; poor students suffer from more severe medical problems than middle class children; and redactions in family poverty lead to improved student behavior. Ogbu and Fordham (1986) found that roots in the “oppositional
culture" supported institutionalized racism in America, thus Blacks associated academic performance as something Whites did and pursued other avenues to achieve status. Ronald Edmonds, of Harvard University, eloquently admonished a nation that high-performing, high-poverty schools are possible and that we can effectively teach all children whose education is of interest to us.

America's public schools have overwhelmingly left poor students behind since the inception of free and public education. Proportionally, the majority of poor students in American schools are students of color. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2000), 35.9 million people live below the poverty line in America, including 12.9 million children. This comprises 20% of America's children. (US Census Bureau, 2000). Many educators, and others, have asserted that the ills of racism, poverty, and single-parent households are insurmountable and doom poor children to failure. Although most public schools that serve large numbers of poor and minority children are underperforming, there are bright spots throughout the nation that are getting the job done, and doing it well.

Several researchers give varied accounts of the achievement gaps in America's public schools (Ogbu, 2003; Lee, 2002; Ferguson, 1998, as cited in Jencks & Phillips, 1998b; Jencks & Phillips, 1998a). Ogbu conducted an ethnographic study of the students in Shaker Heights, Ohio. More than 100 classrooms were observed and classrooms that clearly reflected the make-up of the students in the district were observed. The purpose of the study was to determine how the identity of African-American students as an oppressed group outside the opportunity structure affects their academic achievement specifically and their school experience generally. Ogbu found
that schools in the Shaker Heights area, and schools similarly situated, could close the achievement gaps by:

1. Providing additional education programming utilizing community resources.
2. Providing academically successful role models.
3. Involving parents in the process.
4. Teaching students the difference between short and long term goals.
5. Teachers having high expectations for all students.
6. Providing parents with critical information to be better informed decision makers.

Lee (2002) presents evidence of the achievement gaps over the past 30 years. Lee submits that "substantial success" has been achieved from the 1960s to the mid 1980s for Black students. During this time period the gap was narrowed as Blacks made substantial gains in achievement as the achievement level of Whites remained flat. In the late 1980s the gap began to grow once again as White students made score improvements and Blacks flattened. The Hispanic-White achievement gap has not narrowed as consistently as the Black-White gap has narrowed. Lee explains that other researchers (Crismon, Flanagan, & Williamson, as cited in Jencks & Phillips, 1992b; Hedges & Nowell, 1998) have identified factors such as socioeconomic and family conditions, youth culture and student behaviors, and schooling conditions and practices in explaining the fluctuations in the gaps. Lee cautions that the factors that have been attributed to the narrowing of the achievement gaps do not readily explain the widening of the gaps.
Jencks and Phillips (1998a) found that integrating schools helped with narrowing the black-white achievement gap without negatively affecting White students. They also found that genetics was not responsible for the difference in the Black-White achievement gap, as the performance ability level of Black students adopted into White families was consistent with that of White students.

_Ferguson (2003)_ reviewed and analyzed data from the Minority Student Achievement Network (MSAN), a consortium of 15 middle and upper-middle-income districts throughout the nation. The districts are dispersed throughout Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, California, and Virginia. MSAN acknowledges the disparity in achievement between the different racial and ethnic groups and has resolved to find ways to decrease the gaps. MSAN surveyed middle and high-school students in scores of schools within these districts. Ferguson found that the racial and ethnic differences fell into four categories. These categories are self-reported disparities by students, differences in socio-economic status (SES), nonwhite students' need for teacher encouragement, and differences in observable behaviors and homework completion rates. He concludes that:

1. Teachers must have high expectations for all students.
2. Schools must identify and improve specific deficits of each subgroup.
3. Teachers must provide encouragement.
4. Schools must provide access to resources and learning experiences.
The Tripod Project

One result of Ferguson's research of the 25 MSAN schools (when the research was conducted there were 15) is The Tripod Project. It is so named because the framework requires that the three legs of content, pedagogy, and relationships must be present, in unison, to raise achievement for all and to narrow the achievement gaps. The content leg demands that teachers truly understand what they are teaching so they can effectively teach all students. The leg of pedagogy expects that teachers have multiple effective ways of getting the message across to students. And the third leg, relationships, requires that teachers be able to relate to students in ways that motivate and enable them to succeed.

The Tripod Project is based at the Wiener Center for Social Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, where Ferguson, the project's creator and director, is a lecturer on the faculty and a senior research associate. Of interest to note is the project began in Shaker Heights in 2001, the same district that is the focus of Ogiba's (2003) study. Dozens of school districts currently participate.

High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools

Although the majority of America's public schools do not effectively educate minority and poor children, there are bright spots in schools where minority and poor students are performing well. Casserly (2001) reviewed the research report of the Coalition of the Great Schools, entitled Beating the Odds, that shows that many urban schools are showing good improvement in the reading and math scores of their students. Casserly states that reforms in the areas of standards, instruction, leadership, class size,
effective pre-school programs, and assessments are contributing to the improvement. Department of Defense Schools have a stellar record of educating poor and minority children, and doing it well (Delisio, 2005). Minority students make up 40 percent of the system’s population and 50% of the students qualify for the Free or Reduced-Lunch Program. Ninety-four percent of the parents of students enrolled in the Department of Defense’s schools have no formal degrees other than a high school diploma. With these demographics, still ninety-seven percent of the high school students graduate. Within the African-American and Hispanic subgroups, Department of Defense students score amongst the highest in the nation.

Carter (2009) selected 21 schools throughout the country to examine how each, consistently, had building-wide performance on national achievement tests at the 66th percentile or higher. These schools accomplished this with a minimum of seventy-five percent of its students qualifying for the free or reduced-price lunch program. Carter determined “Seven Common Traits of High-Performing, High-Poverty School” (p. 8), namely,

1. Principals have autonomy to make major decisions, particularly for spending and hiring.
2. Principals use measurable goals to establish a culture of achievement.
3. Master teachers bring out the best in a faculty.
4. Rigorous and regular testing for continuous student achievement.
5. Achievement is the key to discipline.
6. Principals work actively with parents to make the home a center of learning.
7. Effort creates ability.
Cawelti (1999) studied schools getting good results from students deemed tough to teach. Like Carter, he found schools that were getting tremendous results and profiled them in his study. Cawelti similarly found that high-performing schools had five common characteristics:

1. A focus on clear standards and improving results.
2. Teamwork to assure accountability.
3. Principal as strong educational leader.
4. Teachers deeply committed to helping all students achieve.
5. Multiple changes made to improve the instructional life of students.

Haycock (1999) found similar results in the study for the Education Trust. The Education Trust and the Council of Chief State School Officers invited each state to voluntarily participate in a project to identify high-performing, high-poverty schools. Twenty-one states agreed to participate and these states comprised 366 elementary and secondary schools. Haycock states "Somewhere along the line someone decided that poor children couldn't learn, or, at least, not at a very high level. And everyone fell in line." These researchers from the Education Trust found six characteristics of high-performing, high-poverty schools, namely:

1. They use state standards extensively to design curriculum and instruction, assess student work, and evaluate teachers.
2. They increase instructional time in reading and math in order to help students.
3. They devote a larger proportion of funds to support professional development focused on changing instructional practice.
4. They implement comprehensive systems to monitor individual student progress and provide extra support to students as soon as it is needed.

5. They focus efforts to involve parents on helping students meet standards.

6. They have state or district accountability systems in place that have real consequences for adults in the schools.

It is important to note that not every school in the study reported having all six of the characteristics in place, however, most had several of them.

Trimble (2002) conducted a study on the common elements of high-performing, high-poverty middle schools, as Carter and Cawelti’s research overwhelmingly consisted of high-performing, high-poverty elementary schools. Trimble found that effective middle schools that made impressive achievement gains used effective instructional strategies for young adolescents, or implemented many of the eight recommendations from Turning Points (1989) a publication of the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. The Turning Points recommendations include:

1. Create small communities of learning.

2. Teach the core academics.

3. Ensure success for all.

4. Empower teachers and administrators to make decisions.

5. Staff with expert middle school teachers.

6. Promote good health.

7. Reengage families.

8. Connect with the communities.
Trimble found that most middle schools do not implement the *Turning Points* recommendations or other proven effective middle level practices. Trimble and Peterson (2000) conducted a longitudinal study from 1997-2000 observing the policies, practices, and procedures of five high-poverty middle schools in Georgia with student enrollments of at least 400 students. All of the schools were located in southern and middle Georgia. The schools were selected because their test scores exceeded the scores of other schools with similar makeup (minority populations ranging from 55% to 80% and free lunch participation from 55% to 70%). The purpose of this study was to determine the practices in place at the schools, beyond the “known” factors of strong leadership, safe and orderly schools, and positive climate that allow them to be high-performing and high poverty. Three common elements were found in the schools. They include: the ability to acquire grants and manage money well, the use of a variety of team configurations to do the work of the school, and concentrated efforts on data-based goals and programs that affected student performance.

Three major studies, prior to that of Trimble, found that schools which focused on middle level improvements saw increases in student achievement. (DePascale, 1997; Felber, Jackson, Kasak, Mulhall, Brand, & Flowers, 1997; Mertens, Flowers, & Mulhall, 1998). DePascale (1997) researched 26 *Turning Points* middle schools in Massachusetts and found that these schools had the highest gains in the Massachusetts Educational Assessment Program of any network schools and that eighth grade students at these schools took Algebra at a much higher rate than the state average. Felner et al. (1997) conducted a study of 31 Illinois Middle Schools utilizing *Turning Points* and found that schools with high buy-in to the program had student achievement scores significantly
above the state mean in mathematics, language, and reading. Mertens, et. al. (1992) found that student achievement scores improved dramatically for schools with high levels of students from low socio-economic status homes when effective interdisciplinary teams were implemented. These effective teams were student-centered, committed to student achievement, had a strong sense of community, and regularly communicated with parents and guardians.

90/90/90 Schools

Still another study was conducted by the Center for Performance Assessment, included in Reeves' (2000) presentation of the 90/90/90 Schools. The 90/90/90 schools have student populations which:

1. Have at least 90% of its students eligible for the Free or Reduced Lunch Program.
2. Have at least 90% of its students from ethnic minorities.
3. Have at least 90% of its students achieving high academic standards.

The Center for Performance Assessment found that the 90/90/90 Schools have five characteristics attributable to all of its schools. These include:

1. A focus on academic achievement with a critical emphasis on improvement.
2. Clear curriculum choices which spent more time on reading, writing, and mathematics.
3. Frequent assessment of student progress and multiple opportunities for student improvement.
4. An emphasis on writing which helps teachers gain diagnostic information on student writing abilities while helping students process information clearly and concisely.

5. External scoring based on common assessment practices reinforcing those practices by teachers exchanging papers with each other and principals exchanging work with other schools.

These 90/90/90 Schools have overwhelmingly remained successful over the years with their consistent student population. These schools maintain impressive results without prescribing one particular program or format. The schools established standards, as most schools do, but they implemented, monitored, and assessed these standards continually.

**HP2 Schools**

Richardson (2003) tells of the remarkable improvement made by Taft Elementary School in Boise, Idaho over the period 1998-2003 under Principal Susan Williamson. Williamson discusses the change process that her school underwent during that time period, from improving the physical environment to tackling discipline before achievement, to introducing several new practices all at once. Bell (2001) calls high-performing, high-poverty schools HP2 schools, and states that students' home backgrounds are almost always given as reasons for their academic weaknesses. In California, education leaders from 12 California HP2 schools convened at the High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools Symposium in Sacramento. This symposium was sponsored by the Statewide System of School Support (S4)-School Support and
Improvement Centers with the intention of giving educational leaders the information needed to transform their schools, give an understanding of just why these schools were effective, and to be a resource for the general field of education.

An array of researchers have reported the need for high-quality teachers in each and every classroom. Sparks (2003) found that high-quality professional learning by all teachers is critical to high-quality teaching in the classroom. Darling-Hammond (2000) echoed these concerns, concluding that the single most important determinant for what students learn is what their teachers know. Carter (2000) contributes that teacher quality, i.e., experience, training, professional development opportunities, and effectiveness are critical for students to reach their potential. Killion (1999) found that teachers who are lifelong learners are able to adapt to the changes and challenges at the middle school level to effectively educate all students.

National Middle School Association

The National Middle School Association (2003) recognizes 14 characteristics for successful middle schools, acknowledging the interdependency of each characteristic, for total success. Eight of the characteristics comprise the school’s culture. They are:

1. Educators who value young adolescents and are prepared to work with them, understanding the developmental uniqueness of the age group, the curriculum, and effective learning and assessment strategies.

2. Courageous, collaborative leadership with a strong background in theory and best practices for middle level learners.

3. A shared vision that guides decisions and has been created collaboratively.
4. An inviting, supportive and safe environment with committed human relationships. All stakeholders are positive and focused on promoting a safe environment.

5. High expectations for all students are held by teachers and administrators of themselves and others. Middle Schools experiencing success understand that young people are capable of far more than adult assumptions.

6. Students and teachers engaged in active learning. The most successful learning strategies are the ones that personally involve each student.

7. An adult advocate for each and every student. The idea of advocacy is fundamental to the school's culture and every adult takes personal responsibility for students.

8. School-initiated family and community partnerships. The involvement of both family and the community is linked to higher levels of student achievement, improved student behavior, and greater overall support of schools.

The six programmatic characteristics include:

1. Curriculum that is relevant and challenging. Developmentally responsive middle schools have curriculum that embraces the planned aspects of a school's educational program. The learning activities are student-centered and appeal to the students.

2. Multiple learning and teaching approaches that respond to their diversity. Teachers address the individual needs of students and utilize proven strategies to assure that each student receives what is needed to be successful. Teachers work together to design learning activities always with the goal of increasing student engagement and achievement.
3. Assessment and evaluation programs that promote quality learning. Teachers give students authentic assessments and numerous opportunities to set personal goals, chart their individual growth, and reflect on their progress.

4. Organizational structures that support meaningful relationships and learning are in place. Teachers are arranged in teams with this arrangement supporting a strong learning community where students are safe and respected.

5. School-wide efforts and policies that foster health, wellness, and safety. Successful middle schools present an abundance of opportunities for students to develop and maintain healthy minds and bodies.

6. Multifaceted guidance and support services. Developmentally responsive middle schools provide professionals who are readily available to assist students both in and out of school.

The National Middle School Association promotes these characteristics for all middle level schools, without regard to a school’s poverty level or racial makeup. It believes that all schools are capable of experiencing success if they subscribe to the characteristics in their entirety.

The U.S. Department of Education (1998) produced a guide recommending several strategies for turning around low-performing schools that mirrors many of the recommendations of other noted researchers:

1. Raise academic standards.
2. Promote accountability.
3. Keep schools safe and free of drugs.
4. Provide students with extra help when needed.
5. Increase parental and community involvement.
6. Recruit, prepare, and provide continuing training to teachers.
7. Reward excellence in teaching.

The American Federation of Teachers (1997) developed a resource guide for improving low-performing schools and suggests policies that:
1. Are grounded in high academic standards.
2. Enforce high standards of behavior.
3. Use criteria for the identification of low-performing schools that are clear and understood by all stakeholders.
4. Address the particular needs of the individual school.
5. Are backed by solid research.
6. Involve staff and provide them with the professional development, time, and resources they will need to be effective.

In Pennsylvania, few urban middle schools are considered high-performing, high-poverty schools. High-performing, high-poverty schools have the quality of high expectations for everyone. The federal No Child Left Behind law requires that 54% of students in each school perform at the proficient or advanced level on the reading section of the PSSA and that 45% of students perform at the proficient or advanced level on the math section, with an increase in the required percentages expected in 2008. After 2008, the required percentages increase significantly until 2014 when it is expected that 100% of public school students are proficient on the assessment. The law also requires that
each subgroup of students performs at proficient levels. This is the primary way that schools make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). For many years schools and districts were deemed acceptable if the mandated percentages were reached by the school overall, even if certain groups of students did not do well.

*American Institute for Research (AIR) Database of High-Performing Schools*

The American Institute for Research (AIR) developed a database utilizing information available from the United States Department of Education to determine the number and location of high-performing, high-poverty schools throughout the country. Prior to the year 2000, no organization had compiled information on more than a few hundred of these schools, dispersed over 21 states. In 2000, The Education Trust analyzed AIR’s database and found that nationwide, there were 4,577 schools that met the following criteria:

1. Students’ performance in math and/or reading in the top third among all schools in the state at the same grade level.

2. Percentage of low-income students in the school at 50% and ranked in the top third of schools at that grade level and/or

3. The percentage of African American and Latino students in the school was at least 50% and ranked in the top third of schools at that grade level.

From this analysis, 3,592 schools are high-performing and high-poverty; 2,305 schools are high-performing and high-minority, and 1320 of these schools were considered high-performing, high-poverty, high-minority schools. According to the
Dispelling the Myth Online database (www2.edtrust.org), in 2003 Pennsylvania's public schools contained:
1. 19 schools containing grade five (elementary schools with grades Kindergarten-ave, elementary schools with grades Kindergarten-six, or middle schools with grades five-eight) that had at least 50% minority students, at least 50% living in poverty, and a minimum of 50% of these students performing proficient or better on the PSSA in reading.
2. 19 (same criteria as above) in math grade five (elementary or middle).
3. 16 (same criteria as above) in reading grade eight (middle school).
4. 16 (same criteria as above) in math grade eight (middle school).
5. 2 (same criteria as above) in reading grade 11 (high school).
6. 1 (same criteria as above) in math grade 11 (high school).

Based upon the extensive research that has been done on schools that effectively educate minority and poor children, the following are essential for success of minority and poor children in America's schools:
1. A clear focus on standards and student improvement.
2. A principal as a strong educational leader that hold everyone accountable for student performance.
3. Extended time for students in reading, math, and writing.
4. Teachers that are committed to seeing each student perform to high levels.
5. Rigorous and regular testing.
Summary

The above research gives examples of schools and districts that have decreased the achievement gaps and saw improvement in the achievement of its minority and poor students. Throughout the nation, some schools are decreasing the achievement gaps by implementing best practices that are effective in improving the achievement of poor and minority students and giving their students, parents, and teachers a voice in implementation of those practices. At the conclusion of this research the effectiveness of each of the three schools participating will be determined, based upon the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers. A comparison of these results to the results of the state of Pennsylvania on the effectiveness of the schools will also occur.
Chapter III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction to the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)

The purpose of this study is to determine the students, parents, and teachers perceptions of the effectiveness of each of their schools. The No Child Left Behind legislation deems a school effective if it is making AYP. AYP is determined solely on student performance on the annual state assessment. Schools that perform satisfactorily or better on the assessment are perceived as effective. Schools that do not perform consistently well on the assessment are deemed ineffective.

School effectiveness should be measured in other ways. The opinions of the stakeholders in each school are critical in the determination. In Pennsylvania, White students consistently outperform Black students and non-poor students outperform poor students on the PSSA. In Pennsylvania and throughout the country, many schools with sizable numbers of poor and minority students are deemed in need of improvement. The researcher selected one district with three middle schools to conduct this study. The district is deemed “Making Progress” based on the overall improved results of the district’s schools. In 2005 the district overall was placed in School Improvement. In 2006 enough improvement occurred to improve the rating.

The researcher sought to determine the students, parents, and teachers perceptions of the effectiveness of their school, even when the school failed to make AYP. The effectiveness of each school, in this research study, was determined based upon the rating given by the stakeholders in each domain. The domains include: school climate, school
leadership, teacher behavior, the curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student
discipline and behavior, staff development, and parent involvement.

Setting: Three Pennsylvania Public Middle Schools

School Number One

School 1 is located in Pennsylvania, in the same district as schools two and three. The student population is approximately 500 students comprised of grades six, seven, and eight with 50 professional staff members. The school is located within a township, just outside of the city, and different from that of School 2. This school is fairly diverse, comprised of sizable numbers of White and African-American students. Sixty-five percent of the 182 eighth grade students are White, 29% are African-American, 3% Hispanic, and 3% Asian.

In 2006 School 1 did not make AYP. All subgroups of students made the proficiency expectation in reading, as a minimum of 54% of the students overall and within each subgroup achieved proficiency or the subgroups decreased the number of non-proficient students by 10%. In math, the school fell short of the requirement that 45% of all students and subgroups of students attain proficiency or see a 10% decrease in the number of non-proficient students. African-American and poor students did not meet the requirement. Although this school does not qualify for Title I services, 25% of the eighth grade students participate in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program.

This school did not make AYP for 2 consecutive years so it has been placed on the state’s School Improvement I list. Because the school is not a Title I school, it did not
have to give School Choice to its students. For the current year the school has a new principal. This research will help determine if the students, parents, and teachers’ perceptions are consistent with the state’s in determining school effectiveness. If the perception of the stakeholders is consistent with the state, this school should be deemed least effective as it failed to make AYP for the last 2 years.

**School Number Two**

School 2 is also located in Pennsylvania, in the same district as schools 1 and 3. The student population is 600 students, comprised of grades six, seven, and eight with 50 professional staff members. The school is located within a township, just outside of the city. This school, too, is very diverse, comprised of sizable numbers of White, Black, and Hispanic students. Fifty-eight percent of the 189 eighth graders are White, 32% are Black, and 8% are Hispanic.

In 2006 School 2 made AYP. All students, as well as all subgroups of students, scored above the required proficiency level of 54% in Reading and 45% in Math or decreased the number of non-proficient students by 10% to obtain this status. This school is also a Title I school as 39% of the students participate in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. The state has deemed this school effective because of the AYP designation. For the current year the school has a new principal. This research will help determine if the students, parents, and teachers’ perceptions are consistent with the state’s in determining school effectiveness. If the perceptions of the stakeholders are consistent with the state, this school should be deemed the most effective of the three schools, as it made AYP for 2 years in a row.
School Number Three

School 3 is located in Pennsylvania with a student population of approximately 500 students that comprise grades 6, 7, and 8 and 50 professional staff members. 175 of these students are eighth graders. The school is located in a small city and is very diverse; comprised of sizable numbers of White, Black, and Hispanic students. Forty-one percent of the 175 eighth graders are White, 42% are Black, and 16% are Hispanic. One percent of the students are of Asian descent.

In 2005, the school was placed on the State’s School Improvement list because it did not make AYP for 2 years in a row. The school did not make AYP because Black students and poor students were not proficient in Reading and poor students were not proficient in Mathematics. Fifty-one percent of the students are from low socio-economic status homes participating in the Federal Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program. In addition, the school is a Title I school, which required that the school offer School Choice to all of its students. Because a requirement to be removed from the School Improvement list is that a school makes AYP for 2 consecutive years, this school was designated as in School Improvement based on the 2005 PSSA results. In 2006 this school did make AYP and has been removed from School Improvement and is now designated as “Making Progress”. The principal is in his/her second year as principal.

This research will help determine if the students, parents, and teachers’ perceptions are consistent with the state’s in determining school effectiveness. If the perceptions of the stakeholders are consistent with the state, this school could be deemed second most effective as it did not make AYP in 2005 but did make it in 2006.
The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)

The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) is the mandated yearly assessment utilized by the state of Pennsylvania to assess the reading and mathematic abilities of public school students in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. This assessment measures students' mastery of the academic standards for reading, writing, speaking, and listening and mathematics. These Reading and Mathematics assessments occur in March of each year. The assessment consists of four categories of results: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. The Pennsylvania Department of Education defines each category as such:

Advanced – This level reflects superior academic performance. Advanced work indicates an in-depth understanding and exemplary display of the skills included in the Pennsylvania Academic Content Standards.

Proficient – Proficiency reflects satisfactory academic performance. Proficient work indicates a solid understanding and adequate display of the skills included in the Pennsylvania Academic Content Standards.

Basic – This level reflects marginal academic performance. Basic work indicates a partial understanding and limited display of the skills included in the Pennsylvania Academic Content Standards. This work is approaching satisfactory performance, but has not been reached. There is a need for additional instructional opportunities and/or increased student academic commitment to achieve the proficient level.

Below Basic – The lowest level reflects inadequate academic performance. Below basic work indicates little understanding and minimal display of the skills included in the Pennsylvania Academic Content Standards. There is a major need for additional
instructional opportunities and/or increased student academic commitment to achieve the proficient level.

A scaled score is given to each student to ascertain achievement within each of the four achievement levels. Table 2 displays the scaled scores for 8th grade students in Reading and Mathematics on the PSSA.
Table 2.

*Eighth Grade Scaled Scores in Mathematics and Reading on the 2006 PSSA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Category</th>
<th>Scaled Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>1446 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>1284-1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1171-1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Basic</td>
<td>1170 and below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Pennsylvania students who score in the top two categories of advanced and proficient have met the State’s expectation for student performance. Those scoring in the bottom two categories, basic and below basic, have not. Pennsylvania requires that 54% of all students, as well as 54% of each subgroup of students, score at the proficient level in Reading. It also requires that 45% of all students, as well as 45% of each subgroup of students, score at the proficient level in Mathematics. When schools have met the above criteria (or decreased the numbers of non-proficient students by 10%) they make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). When a school has not met the above criteria sanctions are given to the school and district. The sanctions vary in severity, from mild to severe, based on the length of time a school has not made AYP. The sole determinant of school success is the annual assessment. The Pennsylvania Department of Education, by mandate of the Federal No Child Left Behind Legislation, places schools on “lists” when AYP has not been made. Those lists are:

1. Warning: The first year a school fails to make AYP
2. School Improvement I: The second year in a row that a school fails to make AYP
3. School Improvement II: The third year in a row that a school fails to make AYP
4. Corrective Action I: The fourth year in a row that a school fails to make AYP
5. Corrective Action II: The fifth year in a row that a school fails to make AYP

When a school has failed to make AYP for 2 or more years the school may be subject to additional requirements. For example, a school in School Improvement I is required to offer School Choice to all students if the school is a Title I school. Schools in School Improvement II are required to offer supplemental services such as tutoring. As a school
progresses to Corrective Action I, significant changes in leadership, curriculum, and professional development could result. When a school reaches Corrective Action II significant changes in the governance of the school may occur.

Instruments

The researcher used the Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments to gather the perceptions of teachers, parents, and students in three middle schools within the same district. Each instrument groups statements about the school climate, leadership, teacher behavior, curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student discipline, staff development, and parent involvement into domains. The Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments battery consists of three surveys: one for staff, one for students, and one for parents. Dusewicz and Beyer (1990) state, “Together these scales form a package of survey instruments designed to be used with school staff, parents and students as part of an assessment of the quality and effectiveness of a school or district”. The Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments have been used frequently in measuring perceived school effectiveness. South Dakota’s EveryTeacher grant (2002) utilizes an adapted version of the Dimensions of Excellence Scales to gather information regarding the quality of delivery of the professional development in which each teacher is engaged. EveryTeacher administered 22 questions in its survey. Bomotti (1999) utilized the school climate dimension of this same scale in conducting a comparative study of teachers in traditional public schools and in charter schools. Twelve adapted questions from this survey were included in the instruments that the researchers gave to the teachers.
The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL, 1996) includes the Dimensions of Excellence Scales in its publication of articles representing holdings to date at the Test Center. Although NWREL specifically states that it does not endorse any publication it lists it also states that articles are included to provide ideas.

The staff survey consists of 200 statements and asks the raters to characterize the school climate. Raters can respond to each question by reporting "Almost Never", "Seldom", "Sometimes", "Frequently", or "Almost Always". The results are then scored and a numeric value, from 1-5, is calculated for the results. The student survey consists of 44 statements. Raters can respond to each question by reporting "Almost Never", "Seldom", "Sometimes", "Frequently", or "Almost Always". The results are then scored and a numeric value, from 1-5 is calculated for the results. Only four dimensions are reported for students: school climate, teacher behavior, monitoring and assessment, and discipline and behavior. The parent survey consists of 71 statements. Raters can respond to each question by reporting "Almost Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Frequently, or Almost Always". The results are then scored and a numeric value, from 1-5 is calculated for the results. The same eight dimensions that are reported for staff are given to parents.

Table 3 reflects the domains that each stakeholder completed.
Table 3

Domains Completed by Stakeholder Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School climate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Assessment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior and Discipline</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

The data for this study is collected in several ways. First, the staff members at each of the three schools completed the Dimensions of Excellence Scales School Staff Survey to assess the perceived effectiveness of each school (Dusewicz & Beyer, 1990). The survey requests responses to 200 questions from the eight dimensions of school effectiveness. Each dimension contains between four and nine specific indicators to which the survey items relate. Table 4 contains the eight dimensions of school effectiveness and the indicators specific to each.
### Table 4

Dimensions of Excellence Scales Staff Survey (1-5) and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Specific Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL CLIMATE DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Shared decision-making and consensus on values and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orderly environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Morale and school pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication and human relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standard setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent /community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER BEHAVIOR DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Involvement in school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Scope, sequence, and articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development and review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Communication of assessment information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appropriateness of tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grading policy and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variety of assessment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation/use of test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-Continued

Dimensions of Excellence Scales Staff Survey (6-8) and Indicators

| STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION | • Disciplinary policy  
| • School-parent partnerships  
| • Prevention  
| • Principal leadership  
| • Teacher role  
| • Environment |
| STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION | • Philosophy  
| • Purpose  
| • Participation and support  
| • Time and place  
| • Process and content  
| • Evaluation  
| • Outcomes |
| PARENT INVOLVEMENT DIMENSION | • Communication  
| • Assessment  
| • Opportunities for participation  
| • Commitment |

The second way data is collected is by way of the Dimensions of Excellence Parent Scales survey, which is completed by the parents of eighth grade students. This survey scale measures the same eight dimensions measured by the Staff survey. Some of the dimensions ask parents to measure fewer indicators, as seen in Table 5.
### Table 5

**Dimensions of Excellence Scales Parent Survey (1-5) and Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Specific Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL CLIMATE DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Shared decision-making and consensus on values and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orderly environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Morale and school pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication/human relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP DIMENSION</td>
<td>• School improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standard setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent/community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER BEHAVIOR DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Involvement in school activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRICULUM DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>• Communication of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION</td>
<td>• Appropriateness of tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grading policy and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Variety of assessment methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation/use of test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Assessment records</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-
**Dimensions of Excellence Scales Parent Survey (6-8) and Indicators**

| STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION | Disciplinary policy  
|                                           | School-parent partnerships  
|                                           | Principal leadership  
|                                           | Teacher role  
|                                           | Environment  
| STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION               | Purpose  
|                                           | Participation and support  
|                                           | Outcomes  
| PARENT INVOLVEMENT DIMENSION              | Communication  
|                                           | Assessment  
|                                           | Opportunities for participation  
|                                           | Commitment  

The third survey, *Dimensions of Excellence Student Scale*, was given to eighth grade students. This survey scale allows students to give their views on the effectiveness of the school by providing feedback in four of the eight dimensions given to the adults. These domains include: school climate, teacher behavior, monitoring and assessment, and student discipline and behavior. The indicators for these four domains are shown in Table 6.
Table 6

Dimensions of Excellence Student Scale Survey and Indicators

| SCHOOL CLIMATE DIMENSION | • Orderly environment  
|                          | • High expectations  
|                          | • Morale and school pride  
|                          | • Facilities  
|                          | • Communication/human relations  
| TEACHER BEHAVIOR DIMENSION | • Instruction  
|                           | • Assessment  
|                           | • Management  
| MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT DIMENSION | • Communication of information  
|                                       | • Appropriateness of tests  
| STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION | • Environment  

Specific questions for each indicator were asked of the three groups being surveyed at each school: the staff, parents, and students. The responses generated from the surveys were utilized to obtain the mean scores for each domain and their significance by way of One Way ANOVAs.

Validity and Reliability

Dusewicz and Beyer (1990) in their publication for Research for Better Schools, define reliability as “the internal consistency of a scale or test and to the stability or reproducibility of scale or test scores” (p. 11). Research instruments should be reliable and have high correlations. Although there are no formal cutoffs for determining a reliable measure the coefficients have a value from .00 to 1.00. This value is denoted as alpha. Values in the .80 and .90 range have high alphas. Each dimension of the survey instruments given have consistently high alphas. This indicates that the dimensions being
analyzed are very reliable. The coefficients for each of the eight domains are as follows:

School climate = .96, Leadership = .98, Teacher behavior = .93, Curriculum = .89,
Monitoring and assessment = .93, Student discipline and behavior = .91, Staff
development = .95, and Parent involvement = .90.

**Power Analysis**

Power analysis is the ability of a particular test to detect an effect if one is actually present. In power analysis, the researcher seeks the appropriate sample size to use from a population. If an adequate sample is not obtained, adequate power is not available to detect the necessary effect. If the sample is too large, time is being wasted by the researcher. If the sample is too small it may not be representative of the population. Power analysis is used to obtain the appropriate sample size for the study. With an effect size (Cohen’s d) of .40, an alpha of .05, and a power of .80 using two-tailed tests, Hinkle, Wiersma and Jurs (2003) report that a sample size of 52 is necessary from each of the populations sampled.

**2006 Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA)**

In 2006 the PSSA was given to Pennsylvania public school students in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 in the areas of mathematics and reading for the very first time. Prior to 2006, only students in third, fifth, eighth, and 11 grades completed the assessment. The Pennsylvania Department of Education reports in its Handbook for Report Interpretation (2003), the purposes for the PSSA. Those purposes include:

1.) To provide an understanding of individual students’ and schools’ achievement of the academic standards categories.
2.) To measure the degree to which school programs enable students to attain the standards.

3.) To provide results to schools to use in strategic planning.

4.) To provide information to the general public and state policymakers about student achievement.

5.) To provide aggregated results of students as well as results by subgroups of students.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education’s (PDE) Accountability System established its underlying principles as:

1.) Applying to all public schools and districts.

2.) Being based on Pennsylvania’s standards and content.

3.) Expecting 100% of students performing at proficient or above in reading and mathematics by 2014.

4.) Including rewards, assistance, and consequences for performance.

5.) Being aligned with the federal No Child Left Behind legislation.
Comparison of Reading Scores: The State, School 1, School 2, and School 3

In 2006, 70.6% of Pennsylvania’s public school eighth graders were proficient or above in reading on the PSSA. At School 1, 60.7% of the students were proficient or above in reading. At School 2, 71% of the students were proficient or above in reading in the same year. And in School 3, 62.7% of the students were proficient overall.

When comparing the percentages of proficiency for individual subgroups of students in Pennsylvania to the proficiencies of the three schools, differences are found in the proficiency levels. Table 7 details the differences.

Table 7
Comparison of Subgroup Proficiencies in Reading on the 2006 PSSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>State %</th>
<th>School #1</th>
<th>School #2</th>
<th>School #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 10 students were represented in this group, thus, scores are unavailable
Comparison of Math Scores: The State, School One, School Two, School Three

In 2006, 62% of Pennsylvania’s public school eighth graders were proficient or above in math. At School 1, 49.7% of the students were proficient or above in math. At School 2, 53.8% of the students were proficient or above in math. In School 3, 44% of the students achieved proficiency. When comparing the percentages of proficiency for individual subgroups of students in Pennsylvania to the proficiencies of the three schools, differences are once again found in the proficiency levels. Table 8 details the differences.

Table 8
Comparison of subgroup proficiencies in Math on the 2006 PSSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>State %</th>
<th>School #1</th>
<th>School #2</th>
<th>School #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 10 students were represented in this group, thus, scores are unavailable
Data Analysis

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for Comparing Means of Three or More Variables

When the means of three or more samples are compared the usage of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) occurs to avoid the inherent error that occurs with t-tests. With three samples to compare, three separate t-tests would need to be completed. The very nature of using t-tests would be inappropriate when comparing more than two samples because in each t-test a 5% chance of being wrong is acceptable, when \( p = .05 \). When large numbers of t-tests are completed we expect to receive a false result at a certain point. ANOVA eliminates this issue by detecting significant differences between the samples as a whole. One test gives the differences between the means at a specified probability level.

Multiple Comparisons-Tukey’s Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) Test

When the ANOVA F-test finds statistically significant differences in the samples, a thorough analysis of the nature of the effects occurs. There are numerous ways to perform multiple comparisons of data and in this research Tukey’s HSD method was utilized. The Tukey method tests all possible pair-wise differences of means to determine if at least one difference is statistically different.

The research questions ask about the stakeholders’ perceived effectiveness of their school. The answers to the research questions are garnered by tallying the responses from each stakeholder group. Question 1 asks “How is the school climate characterized?” This question is addressed by usage of one-way ANOVAS to compare mean domain scores for this dimension for each of the schools. Question 2 asks, “What
are the behaviors of school-based leaders?” The questions are answered by usage of one-way ANOVAS to compare mean domain scores and standard deviations for this dimension for each of the school. In response to question 3, “What are the behaviors of teachers?” the usage of one-way ANOVAS to compare mean domain scores and standard deviations for this dimension for each of the schools occurred. Question 4, “What is the perception of the curriculum?” is also answered by way of usage of one-way ANOVAS to compare mean domain scores and standard deviations for this dimension for each of the schools.

For Question 5, “How are students monitored and assessed?” usage of one-way ANOVAS to compare mean domain scores and standard deviations for this dimension for each of the schools occurred. Question 6, “What are the perceptions of student behavior and discipline?” is addressed the same way with usage of a one-way ANOVA. Question 7, “What is the perception of the staff development available?” too, is addressed by way of one-way ANOVA. Research Question 8 asks “What is the perception of parent involvement?” Once again, one-way ANOVA is used.

Summary

The No Child Left Behind mandate has brought unprecedented accountability requirements to all of America’s public schools. Schools are no longer able to leave the needs of struggling learners unaddressed because the masses have been successful. This new accountability system demands that schools educate these struggling students, as well, or face sanctions that range in level of severity. The sole determinant of success, thus far, has been the annual assessment that all states are mandated to give to students in
grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and eleven. This critical assessment should be part of the
determination of school effectiveness but should not be the sole determinant. The
perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers—key stakeholders within the school—
should also play a role in the determination of school effectiveness. This research will
show that the perceptions of school effectiveness, as determined by the students, parents,
and teachers from three schools located within one school district differ from those of the
state. The school that the state perceives as most effective is perceived as least effective
by the students, parents, and teachers in the building.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Chapter IV discusses the results of the analysis of data. A presentation and discussion of the descriptive statistics from the demographic information will occur, as well as a presentation of the results from the Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey for School Staff, the Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey for Parents, and the Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey for Students. An analysis of each research question will also be presented.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceived effectiveness of three middle schools located within the same school district, as reported by the eighth grade students, parents of eighth graders, as well as the teachers from each school. Specifically, this study sought to determine:

1. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain one (school climate).
2. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain two (leadership).
3. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain three (teacher behavior).
4. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain four (curriculum).
5. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain five (monitoring and assessment).
6. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain six (student discipline and behavior).

7. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain seven (staff development).

8. The impact of the perception of the students, parents, and teachers on the effectiveness of their school in domain eight (parent involvement).

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How is the school climate perceived at each of the three schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

2. How are the behaviors of school-based leaders perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

3. How are the behaviors of teachers perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

4. How is the effectiveness of the curriculum perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

5. How effectively are the students monitored and assessed in each school and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

6. How are the patterns of student behavior and discipline perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

7. How are the staff development opportunities perceived in each of the school and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?
8. How is the level of parent involvement perceived in each school and are there
differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

**Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments**

The researcher used the *Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments* to
gather the opinions of teachers, parents, and students in three middle schools within the
same district. Each instrument groups statements about the school climate, leadership,
teacher behavior, curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student discipline, staff
development, and parent involvement into domains.

In this research study all of the eighth grade students at three middle schools
located within the same school district were given the opportunity to participate, as well
as the parents of all eighth graders, and all of the teachers within each school. The data
received from each of the groups was analyzed to determine if statistically significant
differences occur within each domain, between the students in each school, the parents in
each school, and the teachers in each school.
Race and Age of Students

Students were asked to provide their race and age, in addition to completing the student survey. At school number one all 52 students who participated in the study provided their race and age. The categories of race included: White, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, or Multi-racial. School 1 has 182 eighth graders in the school. Sixty-five percent of the 182 eighth grade students are White, 29% are Black, 3% Hispanic, and 3% Asian.

Of the 52 students from School 1 who participated in the study, 29 (55.8%) are White, 19 (36.5%) are Black, one (1.9%) is Hispanic, one (1.9%) is Asian, and two (3.8%) report their race as Multi-racial. The ages of the students range from 13-15, with a median age of 13.

At School 2 all 52 students who participated in the study provided their race and age. School 2 has 189 eighth graders in the school. Of the 189 eighth graders, 58% are White, 32% are Black, and 8% percent are Hispanic. Less than 2% are Asian.

Of the 52 students from school number two who participated in the study, 27 (51.9%) are White, 15 (28.8%) are Black, three (5.8%) are Hispanic, and 7 (13.5%) report their race as Multi-racial. The ages of the students range from 13-15 years with a median age of 14.

At School 3 all 52 students who participated in the study provided their race and age. School number three has 175 eighth graders in the school. In this school, 41% of the 175 eighth graders are White, 42% are Black, and 16% are Hispanic. One percent of the students are of Asian decent.
Of the 52 students from School 3 who participated in the study, 23 (44.2%) are White, 14 (26.9%) are Black, 7 (13.5%) are Hispanic, and 8 (15.4%) report their race as Multi-racial. The ages of the students range from 13-15 with a median age of 13.5. Table 9 reflects the race of the student participants.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Municipality, Household Income, and Students Years of Education in District as reported by Parents

Parents were also asked to provide the city or township in which they live. Table 10 depicts their responses. Within the school district borders there are eight townships and one city, for a total of nine municipalities. All parents who participated in
the survey provided this information. Table 10 provides the number of parents who live in each of the nine municipalities. The municipalities are lettered A-I.

At School 1 parents report living in five of the municipalities. Nineteen (36.5%) of the parents report living in municipality B. One (1.9%) parent reports living in municipality F. Seven (13.5%) parents report living in municipality G. Ten (19.2%) parents report living in municipality H. Fifteen of the 52 (28.8%) parents report living in municipality I.

At School 2 parents report living in six of the nine municipalities. Ten (19.2%) of the parents report living in municipality B. Ten (19.2%) parents report living in municipality C. Fourteen (26.9%) parents report living in municipality E. Six (11.5%) parents report living in municipality F. Ten (19.2%) parents report living in municipality G. Two parents (3.8%) report living in municipality I.

At School 3, the 53 parent respondents report living in four of the nine municipalities. Twenty-eight (52.8%) of the parents report living in municipality A. Fifteen (28.3%) parents report living in municipality B. Six (11.3%) parents report living in municipality C. And four (7.5%) of the parents report living in municipality D.
Table 10

Municipalities Within the District With Percentage of Participants Living There

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Attending School #1</th>
<th>Attending School #2</th>
<th>Attending School #3</th>
<th>Percentage Total of Whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
<td>100*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may be slightly different because of rounding.
Parents were also asked to select the annual household income that applied to them. Seven ranges of income were provided:
Less than $20,000.00, $20,000.00-$29,999.00, $30,000.00-$39,999.00, $40,000.00-$49,999.00, $50,000.00-$74,999.00, $75,000.00-$99,999.00, and $100,000.00 or more

Table 11 reports the distribution of parental income for the three schools. At School One the median household income is in the $50,000.00-$75,000.00 range. The mode is the "$100,000.00 or more" category as 13 of the 52 (25%) parents report household income in that range. Six of 52 (11.5%) parents report household income in the $75,000.00-$99,999.00 range. Twelve of 52 (23%) parents report household income in the $50,000.00-$74,999.00 range. Seven of 52 (13.5%) parents report household income in the $40,000.00-$49,999.00 range. Seven of 52 (13.5%) parents report household income in the $30,000.00-$39,999.00 range. Three of 52 (5.8%) parents report household income in the $20,000.00-$29,999.00 range. Four of 52 (7.7%) parents report household income of less than $20,000.00.

At School 2 the median household income is in the $75,000.00-$99,999.00 range. The mode is the "$100,000.00 or more" category as 17 of 52 (32.7%) parents report household income in that range. Nine of 52 (17.3%) parents report household income in the $75,000.00-$99,999.00 range. Five of 52 (9.6%) parents report household income in the $50,000.00-$74,999.00 range. Eight of 52 (15.4%) parents report household income in the $40,000.00-$49,999.00 range. Six of 52 (11.5%) parents report household income in the $30,000.00-$39,999.00 range. Two of 52 (3.8%) parents report household income
in the $20,000.00-$29,999.00 range. Four of 52 (7.7%) parents report household income of less than $20,000.00. One parent (2%) did not provide household income information.

At School 3 the median household income is in the $50,000.00-$74,999.00 range. The mode is the "$100,000.00 or more" category as 10 of 53 (18.9%) parents report household income in that range. Eight of 53 (15.1%) parents report household income in the $75,000.00-$99,999.00 range. Nine of 53 (17%) parents report household income in the $50,000.00-$74,999.00 range. Six of 53 (11.3%) parents report household income in the $40,000.00-$49,999.00 range. Nine of 53 (17%) parents report household income in the $30,000.00-$39,999.00 range. Six of 53 (11.3%) parents report household income in the $20,000.00-$29,999.00 range. Five of 53 (9.4%) parents report household income of less than $20,000.00.
Table 11

*Household Income Percentages of Families from the Three Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$29,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students Length of Time in District as Reported by Parents

Parents also provided the number of years their eighth grader attended school in the school district. The school system is comprised of grades kindergarten through 12. A student who began kindergarten in the district and had never been retained in grade would have attended for 9 years. Table 12 provides the median and range of years the student participants were educated within the district.
The median number of years the eighth graders attended school in the district is nine years in School 1. The range of years attended was a low of 2 years to a high of 10 years.

In School 2 the median number of years an eighth grader attended school in the district is 9 years. The range of years attended was a low of 2 years to a high of 10 years.

In School 3 the median number of years an eighth grader attended school in the district is nine years. The range of years attended was a low of 2 years to a high of 11 years.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Lowest Number of Years Students Educated in District</th>
<th>Highest Number of Years Students Educated in District</th>
<th>Median Number of Years Students Educated in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School One</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Two</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Three</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Years Teaching Overall and in District as reported by Teachers

The teachers reported the number of years each had been teaching and the number of years teaching in the current school district. In School 1, 16 teachers participated in the survey. In this school the median number of years teaching is seven. The range of years teaching is a low of 1 year to a high of 19 years. The median number of years the teachers in School One taught within the school district is 3.5 years. The range of years teaching within the district is a low of 1 year to a high of 18 years.

In School 2, 15 teachers participated in the survey. In this school the median number of years teaching is seven. The range of years teaching is a low of 1 year to a high of 29 years. The median number of years the teachers in School 2 taught within the school district is five. The range of years teaching within the district is a low of 1 year to a high of 26 years.

In School 3, 32 teachers participated in the survey. In this school the median number of years teaching is 9.25. The range of years teaching is a low of 1 year to a high of 29 years. The median numbers of years the teachers in School 3 taught within the school district is 4.5. The range of years teaching within the district is a low of 1 year to a high of 29 years. Table 13 reflects the teachers number of years teaching in the district and overall.
## Teachers' Number of Years Teaching In District and Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Median Years Teaching in District</th>
<th>Median Years Teaching Overall</th>
<th>Lowest Number of Years Teaching</th>
<th>Highest Number of Years Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Two</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Three</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey-Students

The first group analyzed was the students. The students were given 44 statements about the effectiveness of their school. Students were given the opportunity to respond to the statements by rating their opinions of the statements. Students did this by selecting one of five possible responses from a Likert scale. The students' perceptions of the statements elicited the following responses: almost never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), frequently (4), or almost always (5). The 44 statements were grouped into the four domains of school climate, teacher behavior, monitoring and assessment, and student discipline and behavior. The first domain, school climate, contained 21 statements. Domain two, teacher behavior, contained 16 statements. Domain three, monitoring and assessment, contained four statements. And the final domain, student discipline and behavior, consisted of three statements.

Mean Domain Results for Students

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the simultaneous effects of the independent variables, or factors, on the dependent variable. The independent variable is the school attended by the students who participated in the survey. The dependent variables are the students' opinions of the effectiveness of their school in domain one (school climate), domain two (teacher behavior), domain three (monitoring and assessment), and domain four (student discipline and behavior). By analyzing the data, several statistically significant differences are found in the means of the four domains at each of the three schools.
Fifty-two eighth grade students from each of the three schools participated in the survey. In School 1 the mean scores for each of the four domains were: 3.992 for school climate, 4.057 for teacher behavior, 3.973 for monitoring and assessment, and 3.487 for student discipline and behavior. In School 2 the mean scores for each of the four domains were: 3.788 for school climate, 3.819 for teacher behavior, 3.804 for monitoring and assessment, and 2.992 for student discipline and behavior. Finally, in School 3 the mean scores for each of the four domains were: 4.152 for school climate, 3.971 for teacher behavior, 3.971 for monitoring and assessment, and 3.634 for student discipline and behavior. Table 14 below report the mean domain scores and standard deviations for all three schools. These data suggest that the students in school two have a lower perception of the effectiveness of their school in each of the domains listed.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Domain 1 School Climate Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Domain 3 Teacher Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Domain 5 Monitoring and Assessment Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Domain 6 Student Discipline and Behavior Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>4.057</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>3.973</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>3.487</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>3.788</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>3.819</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>3.804</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>4.152</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>3.997</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>3.634</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of the Main Effects

A determination of the significance of the main effects was completed. A one-way ANOVA was run in which an F-value of 6.157, p-value of .003 and degrees of freedom (2, 152) were found for domain one. This indicates that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the students’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain one. In domain two there is an F-value of 3.004, p-value of .053 and degrees of freedom (2, 152). This indicates that the main effect of school attending does not have a significant impact on the students’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain two. For domain three, there is an F-value of 1.423, p-value of .244 and degrees of freedom (2, 152). This indicates that the main effect of school attending does not have a significant impact on the students’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain three. And in the final domain an F-value of 9.969, p-value of .000 and degrees of freedom (2, 152) are found. This signifies that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the students’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain four. Table 15 reflects the one-way ANOVA results for students in Domains I-IV.
Table 15

One-way ANOVA-Students in Domains I-IV

**Oneway (Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.511</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>6.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>40.873</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>8.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.384</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>2.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>36.873</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>5.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.409</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>54.734</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>5.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.259</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>11.661</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.840</td>
<td>9.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.252</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>5.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101.913</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because two of the four main effects, domains one and four, have a statistically significant difference in mean scores an analysis of the multiple comparisons (Tukey) table occurred.

**Multiple Comparisons (Tukey)**

The overarching questions in this analysis are:

Is there a difference in student perceptions of the effectiveness of their school at each school? If there is a difference, does it attain statistical significance?

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.788, standard error = 0.102) and school number three (mean = 4.152, standard error = 0.102), the mean difference of -0.365 is statistically significant with a p < 0.002 for domain one. The students
at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain one (school climate) than the students at School 3. The students in School 2 perceive their school as less effective than the students in School 3 in the area of school climate.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 1 (mean = 4.097, standard error = .099) and School 2 (mean = 3.819, standard error = .099), the mean difference of .237 is statistically significant with a p < .047 for domain two. The students at School 1 tended to report higher scores in domain two (teacher behavior) than the students at School 2. The students in School 1 perceive their school as more effective than the students in School 2 in the area of teacher behavior.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 1 (mean = 3.487, standard error = .150) and School 2 (mean = 2.992, standard error = .150), the mean difference of .495 is significant with a p < .003 for domain four. The students at School 1 tended to report higher scores in domain four (student discipline and behavior) than the students at School 2. The students in School 1 perceive their school as more effective than the students in School 2 in the area of student discipline and behavior.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 2.992, standard error = .151) and School 3 (mean = 3.634, standard error = .151), the mean difference of -.641 is significant with a p = .000 for domain four. The students at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain four (student discipline and behavior) than the students at School 3. The students in School 2 perceive their school as less effective than the students in School 3 in the area of student discipline and behavior.
Table 16 on the following page details the Post-Hoc tests.
### Post Hoc Tests

#### Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Tukey p&lt;0.05</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Stat. Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The p<0.05 difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

---

**Students**
Summary of Student Results

In summary, the students at School 3 rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain one, higher than the students from School 2, and the difference is statistically significant. The students at School 3 also rated the effectiveness of their school higher than School 1, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. This domain reflects the students’ perception of the climate within their school.

The students at School 1 rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain two, higher than the students from School 2, and the difference is statistically significant. The students at School 1 also rated the effectiveness of their school higher than the students at School 3, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. This domain reflects the students’ perception of the teacher behavior within their school.

The students at School 3 rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain three, higher than both the students from School 1 and School 2. The differences were not statistically significant. This domain reflects the students’ perception of the monitoring and assessment within their school.

The students at School 3 rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain four, higher than the students at School 2, and the difference is statistically significant. The students at School 3 also rated the effectiveness of their school higher than the students at School 1, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. This domain reflects the students’ perception of the student behavior and discipline within their school.

School 3 is perceived as more effective than schools one and two in domains one and four. School 1 is perceived as more effective than Schools 2 and 3 in domains 2 and 3.
Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey-Parents

The next group analyzed was the parents. The parents were given 71 statements about the effectiveness of the school which their eighth grader attends. Parents were given the opportunity to respond to the statements by rating their opinions of the statements. Parents did this by selecting one of five possible responses from a Likert scale. The parents' perceptions of the statements elicited the following responses: almost never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), frequently (4), or almost always (5). The 71 questions were grouped into the eight domains of school climate, leadership, teacher behavior, curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student discipline and behavior, staff development, and parent involvement.

Domains for Parents

The first domain of the survey, school climate, contained 14 statements that gave parents the opportunity to rate the effectiveness of the school. Domain two, leadership, contained 11 statements. Domain three, teacher behavior, contained 13 statements. Domain four, curriculum, contained five statements. Domain five, monitoring and assessment, contained eight statements. Domain six, student discipline and behavior, contained eight statements. Domain seven, staff development, contains three statements. And the final domain, parent involvement, consisted of nine statements.

Mean Domain Results for Parents

Table 17 reflects the mean domain results for parents. In School 1 the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 4.069 for school climate, 4.158 for leadership,
4.083 for teacher behavior, 3.896 for curriculum, 3.893 for monitoring and assessment, 3.739 for student discipline and behavior, 3.753 for staff development, and 3.400 for parent involvement.

In School 2 the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 3.662 for school climate, 3.590 for leadership, 3.879 for teacher behavior, 3.635 for curriculum, 3.683 for monitoring and assessment, 3.610 for student discipline and behavior, 3.533 for staff development, and 3.320 for parent involvement.

Finally, in School 3 the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 4.269 for school climate, 4.326 for leadership, 4.169 for teacher behavior, 4.205 for curriculum, 3.961 for monitoring and assessment, 3.642 for student discipline and behavior, 3.999 for staff development, and 3.474 for parent involvement.
Table 17

*Mean Parent Domain Scores from Each School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Domain 2</th>
<th>Domain 3</th>
<th>Domain 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>Teacher Behavior</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #1</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>4.158</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #2</td>
<td>3.662</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>3.590</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #3</td>
<td>4.269</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>4.326</td>
<td>.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domain 5</th>
<th>Domain 6</th>
<th>Domain 7</th>
<th>Domain 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring/Assessment</td>
<td>Student Discipline/Behavior</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #1</td>
<td>3.893</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #2</td>
<td>3.683</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>3.610</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #3</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>3.642</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the simultaneous effects of the independent variables, or factors, on the dependent variable. Table 16 reflects the results of the test. The independent variable is the school attended by the students of the parents who participated in the survey. The dependent variables are the parents' opinions of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain one (school climate), domain two (leadership), domain three (teacher behavior), domain four (curriculum), domain five (monitoring and assessment), domain six (student discipline and behavior), domain seven (staff development), and domain eight (parent involvement). By analyzing the data, several differences are found in the means of the eight domains at each of the three schools. Fifty-two parents of eighth grade students from school number one and fifty-two parents of eighth grade students from school number two participated in the survey. Fifty-three parents of eighth grade students from school number three participated.

Significance of the Main Effects

We next determine if the main effects are significant. A one-way ANOVA was run in which an F-value of 19.197, p-value of .000 and degrees of freedom (2, 154) were found for domain one. This signifies that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain one.

In domain two there is an F-value of 23.785, p-value of .000 and degrees of freedom (2, 153). This signifies that the main effect of school attending has a significant
impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain two.

For domain three, there is an $F$-value of 3.84, $p$-value of .024 and degrees of freedom (2, 154). This signifies that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain three.

In domain four an $F$-value of 11.351, $p$-value of .000 and degrees of freedom (2, 154) are found. This signifies that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain four.

In domain five an $F$-value of 3.112, $p$-value of .047 and degrees of freedom (2, 154) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain five.

Domain six has an $F$-value of .413, $p$-value of .662, and degrees of freedom (2, 153). This indicates that the main effect of school attending does not have a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain six.

In domain seven an $F$-value of 5.881, $p$-value of .003, and degrees of freedom (2, 152) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school attending has a significant impact on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in domain seven.
And in the final domain, domain eight, an F-value of .176, p-value of .839 and degrees of freedom (2, 154) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school attending does not have a significant effect on the parents' perception of the effectiveness of their child's school in this domain. Table 18 reflects this information by domain.
### Table 18

**One-way ANOVA-Parents in Domains I-VIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>Within Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>50.107</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40.738</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90.845</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.522</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49.922</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.444</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40.794</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44.111</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58.777</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.443</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.237</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55.204</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.441</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 6</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>81.905</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82.347</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 7</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6.462</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>73.249</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79.711</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>230.221</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230.679</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because six of the eight main effects were significant an analysis of multiple comparisons (Tukey) was completed.

Multiple Comparisons (Tukey)

The overarching questions in this analysis are:

Is there a difference in student perceptions of the effectiveness of their school? and

If there is a difference is it significant?

Domain One

Table 19 reflects the post hoc multiple comparisons results. Based on a comparison of the means of School 1 (mean = 4.069, standard error = .010) and School 2 (mean = 3.662, standard error = .101), the mean difference of .407 is statistically significant with a $p = .000$ for domain one. The parents at School 1 tended to report higher scores in domain one than the parents at School 2.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.662, standard error = .100) and School 3 (mean = 4.269, standard error = .100), the mean difference of -.612 is statistically significant with a $p = .000$ for domain one. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain one (school climate) than the parents at School 3.

Domain Two-School Climate

Based on a comparison of the means of School 1 (mean = 4.158, standard error = .112) and School 2 (mean = 3.59, standard error = .112), the mean difference of .568 is
statistically significant with a $p = .000$ for domain two. The parents at School 1 tended to report higher scores in domain two than the parents at School 2.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.59, standard error = .112) and School 3 (mean = 4.326, standard error = .112), the mean difference of -.738 is statistically significant with a $p = .000$ for domain two. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain two than the parents at School 3.

Domain Three-Teacher Behavior

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.879, standard error = .107) and School 3 (mean = 4.169, standard error = .107), the mean difference of -.290 is statistically significant with a $p < .021$ for domain three. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain three than the parents at School 3.

Domain Four-Curriculum

Based on a comparison of the means of School 1 (mean = 3.896, standard error = .107) and School 3 (mean = 4.205, standard error = .107), the mean difference of -.312 is statistically significant with a $p < .028$ for domain four. The parents at School 1 tended to report lower scores in domain four than the parents at School 3.

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.635, standard error = .121) and School 3 (mean = 4.205, standard error = .121), the mean difference of -.574 is statistically significant with a $p = .000$ for domain four. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain four than the parents at School 3.
Domain Five-Monitoring and Assessment

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.683, standard error = .117) and School 3 (mean = 3.961, standard error = .117), the mean difference of -.281 is statistically significant with a $p < .045$ for domain five. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain five than the parents at School 3.

Domain Seven-Staff Development

Based on a comparison of the means of School 2 (mean = 3.533, standard error = .136) and School 3 (mean = 3.999, standard error = .136), the mean difference of -.467 is statistically significant with a $p < .002$ for domain seven. The parents at School 2 tended to report lower scores in domain seven than the parents at School 3. Table 17 reflects the significance within the domains.
### Post Hoc Tests

#### Multiple Comparisons (Tukey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design 1</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 2</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design 2</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 4</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.*

---

**Parents**
Summary of Parent Results

In summary, the parents of eighth graders at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain one, higher than the students from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The students at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number one, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. It is probable that the difference between these schools occurred by chance. This domain reflects the parents' perception of the climate within the school. The parents of school number one, in domain one, rated the effectiveness of the school higher than the students from school number two and this difference was also statistically significant.

The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain two, higher than the parents from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number one, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. It is probable that the difference between these schools occurred by chance. This domain reflects the parents' perception of the leadership within the school. The parents of school number one, in domain two, rated the effectiveness of the school higher than the students from school number two and this difference was statistically significant.

The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain three, higher than the parents from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number one, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. It is probable that the difference between these schools occurred by chance.
The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain four, higher than the parents from school number one, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents as school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number two, as well, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents at school number three are more pleased with the curriculum than the parents at school number one and two.

The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain five, higher than the parents from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents in school number three are more pleased with the monitoring and assessment that occur in school three than the parents in school two.

The parents at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain seven, higher than the parents from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The parents in school number three are more pleased with the staff development that occurs in school three than the parents in school two.

*Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey-Teachers*

The next group analyzed was the teachers. The teachers were given 200 statements about the effectiveness of the school where they teach. Teachers were given the opportunity to respond to the statements by rating their opinions of the statements. Teachers did this by selecting one of five possible responses from a Likert scale. The teachers' perceptions of the statements elicited the following responses: almost never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), frequently (4), or almost always (5). The 200 questions were grouped into the eight domains of school climate, leadership, teacher behavior,
curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student discipline and behavior, staff development, and parent involvement.

Mean Domain Results of Teachers

Table 20 reflects the mean teacher domain scores from each school. The first domain, school climate, contained 33 statements that gave teachers the opportunity to rate the effectiveness of the school. Domain two, leadership, contained 32 statements. Domain three, teacher behavior, contained 32 statements. Domain four, curriculum, contained 19 statements. Domain five, monitoring and assessment, contained 26 statements. Domain six, student discipline and behavior, contained 18 statements. Domain seven, staff development, contains 24 statements. And the final domain, parent involvement, consisted of 16 statements.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the simultaneous effects of the independent variables, or factors, on the dependent variable. The independent variable is the school where the teacher participant teaches. The dependent variables are the teachers' opinions of the effectiveness of the school in domain one (school climate), domain two (leadership), domain three (teacher behavior), domain four (curriculum), domain five (monitoring and assessment), domain six, (student discipline and behavior), domain seven (staff development), and domain eight (parent involvement). By analyzing the data, several differences are found in the means of the eight domains at each of the three schools. 16 teachers from school number one, 15 teachers from school number two, and 32 teachers from school number three participated.
In school number one the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 3.739 for school climate, 3.941 for leadership, 4.127 for teacher behavior, 3.899 for curriculum, 3.698 for monitoring and assessment, 3.847 for student discipline and behavior, 3.704 for staff development, and 3.106 for parent involvement.

In school number two the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 3.287 for school climate, 3.407 for leadership, 3.463 for teacher behavior, 3.729 for curriculum, 3.367 for monitoring and assessment, 3.434 for student discipline and behavior, 2.895 for staff development, and 2.743 for parent involvement.

Finally, in school number three the mean scores for each of the eight domains were: 3.964 for school climate, 4.285 for leadership, 4.383 for teacher behavior, 4.129 for curriculum, 4.046 for monitoring and assessment, 3.768 for student discipline and behavior, 3.831 for staff development, and 3.094 for parent involvement.
### Table 20

**Mean Teacher Domain Scores from Each School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Domain 2</th>
<th>Domain 3</th>
<th>Domain 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>Teacher Behavior</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.79 .382</td>
<td>3.941 .477</td>
<td>4.127 .515</td>
<td>3.899 .618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Dev.</strong></td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #1</td>
<td>3.287 .493</td>
<td>3.407 .691</td>
<td>3.463 .541</td>
<td>3.729 .283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #2</td>
<td>3.964 .448</td>
<td>4.285 .532</td>
<td>4.383 .462</td>
<td>4.129 .572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #3</td>
<td>4.046 .585</td>
<td>3.768 .732</td>
<td>3.831 .686</td>
<td>3.094 .575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domain 5</th>
<th>Domain 6</th>
<th>Domain 7</th>
<th>Domain 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring/Assessment</td>
<td>Student Discipline/Behavior</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>3.698 .432</td>
<td>3.847 .625</td>
<td>3.704 .509</td>
<td>3.106 .596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Std. Dev.</strong></td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #1</td>
<td>3.367 .460</td>
<td>3.434 .343</td>
<td>2.895 .767</td>
<td>2.743 .612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School #2</td>
<td>4.046 .585</td>
<td>3.768 .732</td>
<td>3.831 .686</td>
<td>3.094 .575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance of the Main Effects

Table 21 reflects the significance of the ANOVA results. A determination of the significance of the main effects occurred. A one-way ANOVA was run in which an F-value of 7.339, p-value of .001 and degrees of freedom (2, 59) were found for domain one. This signifies that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches has a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain one.

In domain two there is an F-value of 6.743, p-value of .002 and degrees of freedom (2, 59). This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches has a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain two.

For domain three, there is an F-value of 7.882, p-value of .001 and degrees of freedom (2, 59). This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches has a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain three.

In domain four an F-value of 2.924, p-value of .062 and degrees of freedom (2, 59) are found. This signifies that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches does not have a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain four.

In domain five an F-value of 5.964, p-value of .004 and degrees of freedom (2, 58) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches has a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain five.
Domain six has an F-value of 1.512, p-value of .229, and degrees of freedom (2, 58) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches does not have a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain six.

In domain seven an F-value of 7.883, p-value of .001, and degrees of freedom (2, 57) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches has a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in domain seven.

And in the final domain, domain eight, an F-value of .928, p-value of .401 and degrees of freedom (2, 55) are found. This indicates that the main effect of school where the teacher teaches does not have a significant impact on the teachers’ perception of the effectiveness of their school in this domain.
## Table 21

**One-way ANOVA: Teachers in Domains I-VIII**

### One-way (Teachers)

Data Set: I:\ADOCME\Database\CAI-Temp\Ceta\Notes\I\CAI\Teachers\Master Database.XDF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>7.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>5.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because five of the eight main effects were significant an analysis of Multiple Comparisons (Tukey) was completed.

*Multiple Comparisons (Tukey)*

The overarching questions in this analysis are:

Is there a difference in student perceptions of the effectiveness of their school?

If there is a difference is it significant?

**Domain One - School Climate**

Table 22 reflects the Post-Hoc test results. Based on a comparison of the means of school number one (mean = 3.739, standard error = .160) and school number two (mean = 3.336, standard error = .160), the mean difference of -.403 is statistically significant with a p < .039 for domain one. The teachers at school number one tended to report higher scores in domain one than the teachers at school number two.

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.336, standard error = .140) and school number three (mean = 3.873, standard error = .140), the mean difference of -.537 is statistically significant with a p < .001 for domain one. The teachers at school number two tended to report lower scores in domain one than the parents at school number three.
Domain Two-School Leadership

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.521, standard error = .167) and school number three (mean = 4.136, standard error = .167), the mean difference of -.615 is statistically significant with a p < .001 for domain two. The teachers at school number two tended to report lower scores in domain two than the teachers at school number three.

Domain Three-Teacher Behavior

Based on a comparison of the means of school number one (mean = 4.127, standard error = .232) and school number two (mean = 3.481, standard error = .232), the mean difference of .646 is statistically significant with a p < .019 for domain three. The teachers at school number one tended to report higher scores in domain three than the teachers in school number two.

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.481, standard error = .203) and school number three (mean = 4.282, standard error = .203), the mean difference of -.801 is statistically significant with a p < .001 for domain three. The teachers at school number two tended to report lower scores in domain three than the teachers at school number three.

Domain Five-Monitoring and Assessment

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.335, standard error = .168) and school number three (mean = 3.914, standard error = .168), the mean difference of -.579 is statistically significant with a p < .003 for domain five. The
teachers at school number two tended to report lower scores in domain five than the teachers at school number three.

Domain Seven-Staff Development

Based on a comparison of the means of school number one (mean = 3.704, standard error = .243) and school number two (mean = 3.003, standard error = .243), the mean difference of .701 is statistically significant with a p < .015 for domain seven. The teachers at school number one tended to report higher scores in domain seven than the teachers at school number two.

Based on a comparison of the means of school number two (mean = 3.003, standard error = .211) and school number three (mean = 3.827, standard error = .211), the mean difference of .825 is statistically significant with a p < .001 for domain seven. The teachers at school number two tended to report lower scores in domain seven than the teachers at school number three.
Table 22

Pest Hoc Tests-Multiple Comparisons (Tukey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School 1</th>
<th>School 2</th>
<th>School 3</th>
<th>School 4</th>
<th>School 5</th>
<th>School 6</th>
<th>School 7</th>
<th>School 8</th>
<th>School 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Comparisons

The table above shows the results of the multiple comparisons (Tukey) for the Pest Hoc Tests. Each row represents a comparison between two schools, with the mean, low, and high values for each school.

Teachers
Summary of Teacher Results

In summary, the teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain one, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number one, as well, but this difference is not statistically significant. The teachers at school number one rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number two, and the difference is statistically significant.

The teachers in school number one and school number three, in domain one, rated the effectiveness of their schools higher than the teachers from school number two. The teachers in schools one and three rate the school climate higher than the teachers at school two.

The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain two, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. This domain reflects the teachers' perception of the leadership within the school. The teachers of school number three rated the leadership higher in school number three than in school number two. The teachers in school number three rated the leadership higher than in school number one, as well; however the difference is not statistically significant. It is probable that the difference occurred by chance.

The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain three, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers at school number one rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number two, as well, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers at schools one and three rate the teacher behavior as higher than
in school number two. The teachers at school number three rate the teacher behavior higher than at school number one, as well, however this difference is not statistically significant. It is probable that the difference between these schools occurred by chance.

The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain five, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school higher than school number two, as well, but the difference is not statistically significant. The teachers at school number three are more pleased with the monitoring and assessment occurring at school number three than the teachers at school number two.

The teachers at school number one rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain seven, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers in school number one are more pleased with the staff development that occurs in school one than the teachers in school number two. The teachers at school number three rated the effectiveness of their school, in domain seven, higher than the teachers from school number two, and the difference is statistically significant. The teachers in school number three are more pleased with the staff development that occurs in school number three than the teachers in school number two.

**Overall Effectiveness Results**

The results of the surveys given to the students, parents, and teachers at each of the three schools reveal the perception of each of these stakeholders on the effectiveness of their school. At school number one students perceive their school as the most effective in two of the four domains. The parents there perceive their school as the most effective
in one of the eight domains. And the teachers at school number one perceive their school as the most effective in two of the eight domains.

At school number two none of the students, parents, or teachers perceived their school as the most effective in any of the domains.

At school number three students perceive their school as the most effective in two of the four domains. The parents there perceive their school as the most effective in seven of the eight domains. And the teachers at school number three perceive their school as the most effective in six of the eight domains. Table 23 reflects the school with the overall highest reported stakeholder score for each domain. Of the 20 total domains reported school one is perceived as most effective in five of the domains, school two is perceived as most effective in none of the domains, and school three is perceived as most effective in 15 of the domains.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>Domain 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Climate</td>
<td>School Leadership</td>
<td>Teacher Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>Domain 5</td>
<td>Domain 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Monitoring Assessment</td>
<td>Student Discipline and Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School 1</td>
<td>School 3</td>
<td>School 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School With the Highest Perceived Effectiveness by Each Stakeholder
Research Questions

Domain I-School Climate

The following research questions guided the study:

How is the school climate perceived in each of the three schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Each student participant responded to the 21 statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix section. Each parent participant responded to the 14 statements in this domain. The statements that comprised the domain appear in the Appendix section. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix section.

Domain II-Leadership

How are the behaviors of school-based leaders perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Parents and teachers responded to this domain. Each parent participant responded to the 11 statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix section. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain also appear in the Appendix section.
Domain III-Teacher Behavior

How are the behaviors of teachers perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Students, parents, and teachers responded to this domain. Each student participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprised the domain appear in the Appendix. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix.

Domain IV-Curriculum

How is the effectiveness of the curriculum perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Parents and teachers responded to this domain. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear below in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix.

Domain V-Monitoring and Assessment

How effectively are the students monitored and assessed in each school and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?
Students, parents, and teachers responded to this domain. Each student participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprised the domain appear below in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprised the domain appear below in the Appendix.

Domain VI-Student Behavior and Discipline

How are the patterns of student behavior and discipline perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Students, parents and teachers responded to this domain. Each student participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear below in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear below in the Appendix.

Domain VII-Staff Development

How are the staff development opportunities perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?
Parents and teachers responded to this domain. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear below in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix.

Domain VIII- Parent Involvement

How is the level of parent involvement perceived in each school and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Parents and teachers responded to this domain. Each parent participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear below in the Appendix. Each teacher participant responded to the statements in this domain. The statements that comprise the domain appear in the Appendix.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter I provides a rationale for this research study. Students, parents, and teachers spend an extraordinary amount of time in schools learning, supporting, and teaching. These critical stakeholders are less involved than administrators and policy makers in making decisions that directly affect their schools. In this qualitative, comparative research study the researcher sought the opinions of the eight grade students, parents of eighth graders, and teachers from three middle schools located within the same school district on the effectiveness of their school in eight overarching areas, or domains. Each of the three schools is racially and socio-economically diverse, with significant numbers of students who qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Based on the responses from the various groups the perceived level of effectiveness of each of the schools was determined.

Chapter II provides a review of the relevant literature on student achievement gaps by race and income and high performing schools. The following areas were discussed: current reform efforts, No Child Left Behind, the achievement gaps, and high-performing, high-poverty schools.

Chapter III describes the design of the study and the quantitative research method employed. It also gives the setting for the three schools in the study as well as the school district in which they all sit. The Dimensions of Excellence Scale Survey for students, parents, and staff members is presented and explained. Each survey is further broken down into domains, four for the students and eight for the parents and teachers. The
students responded to 44 statements about their perception of the effectiveness of their school. The parents responded to 71 statements and the teachers to 206.

Chapter IV presented the findings and analyzed the research subjects' responses to the statements given in the survey. These results were presented in the four (students) or eight (parents and teachers) domains within the survey. Those domains include: school climate, leadership, teacher behavior, curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student behavior and discipline, staff development, and parent involvement.

Chapter V provides the conclusions based on the analysis of the survey data to rank the effectiveness of the three schools in each stakeholder category, as determined from the results of the respective survey that each completed. This chapter provides recommendations for future study and implications for the schools and the school district. The research questions will frame the analysis in this chapter.

The following research questions were used to guide this course of study:
1. How is the school climate perceived at each of the three schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?
2. How are the behaviors of school-based leaders perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?
3. How are the behaviors of teachers perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?
4. How is the effectiveness of the curriculum perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?
5. How effectively are the students monitored and assessed in each school and are there differences in the level of the effectiveness of each of the three schools?
6. How are the patterns of student behavior and discipline perceived in each of the schools and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

7. How are the staff development opportunities perceived in each of the school and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

8. How is the level of parent involvement perceived in each school and are there differences in the level of effectiveness of each of the three schools?

Methodology

To answer the research questions the *Dimensions of Excellence Scale Survey Instruments* for students, parents and staff members were utilized. The survey is a pencil and paper survey that takes fifteen to thirty minutes to complete. Students from each of the three schools completed the 44-statement Student Survey, the parents completed the 71-statement Parent Survey, and the teachers completed the 200-statement School Staff Survey. Each survey groups the statements by domain, with the student survey containing four domains and the adult surveys containing eight domains. The *Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey Instruments* have been used frequently in measuring perceived school effectiveness. South Dakota’s *EveryTeacher* grant utilizes an adapted version of the *Dimensions of Excellence Scales* to gather information regarding the quality of delivery of the professional development in which each teacher is engaged. *EveryTeacher* administered 22 questions in its survey. Bonatti, et. al. (1999) utilized the “school climate” dimension of this same scale in conducting a comparative study of teachers in traditional public schools and in charter schools. Twelve adapted
questions from this survey were included in the instruments that the researchers gave to the teachers.

School number one had 52 student participants, 52 parent participants, and 16 teacher participants. At school number two 52 students participated, 52 parents, and 15 teachers. And in school number three, 52 students participated in the survey, 53 parents participated and 32 teachers. All eighth grade students from each of the three buildings were invited to participate. All of the parents of the eighth graders were invited to participate, as well. And all of the teachers in each of the building were invited to participate. The researcher visited two of the three schools to invite participation from the eighth graders, their parents, and teachers. An independent researcher assisted the primary researcher with inviting participants within the third school as the primary researcher has a supervisory role with the students, parents, and teachers in the school.

The data from each of the Dimensions of Excellence surveys was analyzed to determine individual domain scores and group domain scores from each of the respondents in each of the schools. The responses were analyzed on a five-point scale that ranged from a low of 1 (Almost Never) to a high of 5 (Almost Always)

Sample Characteristics

Race and Age of Students

All students from each of the three schools provided their race and age in the survey. Students selected their race from the following list given: White, Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, or Multi-racial. The aforementioned Table 8 reflects the students' response to race.
The median age of students is 13 at school one, 14 at school two, and 13.5 at school three.

Municipality, Household Income, and Students Years of Education in District as reported by Parents

Parents were also asked to provide the city or township in which they live. Within the school district borders there are eight townships and one city, for a total of nine municipalities. All parents who participated in the survey provided this information. The aforementioned Table 8 provides the number of parents who live in each of the nine municipalities.

Household Income Reported by Parents

Parents were also asked to select the annual household income for their household. Seven ranges of income were provided, from less than $20,000.00 to more than $100,000.00. The aforementioned Table 10 reflects the reported household income for all three schools.

Student Length of Time in District Reported by Parents

Parents also provided the number of years their eighth grader attended school in the school district. The school system is comprised of grades kindergarten through 12. The aforementioned Table 11 provides the median and range of years the student participants were educated within the district.
Number of Years Teaching Overall and in District as reported by Teachers

The teachers reported the number of years each has been teaching and the number of years teaching in the current school district. Table 12 (Ch. 4) reflects the teachers' number of years teaching in the district and overall.
Summary of Key Findings

Race of Students and Participation

Each student and parent participant group in each of the schools was racially diverse. School number one has 182 eighth graders in the school. In school one, 65% of the 182 eighth grade students are White, 29% are Black, 3% Hispanic, and 3% Asian. Of the 52 students from school number one who participated in the study, 29 (55.8%) are White, 19 (36.5%) are Black, one (1.9%) is Hispanic, one (1.9%) is Asian, and two (3.8%) report their race as Multi-racial.

School number two has 189 eighth graders in the school. In school two, 58% of the 189 eighth graders are White, 32% are Black, and eight percent are Hispanic. Less than two percent are Asian. Of the 52 students from school number two who participated in the study, 27 (51.9%) are White, 15 (28.8%) are Black, three (5.8%) are Hispanic, and seven (13.5%) report their race as Multi-racial.

School number three has 175 eighth graders in the school. In school three, 41% of the 175 eighth graders are White, 42% are Black, and 16% are Hispanic. One percent of the students are of Asian decent.

Of the 52 students from school number three who participated in the study, 23 (44.2%) are White, 14 (26.9%) are Black, seven (13.5%) are Hispanic, and eight (15.4%) report their race as Multi-racial. (Table 7)

Household Income and Participation

At school number one 25% of the eighth grade students qualify for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program (FRPLP). Of the 52 parent participants at school one, 14
(26.9%) have students who participate in the FRPLP. At school two 39% of the eighth grade students qualify for the FRPLP. Of the 52 parent participants at school two, 13 (25%) have students who participate in the program. And at school three 51% of the eighth grade students qualify for the FRPLP. Of the 53 parent participants at school three, 20 (37.7%) have students who participate in the program. Schools two and three had a higher participation rate from middle and upper middle class parents than from poor parents.

Number of Years Teaching and Participation

At school number one 16 of the 50 teachers participated in the study. The teachers in this building have been teaching a median of seven years overall and 3.5 years within the district. School number two had 15 of its 50 teachers participate. The teachers in this building have been teaching a median of seven years overall and 5 years in the district. And at school number three 32 of the 50 teachers participated. The teachers in this building have been teaching a median of 9.25 years overall and 4.5 years in the district. It is important to note that after the 2001-2002 school term the district was faced with furloughing scores of teachers. Nearly all of the furloughed teachers were eventually offered a position, many never returned and the district faced hiring new teachers to replace the ones that never returned.

Overall Mean Scores of Students, Parents, and Teachers

The overall mean score of all students who participated in the survey is 3.489, falling in the sometimes to frequently range of effectiveness. The overall mean score of
all parents who participated in the survey is 3.83, falling in the sometimes to frequently range of effectiveness. The overall mean score of all teachers who participated in the survey is 3.662, falling in the sometimes to frequently range of effectiveness.

Discussion & Implications

The research questions relating to perceived school effectiveness in each of the domains were answered using the data collected from the Dimensions of Excellence Scale Survey Instruments. The Dimensions of Excellence surveys groups statements about the perceived effectiveness of schools into domains. The domains consist of school climate, school leadership, teacher behavior, curriculum, monitoring and assessment, student discipline and behavior, staff development, and parent involvement. Ferguson (2003), Carter (2000), Cavelti (1999), and Haycock (1999) all attest to the improved effectiveness of schools that focus on some or all of the eight domains in this research. Schools that focus on improving school effectiveness in these areas have been successful at decreasing and eliminating the achievement gaps.

If the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers were consistent with the state and federal governments in determining school effectiveness the expectation would be that School One, which has consistently made AYP, would be rated the most effective of the three schools in the research. Of the 20 domains completed by the students, parents, and teachers none rated School One as most effective. School One was rated by the students, parents, and teachers as least effective of the three schools.

If the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers were consistent with the state and federal governments in determining school effectiveness the expectation would
be that School Two, which has failed to make AYP for two years in a row and has been placed on the state’s School Improvement list, would be rated as least effective by the stakeholders. School Two was perceived most effective in five of the 20 domains and the second most effective school overall.

If the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers were consistent with the state and federal governments in determining school effectiveness the expectation would be that School Three, which failed to make AYP in 2005 but made it in 2006, would be rated as the second most effective by the stakeholders. School Three was perceived most effective in 15 of the 20 domains and the most effective school overall. School three had the highest overall effectiveness mean score of 4.383 on a scale of 1-5 where 1 reflects effectiveness almost never occurring and 5 reflects effectiveness almost always occurring.

In domain three, teacher behavior, as reported by teachers. See Table 22 (Ch. 4) for an overview of the perceived effectiveness in each domain.

The federal No Child Left Behind Act is in need of an overhaul. It currently relies on a single assessment measure to determine the effectiveness of each public school. Based upon this research, key stakeholders in three middle schools within one school district perceive school effectiveness more expansively. They place greater significance on the climate of the school, the leadership abilities of the principal, the behaviors of the teachers, the curriculum, the way that curriculum is monitored and assessed, student discipline and behavior, staff development, and the involvement level of parents in determining school effectiveness. Congress should revamp the current accountability system by adding a component that gives local stakeholders a voice in determining the effectiveness of their schools. In School Three, for example, because it is a Title I school
and failed to make AYP in 2004 and 2005, all students in the building were given the opportunity to choose to attend Schools One and Two. Of the 600 students who attended School Three at the time, only 29 chose to leave. More than 85% of the students and their parents chose to remain in a school the state deemed to be ineffective. It appears that the families who remained made a good choice. In 2006 this school did make AYP.

The Forum on Educational Accountability (FEA, 2007), which includes the National Education Association and the National School Boards Association, agrees that drastic changes are needed in the No Child Left Behind legislation, to include less reliance on tests and penalties and more emphasis on teacher training and parent involvement. In its introduction the FEA discusses a need to shift the law's emphasis from applying sanctions for failing to raise test scores to holding states and localities accountable for making systemic changes that improve student achievement. The FEA goes on to say that schools should have the ability to embrace good teaching and learning and not exist simply to avoid negative sanctions.
Recommendations for Further Study

Additional research opportunities became apparent at the conclusion of this study. This study was limited to three large Pennsylvania middle schools (each with 500-600 students) with sizable numbers of poor and minority students. Two of the three schools are Title I schools and the other is not. The survey instruments utilized, *Dimensions of Excellence Scale Surveys* for students, parents, and school staff used a closed-end Likert scale with five possible responses. Students, parents, and teachers participated in the survey. The original survey, in its entirety, was given to all survey participants, with most participants needing 20-40 minutes to complete the survey.

Future researchers may wish to expand upon this study to further contribute to the expansive field of education:

1. Further research in the area of school effectiveness should be conducted utilizing qualitative measures to better identify discrepancies in perceived effectiveness by students, parents, and teachers. This researcher elicited closed-end responses from the participants. A qualitative study would permit a deeper understanding of how and why the discrepancies exist.

2. Further research should be conducted utilizing an instrument other than the *Dimensions of Excellence Scale Survey Instrument* to determine perceived effectiveness of the stakeholders. Other instruments available include the *Connecticut School Effectiveness Interview and Questionnaire* developed by the
3. Further research should include other vested stakeholders in the school community such as central office administrators, the school board, and community members. These stakeholders are not based within the schools but are responsible for the policy implementation and financial support of the schools.

4. Research of perceived school effectiveness should be conducted in schools outside of Pennsylvania.

5. Further research could compare similar schools located in different school districts. A limitation of this study is that all three schools are located within the same school district.

6. Research could be conducted at the elementary and/or high school levels utilizing the same Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey to determine stakeholder perceptions of school effectiveness for younger and older students.

7. Future research could use an abridged version of the Dimensions of Excellence Scales Survey. In this research study students, parents, and teachers completed the survey in its entirety, with most participants requiring 20-40 minutes to complete the survey.

8. Future researchers could survey one stakeholder group from two or more schools. This researcher surveyed three stakeholder groups: students, parents, and teachers.
Recommendations for Practice

Additional recommendations for practice were found as a result of this study. The federal government, state, and district should value the perceptions of the building level stakeholders and those perceptions should play a major role in the state's overall assessment of the school.

The following recommendations for practice are suggested:

1. Congress should consider making changes to the existing No Child Left Behind legislation. It currently requires states to use a single assessment to determine the effectiveness of a school. Schools deemed ineffective based on this assessment receive sanctions that range from a warning to the state taking control of the school. Students, parents, and teachers are the stakeholders who are physically in the buildings and are able to give a strong indication of the effectiveness of the school. Giving these stakeholders a voice in determining the effectiveness of their school is critical. The current accountability measures should be expanded upon, not replaced, by including these stakeholders in the determination.

2. The changes to the NCLB legislation should also compare students' performance to their own individual previous performance. Currently the performance of each grade level assessed is compared to the previous year's same grade level. For example, the eighth grade performance in 2006 is compared to the eighth grade performance in 2005. Students should be compared only to themselves to determine if the student is making academic achievement gains.

3. The state and district must continue to lobby in an effort to overhaul the No Child Left Behind accountability system. It is necessary for a rigorous system to be in place,
however, it must include the perceptions of the students, parents, and teachers in the school.

4. The school district should further investigate the statistically significant discrepancies in the perceived effectiveness of each of the schools as rated by the students, parents, and teachers by soliciting more conclusive information from them to determine what is happening within each of the schools. The one school that was rated most effective by the state was not rated most effective in any of the 20 domains as reported by the students, parents, and teachers.

5. The district should determine why the parental involvement domain received the lowest overall effectiveness score by parents and teachers. Effective schools must have parents effectively involved. Nearly every researcher in the literature review, found in chapter two, notes the importance of parental involvement in improving the performance of schools.

6. The district should conduct a future study with the same groups of stakeholders utilizing open-ended questions to gain a greater understanding of perceptions, discrepancies, weaknesses, and strengths. For example, in domain seven, staff development, the teachers from each of the schools perceive the mean effectiveness as follows:

   School One  3.704
   School Two  2.895
   School Three  3.831

By utilizing open-ended questions the district can gain a better understanding of why the teachers in schools one and three rate the effectiveness
of their school much higher than the teachers in school number two. The
difference between the scores from school one and school two is statistically
significant as is the differences in scores between school two and school three.
School two, according to the state, is the most effective school by measure of its
success on the PSSA.

7. The district should implement a Director of School Effectiveness, whose
major responsibilities would include working with students, parents, and teachers
to improve the perceived effectiveness of the schools, conducting the research
needed to determine perceived differences in schools, implementing needed
change based on the perceptions, and leading a district-wide parent involvement
council to utilize best practices to involve parents at the building and district
levels.

8. The district should administer the survey to elementary and high school students,
parents, and teachers to gather their perceptions of the effectiveness of their
schools. The district elementary schools are feeders to the middle school. The
elementary school that a student attends determines the middle school the student
will attend. The district could determine if patterns of perception occur through
the feeder system.


National Middle School Association (2003). This we believe: successful schools for young adolescents. Westerville, OH.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL, 1996). Bibliography on assessment: Factors that influence achievement. The Test Center. Portland, OR.
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SCHOOL DISTRICT APPROVAL LETTER
November 3, 2000

Teresa Lee-Brobell
via Dr. Martin Finkstein
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079

Dear Teresa:

I have received your request to conduct your research that
the 3rd grade students, 6th grade students, and teachers. Please know the permission has been granted to
understand your study. I look forward to reviewing the results of your study.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Conto
Superintendent of Schools
RWC/oh
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO STUDENTS
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY

Letter of Solicitation to Students

January 2, 2007

to our Eighth Grade,

My name is Teresa Lee Hamilton and I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University.

I am conducting a research study as a requirement to earn my degree. The Title of the study is "School Effectiveness in Three Public Schools Within a Pennsylvania School District: Identifying Effective Practices." I am writing to you because I believe that your school is an integral part of this research.

The survey involves completing the "School Effectiveness Questionnaire," which takes about 10 minutes to complete. You are not required to participate in the study, but if you do decide to participate, you can stop at any time. The survey is voluntary and will be kept confidential. The survey will not affect your grade in any way.

If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact me or your parents. I have included my contact information below.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mary Harris, International Research Chairperson
Seton Hall University
600 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.317.6144
E-mail: mharries@shu.edu

Teresa Lee Hamilton
Research Assistant
I am hopeful that your parents will permit you to participate in this study. If you will participate I must have your parent's written permission. Your parent should sign the LETTER OF SOLICITATION FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION, which is enclosed. Please place the signed form in the white envelope provided. You should return it to your advisor no later by Houston, January 9, 1981.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Tessa R. Ford
Office Manager
Sewanee University
Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy
400 South College Avenue
Sewanee, Tennessee, 37383
931.272.3950

Sewanee University
Institutional Review Board

[Signature]

[Date]
APPENDIX C

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO STUDENTS AT SCHOOL THREE
Dear Eighth Graders,

My name is William Bailey and I am writing to you on behalf of Mrs. Powell, the school principal at [redacted] School. Mrs. Powell is conducting a study to determine how you feel about your school. This survey consists of 44 questions about how you feel about your school. It should take about 20 minutes or less to complete.

You are not required to participate in this survey. If you do not wish to participate, you may stop participating at any time, even if you have already started completing the survey. You may choose to stop participating at any time, even if you have already started completing the survey.

No personal information will be shared with you. All surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet for three years after the survey is completed, and no personal information will be shared with you. The surveys will be used to improve your school experience.

If you have any questions about this study, your parents may direct your questions to

[Signature]

[Date]
Dr. Mary Rezick, Institutional Review Board Chairperson
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973-925-1014

I am hopeful that you will choose to participate in this study. To do so, you or your parent must give written permission. If they do not give permission, they should sign the LETTER OF INCONSENT FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION, which is enclosed. Your parent should place the signed form in the white envelope provided. You should return the sealed envelope to your advisor teacher with "William Bailey" written on the outside of the envelope by Monday, January 8, 2007. I will personally retrieve the substitution form back.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William V. Bailey, III

to Dr. Martin Finkelstein

Seton Hall University

Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy

400 South Orange Avenue

South Orange, New Jersey 07079

973-925-2056

[Stamp: 11/17/17]

Agreement Date

Expiration Date

12/31/178
APPENDIX D

PARENT PERMISSION FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION
Parent Permission for Student Participation

January 3, 2007

I give permission for my eighth grade student to participate in the research study of Teresa Lee Powell, professor of science at Sam Hall University. I have received the Letter of Solicitation to Parents for Student Participation.

I understand that a 64 question survey will be completed by my daughter on her perceptions of middle school.

I understand that participation is voluntary and that the data may discriminate participating at any time without penalty.

I understand that the survey is anonymous and strictly confidential.

I understand that the survey will be locked in a cabinet in the home of Teresa Lee Powell for a period of three years following the study.

I understand that Sam Hall University has reviewed and approved this study.

[Signatures]

_________ __________________________
Name of Student Date

_________ __________________________
Parent Signature Date

Sam Hall University

Research Review Board

3/13/2007

Research Date

[Signatures]
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO PARENTS AT SCHOOL THREE FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION
Dear Parent/Guardian of an Eighth Grader,

My name is Walter L. Bowler and I am applying to a school called "Financial University."

I am writing to inform you of a study that a student named "Jason" and I are conducting. The study is focused on understanding the challenges faced by students in our school.

I am asking you to consider participating in this study. By participating, you will be helping us gain valuable insights into the factors that influence student success. Your feedback will be used to improve the learning environment for all students.

The study will be conducted online and will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary, and your responses will be treated confidentially. Your child's identity will not be disclosed.

If you have any questions about the study or would like to participate, please contact me at 555-1234 or email me at walter.bowler@financialuniversity.edu.

Thank you for considering this opportunity.

Sincerely,
Walter L. Bowler

[Signature]
Dr. Mary Rutisha, Institutional Review Board Chairperson,
Tumen Hall University
402 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.336.8334

I am hoping that you will choose to permit your son/daughter to participate in this study. If you will give permission, please sign the LETTER OF INVITATION FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION, which is enclosed. Please place the signed letter in the white envelope provided. You or your child should return the sealed envelope in the white envelope enclosed with "William Briley written on it and the envelope by Monday, January 6, 2005. I will personally retrieve the information from you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William W. Berg
Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.275.3586
APPENDIX F

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO PARENTS FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION
Letter of Solicitation To Parents for Student Participation

January 2, 2007

Dear Parent (Name of student):

My name is TrishaLee Powell, and I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University. I am conducting a research study on the experiences and needs of parents with students who have special needs. The purpose of this study is not only to better understand the experiences of parents but also to provide recommendations for improvement. The study involves a survey and an interview, and it is voluntary. Participation is not required to be part of the research.

If your child does not wish to participate, please inform us upon receipt of this letter. There are no personal benefits from his/her involvement. We are committed to ensuring the privacy and confidentiality of the data collected.

Your child may choose not to participate at any time, even if he/she stated, Completing the survey is voluntary.

No identifiable data will be shared with any other organization without your approval.

The survey will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after the study.

Because I am a student at Seton Hall University, I am required to get the University’s approval before beginning the study. Seton Hall University has given its approval.

If you have any questions about my study, you may direct them to:

Solicitation Date: 1/2/2007

Sincerely,

TrishaLee Powell
Doctoral Student
Dr. Mary Rozicka, Institutional Review Board Chairperson
Clore Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.313.3114

I am hopeful that you will choose to permit your son/daughter to participate in this study.
In order to give permission, please sign the PARENT PERMISSION FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION, which is enclosed. Please place this signed form in the white envelope provided. Your child should return the envelope to the math office by Wednesday, January 19, 2007.

Sincerely,

Teresa Lee Freehill
Dr. Martin Pulaski
Clore Hall University
Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy
and South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.313.3114
APPENDIX G

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO PARENTS FOR PARENT PARTICIPATION
Letter of Solicitation To Parents for Parent Participation

January 2, 2001

Dear Parent/Guardian,

My name is Tcesta Lee Powell and I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University.

I am conducting a research study as a requirement to earn my degree. The title of the study is "School Effectiveness in Three Middle Schools Within a Pennsylvania School District Designated as 'Making Progress'."

I am asking that you participate in my study. You would complete a survey called "Dimension of Excellence Parent Scale Survey. This survey contains 71 statements about your opinion of your child's school. This should take about 20 minutes or less to complete.

You are not required to be part of the research. If you do not wish to participate, that is perfectly fine. Your child will not lose anything because it is entitled to have. There are no expected personal benefits from your involvement. When all of the surveys are compiled and reviewed, we should be able to see how parents feel about their child's school.

You may choose to stop participating at any time, even if you started. Completing the entire survey is voluntary.

No one other than my professor and will see the results of the survey. You will complete the survey anonymously and I will not be able to determine which survey belongs to you.

The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet for three years after I finish the study.

Because I am a student at Seton Hall, I am required by the University's approval before beginning this study. Seton Hall University has given its approval.

If you have any questions about this study, you may direct your questions to:

Dr. Alphonse S. De Vito
Chairman, Educational Policy
Seton Hall University
40 University
South Orange, New Jersey 07079

Sincerely,

Seton Hall University
Dr. Mary Regina, Qualitative Research Chairperson
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.313.6141

I hope that you will choose to participate in this study. If you feel any discomfort, please contact the researcher. Your participation will be held in confidence and your responses will not be connected to your identity. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[ICP, Title, e-mail, and phone number]

Seton Hall University
Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.313.6141
APPENDIX H

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO PARENTS AT SCHOOL THREE
Letter of Solicitation To Parents of School Eighth Graders
for Student Participation

January 2, 2007

Dear Parent/Guardian of an Eighth Grader,

My name is William Bailey and I am assisting Teresa Lee Powell, a doctoral student at Seton Hall University, with conducting a research study. Mrs. Powell is Principal of your eighth grade school. I am assisting Mrs. Powell so that there is no conflict of interest if you decide to have your child participate.

Mrs. Powell is conducting this research study as a requirement to earn her degree. The Title of the study is School Effectiveness in Three Middle Schools Within a Pennsylvania School District Framed as a Master's Project.

I am asking that you give permission for your eighth grade student to participate in this research. She would complete a survey entitled Dimensions of Excellence Student Self Survey. This survey contains 44 statements about how students feel about their school. This should take about 20 minutes to complete.

Your child is not required to be part of the research. If your child does not wish to participate she can do the survey. It is voluntary.

There are no expected personal benefits from her involvement. When all of the surveys are completed and reviewed we should be able to see how students feel about their school.

Your child may choose to stop participating at any time, even if she has started. Completing the survey is voluntary.

No one other than Mrs. Powell, her professor and me will see the results of the survey. Your child will complete the survey anonymously and Mrs. Powell will not be able to determine which survey belongs to your child.

The surveys will be kept in a locked cabinet for three years after Mrs. Powell finishes her study.

Because she is a student at Seton Hall, Mrs. Powell is required to get the University's approval before beginning this study. Seton Hall University has given its approval.

If you have any questions about this solicitation, you may contact me at William Bailey via email at william.bailey@setonhall.edu.

Sincerely,

William Bailey
Dr. Marry Rozika, Institutional Review Board Chairperson
Saint Peter University
360 Smith Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.319.6114

I am hopeful that you will choose to participate in this study. To do so, you may simply complete the survey and place it in the mail-in envelope that has been provided and return it to your child's school. Your or your child should return the sealed envelope to the box in the Main Office by Friday, January 12, 2007. I will personally retrieve the information from there.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William W. Delo, III
City Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.
Saint Peter University
Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy
360 Smith Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.275.2056

Saint Peter University

[Stamp] Date: 12/5/06

[Stamp] Date: 12/5/06
APPENDIX I

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO TEACHERS
Dear Teacher,

My name is Teresa Lee Powell and I am a doctoral student at Seton Hall University in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision. I am conducting a research study on the effectiveness of Three-Mile Youth School District's Middle and Elementary Schools. The purpose of this study is to determine the effectiveness of Three-Mile Youth School District's Middle and Elementary Schools.

I am asking that you participate in this research. Your participation would include completing the Questionnaire of Excellence. The survey is an anonymous survey containing 20 questions about the effectiveness of the school's overall program. Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary. Your refusal to participate does not involve any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. There are no rewards or benefits for your involvement; however, it is important to include the field of education in offering an increased understanding of how teachers perceive the effectiveness of their school.

You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty. Participation in this survey is voluntary and could be withdrawn at any time. It will take approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey.

All information received from surveys will be kept strictly confidential.

All data will be kept in a locked cabinet in the researcher's home for a period of time following the study.

The project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subject Research. If you have questions about the purpose of this study, please contact:

Mary Ruggles, Institutional Review Board Coordinator
Seton Hall University
600 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973-596-5314

Seton Hall University
Office of Institutional Research

Thank you for your participation in this important study.
I am hopeful that you will choose to participate by completing the staff survey. To participate simply complete the survey and return it in the envelope provided. The envelope should be returned to the market box in the Main Office of your school by Friday, January 12, 2002.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Teresa L. Peters
Chair, Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy

400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.275.2026

[Signature]

Teresa L. Peters
Chair, Department of Educational Leadership, Management & Policy

400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.275.2026
APPENDIX J

LETTER OF SOLICITATION TO TEACHERS AT SCHOOL THREE
Letter to the Teachers of 

January 3, 2007

Dear Teachers,

My name is William Shady and I am working for Dr. John Powell, a doctoral student at State University, investigating a research study. Dr. Powell is Principal of your school, School. I am assisting Dr. Powell in that there is no conflict of interest if you decide to participate in this study.

Mrs. Powell is a doctoral student at State University in the Department of Education, Administration, and Supervision. She is conducting a research study as a requirement to earn her degree. The purpose of this study is to determine School Effectiveness in Three Middle Schools Within a Pennsylvania School District Designed to Making Progress.

I am asking you to participate in this research. Your participation would include completing the Dimensions of Excellence School Staff Survey, consisting of 100 questions about the effectiveness of the school in which you teach. Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary. Your refusal to participate does not affect any present or future benefits to which you are entitled. There are no expected personal benefits for your participation, however, it is expected to benefit the field of education in offering increased understanding of how schools perceive the effectiveness of their school.

You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty. Participation in the research is voluntary and could be withdrawn at any time. It would take approximately 30 minutes to complete the survey.

All information gathered through surveys will be kept safe and confidential.

No one other than Dr. Powell, her graduate advisor, and her will see the results of the survey. You will complete the survey anonymously and Dr. Powell will not be able to determine which survey belongs to you.

All data will be kept in a locked cabinet in the research office for a period of time after the study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Position]

[Institution]
This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subject Research. If you have questions about this study, you may direct them to:

Mary Rose Jr., Institutional Review Board Chairperson
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.766.6148

I hope you will feel comfortable participating in this study. To participate, you need only complete the survey and email it to the person listed above. If you participate, a survey will be sent to you. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete, and it will be completed in the MailChimp by January 12, 2021. I will personally check your surveys before the deadline.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William W. Bailey, III
c/o Dr. Martin Faircloth
Seton Hall University
Department of Educational Leadership, Management, & Policy
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
973.766.2766

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

[Signature]

[Date: 1/10/2021]
APPENDIX K

DIMENSIONS OF EXCELLENCE SCALE SURVEYS FOR STUDENTS
Dimensions of Excellence Scales

STUDENT SURVEY

Russell A. Basowicz
Frances E. Beyer

Research for Better Schools
166 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
1. My school is a safe and open place.
2. My school has plenty of room for work.
3. Most of the students in my grade don't like to cause trouble.
4. I learn the same way as other students in my class.
5. I am treated fairly by my principal and vice principal.
6. The teachers don't take my school and its interests in what we do in my school.
7. The principal and vice principal are friendly and interested in what I am doing.
8. I like coming to school each day.
9. I get along well with the other students in my class.
10. The teachers are friendly and interested in what I am doing.
11. The teachers feel that my ideas are important.
12. The teachers try to understand how I feel things.
13. I am not afraid to ask teachers for help.
14. I am not afraid to ask the principal and vice principal for help.
15. I get help from teachers when I ask for it.
16. I go to the principal and vice principal when they ask for it.
17. The teachers expect me to get good grades.
18. I am proud of my school.
### TEACHER INSTRUCTION DIMENSION

Note: This appendix refers to the behavior of teachers. Please give your opinion about the teachers in your school. For each item, choose the answer that best reflects your opinion or experience.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. You take good care of the things that belong to my school, like books, desks, and lockers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I see the principal and the principal in photos like the hallways, classrooms, and in my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The principal and the principal often help me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Scale:
- 1: Never
- 2: Occasionally
- 3: Sometimes
- 4: Frequently
- 5: Always
### III. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT DIMENSION

The following statements refer to the monitoring and assessment of students. Please check each of these statements, rank and describe the extent to which they hold true at your school. Percentages in bold are Interim Achievement Levels set by the California Achievement Test but may be different. For each item choose the answer that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. The teachers are fair in grading all students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The teachers give us homework and check it regularly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The lessons keep me busy throughout the entire session.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION

The items in this section refer to student behavior and discipline practices. Please check each item, and describe in what you view student discipline and behavior in your school. For each item choose the answer that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42. Few students talk out loud in class.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The class is usually quiet. Making it noisy is wrong.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. There are many after-school activities in which I can participate.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

DIMENSIONS OF EXCELLENCE SCALE SURVEYS FOR PARENTS
Dimensions of Excellence Scales

PARENT SURVEY

Russell A. Duweicz
Francisco S. Beyer

Research for Better Schools
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
Dimensions of Excellence Scales
PARENT SURVEY

1. SCHOOL CLIMATE DIMENSION

The following statements could be used to characterize school climate for any given school. Read each of the statements below and indicate the extent to which it is true of your school. For each statement choose the answer that best matches your opinion or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The school motivates students to learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school gives honor, awards, and other forms of recognition to students for academic achievement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disagreements are fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students generally take care of and respect their own property and that of other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The school has high expectations for student academic achievement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The school has high expectations for student achievement in non-academic areas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers and students are proud of their school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The school has a high rate of student absenteeism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The school has attractive, safe, clean facilities with adequate workspace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Buildings and grounds are in good repair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is good communication between parents and school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students are willing to approach teachers for advice or help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The principal seeks an active involvement in the well-being of both teachers and students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The community is involved in an ongoing process of describing, establishing, and reviewing values and goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LEADERSHIP DIMENSION

Items in this section refer to the behavior of school-level leaders (principals, assistant principals, etc.), and other school members with leadership responsibilities. Please select the option that best matches your opinion or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Briefed News</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Consensus</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. TEACHER BEHAVIOR ENHANCEMENT

Please give your opinion about the teachers in your school. For each item, choose the answer most appropriate to your opinion or observations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Make sure that all course content is covered and thoroughly taught. (Course content adequately covered.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Give students clear and realistic assignments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Assign and grade homework regularly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Design and conduct lessons that utilize a variety of skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Monitor student progress in a variety of ways including small group questioning, class notes, curriculum maps, peer evaluation, or teacher evaluation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Make students understand the importance of effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Use students' work as an indication of their performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Ensure that students understand the relative value of grades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Provide opportunities to learn when necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Give students feedback on their work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Communicate with parents about what is going on in the classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Encourage students to work in groups and individually.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Are well trained and knowledgeable in the subject they teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


IV. CURRICULUM AND DIMENSION

For each line in this section, keep in mind the current curriculum and the way it is implemented. The primary focus is on academic areas with a secondary focus on the arts, personal development, etc. For each statement choose the answer that best reflects your opinion or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The school curriculum includes learning experiences that emphasize student knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>The school curriculum includes learning experiences that involve students' appreciation of the arts and culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>The school curriculum includes learning experiences that involve students' ability to function effectively in society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>The capstone or the school's course is model and up-to-date.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Course materials (e.g., textbooks and equipment) are organized and up-to-date.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT DIMENSION

The following statements refer to the monitoring and assessment of students. Read each of the statements below and determine the extent to which it is a part of your program. Please keep in mind that "effective" includes not only standard achievement tests but also self-assessment, self-evaluation, performance checklists, and other criteria. For each statement choose the answer that best reflects your opinion or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Assessment materials and grading policies are clearly understood by all students, teachers, and parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Students are given prompt and regular feedback on their progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>The reports are communicated promptly and accurately to parents and other community members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Testing procedures of all students in the school are consistent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 49. The school provides the student with adequate and consistent guidance and counseling services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50. Teachers use a variety of methods to assess student progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 51. Teachers use written reports to determine student evaluation criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### VI. STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION

The term 'discipline' refers to overall behavioral and discipline practices. As you answer each item, keep in mind how you view student discipline and behavior in your school. For each item, choose the answer that best matches your opinion or experience.

### 52. The disciplinary policy is clearly explained and fully understood by students, parents, and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 53. The disciplinary policy is consistently enforced by staff, students, and parents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 54. The school implements a student discipline program involving both behavioral and discipline problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 55. The school's disciplinary policy is designed to teach and reward well-behaved students rather than to identify and punish the few.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 56. The school's policies address student behavior and discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 57. The school supports the development of discipline in students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 58. Teachers consistently use and maintain behavior contracts and discipline plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 59. The school has an orderly, well-disciplined atmosphere that is free from student disruption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/Program</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Actual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION

For each item in this section, keep in mind the broad set of activities you are asking to include not only school-wide service days, but also specialty professional development activities (such as summer workshops) sponsored by your school system. For each item, choose the label that best matches your opinion or experience.

| Item | Rating | Extent | Significance | Frequency | Intensity | Answer
|------|--------|--------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------
| 60.  | 1 1 3 4 5 | The staff development program is designed to support the school district and school priorities, particularly new improvement efforts. |
| 61.  | 1 2 3 4 5 | The school district offers summer staff development opportunities for professional growth and development. |
| 62.  | 1 2 3 4 5 | As a result of staff development, significant improvements have been made in the school. |

### VII. PARENT INVOLVEMENT DIMENSION

As you answer each item in this section, keep in mind the perceived involvement activities at your school. For each item, choose the label that best matches your opinion or experience.

| Item | Rating | Extent | Significance | Frequency | Intensity | Answer
|------|--------|--------|--------------|-----------|----------|--------
<p>| 63.  | 1 2 3 4 5 | The school actively communicates with families. |
| 64.  | 1 2 3 4 5 | The school takes a variety of methods to communicate with parents, such as newsletters, parent advisory groups, PTA/PTO, etc. |
| 65.  | 1 2 3 4 5 | The school offers activities to match parent needs and interests. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. Pupils in upper elementary classrooms participate in enriched learning activities as instructed by teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Support for learning includes or reorganizes classroom learning and extends by teachers for parents and students to carry out at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. The school bolsters parents by providing written letters for the expectation of learning to school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. A majority of parents participate in program and program activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Most parents grow in a place for their children to study at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. The school establishes written relationships with parents and communities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SCHOOLS CLIMATE SURVEY

The following statements could be used to characterize school climate for any given school. Read each of the statements below and determine the extent to which it holds true of your school. For each statement choose the response that best matches your reaction or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching staff and students feel that they communicate well with the principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The school has an academic emphasis that believes that all children can learn and meet the school's educational goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students are respected regardless of their academic achievement levels.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The school uses participatory management and problem-solving techniques in making decisions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The school has an open, inclusive atmosphere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is good communication between parents and school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The school has effective, safe, clean facilities with adequate workspaces.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The school motivates students to learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The school has a consistent, widely shared norm-belief value system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The principal has a high level of visibility.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Both teachers and students respect each other with respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The principal takes an active interest in the well-being of both teachers and students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The school has a principal who provides leadership to climate improvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students generally take care of and respect their own property and that of other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. The school has good teacher morale.
16. Students are willing to visit teachers during class for advice or help.
17. The school has a high proportion of students who speak positively about school experience.
18. Buildings and grounds are in good repair.
19. The school has a high rate of student attendance.
20. The school has a high rate of staff attendance.
21. The school has a staff who believe they are able to help all students learn and take responsibility for learning outcomes.
22. Disciplinary problems are few.
23. The school has high expectations for students' academic achievement.
24. The school has high expectations for student achievement in extracurricular activities.
25. The school has high expectations for pupils.
26. Teachers work closely together on common problems.
27. Shared responsibility is assumed by student, faculty, administration, and parents for the achievement of school goals.
28. The school has a system of assessment that is open, regular, and repeatable.
29. The assessment community is involved in an ongoing process of developing, evaluating, and reviewing core and goals.
30. The school has shared expectations and responsibility for disciplinary policies and procedures.
31. The school gives teachers awards and other forms of recognition to students for academic achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Ability Identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

- **34.** Establish and communicate clear, relevant, and achievable goals for the school.
- **35.** Monitor the implementation of school goals.
- **36.** Involves schoolwide programs to motivate educational efforts.
- **37.** Obtain staff commitment to schoolwide improvement efforts.
- **38.** Encourage student and community input and suggestions to improve the educational program of the school.
- **39.** Obtain and use relevant data to influence decision-making.
- **40.** Involve staff in program planning and decision-making.
- **41.** Engage in self-assessment and continuous improvement efforts.
- **42.** Emphasize consistent, open, and comprehensive implementation of improvement efforts.
- **43.** Recognize and reward teacher and student accomplishments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL LEADERS...</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Accept a model for staff and parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Coordinate communication throug...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Direct the instructional program...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Attend to both organizational needs...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Give constructive feedback to staff performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Assist staff achieving high standards of performance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Acknowledge the value of staff contributions to the school's educational program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Encourage staff to apply the research on sound and effective teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Promptly resolve problems and conflicts fairly and consistently.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Involve staff in establishing and enforcing student discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Maintain discipline.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Hold high achievement expectations for all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Meet student academic progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Implement appropriate student placement (e.g., on each student educational program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Use appropriate curriculum and other outcome measures for planning purposes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Use the results of program and staff evaluation to help staff improve their teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Ensure efficient operation of the school and maintenance of its facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Involve parents in the community about student progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL LEARNERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Annual Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. TEACHER BEHAVIOR DIMENSION

Sort in this position order to the behavior of teacher. If you are a teacher, please respond solely on your own behalf. If you are not a teacher, please give your opinions about the teachers in your school. Pick each item, choose the answer that best matches your opinion or priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Annual Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n
72. Provide appropriate assessment, matched to specific learning needs, when necessary.

73. Maintain a comprehensive, accurate, up-to-date knowledge of the subjects taught and relevant materials.

1. Make sure that all core content is covered, assuring mastery by the majority of students. (Core = basic, assessed content.)

78. Give positive feedback to every student.

79. Actively involve students in establishing and maintaining a student-centered climate.

87. From day to day and week to week, have lesson plans and materials ready when they are needed.

79. Develop curriculum materials (e.g., for enrichment or remediation).

86. Have the classroom arrangement and displays arranged to encourage learning without distractions.

81.Give students both structured and self-determined assignments.

82. Communicate and model clear rules and procedures for what students can and cannot do in the classroom.

83. State lesson objectives in ways students understand.

84. Help to make connections between what students are learning and what they already know.

85. Devise and use methods of assessment covering a range of problem-solving skills (e.g., identify, classify, judge, predict).

86. Relate new content to students existing knowledge of previous experience.

87. Tell students when they are wrong without humiliating them.

88. Present lesson content by demonstration, modeling, and explanation.
TEACHERS:

89. Use various kinds of rewards and praise for student success.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

90. Help students complete by a deadline before it begins.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

91. Give various levels of practice assignments.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

12. Devise goals at the beginning of the year, meeting institution, curriculum, and assessment to the needs of students to be taught.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

93. Design and conduct lessons so that students utilize a full range of skills, particularly higher order critical thinking skills like analyzing, synthesizing, and completing.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

14. Create student understanding throughout each lesson.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

95. Provide opportunities for students to work in areas of individual strengths.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

96. Measure student progress in a variety of ways, including critical-thinking, quick thinking, and how much the student is able to maintain student work.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

97. Very unimportant --- using culling and minimal interactive student, and sharing and challenging activities to improve skills and to develop a range of thinking skills.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

IV. CURRICULUM DIMENSION

For each unit in this approach, keep in mind the curriculum used in your school and the way in which it is managed. The program focuses on academic skills with a primary focus on the arts, physical education, etc. If each approach chosen here does not deal with all your options or experiences.

99. For each subject, review a 12-month-15-step sequence of core objectives.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

20. Complete and analyze relationships among the state education department and included in the curriculum.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
100. The curriculum provides for articulation among subject areas and for the integration of certain key ideas of content in a critical way.

101. Preparatory curriculum content is coordinated.

102. Curriculum objectives and outcomes are reviewed, revised, and updated periodically with revisions implemented by teachers.

103. Staff development and performance assessment are planned and implemented through comprehensive use of curriculum materials.

104. Curriculum resources and materials support students' understanding, skills, and appreciation of themselves and others.

105. Curriculum includes spiraling experiences that help students master key skills necessary to function effectively in our society.

106. Curriculum provides a range of learning opportunities, with learning activities reflected in the relative emphasis of subject areas.

107. For each subject area, there is articulation between grade levels, so that teachers in the same topic area are taught to a given grade.

108. Competencies and objectives obtained by the district are included in the curriculum.

109. Curriculum guidelines are established to ensure appropriate duration and frequency of instruction.

110. Curriculum includes use of textbooks and related materials that have been well thought out and systematically matched.

111. Guidelines and/or materials are available to help teachers with equipment, remediation, or acceleration.

112. For each subject area, at each grade level, there is a close match among curricular, instructional, and evaluative goals, and established student achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT DIMENSION

The following statements refer to the monitoring and establishment of student, school, school district, and statewide patterns. Please select Yes, No, Sometimes, or Frequently and check the appropriate box. For each item, choose the option that best matches your opinion or experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>Almost Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
137 Teachers are responsive to students’ needs to help in accomplishing goal results.
138 Teachers receive input from parents and the community on the quality of student learning and performance.
139 The purposes of testing are clearly understood by teachers.
140 The interpretation and use of test results are often misunderstood by teachers.
141 Test information is made available to teachers when it is needed for various instructional purposes.
142 Accurate, up-to-date test results are maintained and accessible to teachers.

VI. STUDENT DISCIPLINE AND BEHAVIOR DIMENSION

The items in this section relate to student behavior and disciplinary practices. As you answer with item, keep in mind how you view student discipline and behavior in your school. For which item choose the answer that best reflects your opinion or experience.

143 The school has a disciplinary policy with clearly stated regulations to address student behavior and consequences for rule breaking.
144 The disciplinary policy is consistently and fairly enforced.
145 The disciplinary policy is periodically reviewed by staff, students, and parents.
146 The disciplinary policy is systematically communicated to staff, students, and parents.
147 The school involves the students’ family in solving serious behavioral and disciplinary problems.

1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Rule and disciplinary procedures are designed to teach and reward self-discipline rather than rely on punishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>The school evokes a sense of student belonging and personal responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>The school helps students withstand personal problems that may lead to behavioral problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>The principal provides leadership in coping and managing behavioral problems for both students and staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>The principal systems staff support in disciplinary matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>The principal ensures that teachers who frequently experience disciplinary problems in their classrooms are given appropriate assistance to help resolve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>The school's positive organizational climate helps prevent disciplinary problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>The school has an orderly, business-like atmosphere free from student disruption.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Teachers formally communicate their expectations and rules of discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Teachers hold students accountable for their behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Students are encouraged and expected to take responsibility for their own behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Teachers model acceptable behavior and ensure that students are held accountable to follow.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT DIMENSION**

For each item in this section, keep in mind the interview and staff development activities in which you have participated during the last 12 months. Include not only any school-wide events, but also special professional development activities (such as summer workshops sponsored by your school system). For each item, choose the answer that best matches your criteria of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161. The retirement activities address staff interests or needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162. Objectives or outcomes of activities are clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163. The program reflects a need that the business of education requires (e.g., professional development for all staff).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164. Administrators work with faculty (e.g., departmental, institution, college, and the state department) to enhance career opportunities for professional growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165. Activities are held in comfortable, appropriate facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166. The system recognizes, rewards, and supports performance excellence (e.g., exemplary practices, innovative research).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167. In-service activities provide sufficient and appropriate opportunities for participation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168. Administrative officials support staff development and encourage further part-time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169. When follow-up is needed to carry out plans, help is readily available.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170. Activities are tailored.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171. The program, training, or program provides valuable professional growth opportunities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172. The program is reviewed and reported, using evaluation data and taking into account evolving needs of the staff and school system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173. As a result of in-service activities, specific changes in the curriculum and methods.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174. Assessments link age appraisal with curriculum and instruction, and with teacher evaluation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175. Actively use valid assessment times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176. Use assessed activities to provide useful information and goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177. Teacher performance in staff professional development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178. The staff development program is designed to support the technical support and appraisal process, particularly new teacher training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179. The assessment materials, etc. match the intended outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180. Participatory self-evaluations (e.g., license criteria, supervision, or required time).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. The range of activities appropriately maps the varying settings and levels of sophistication or complexity, and measures teaching integrity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182. The evaluation strategies are knowledgeable and valid.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183. The staff development program includes various kinds of activities (e.g., summative workshops, self-evaluation, or curriculum development, diagnostic study, editing, and school-based research).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184. As a result of staff development, some staff improvements are made in the schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Plan Until</td>
<td>Mixed Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>The school encourages communication with parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Parents know whether their children are meeting satisfactory standards of meeting the educational goals of the school (e.g., from your child's report cards, and conferences).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>The school involves both parents and teachers in whatever parent participation is available.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>The school provides a way for discovering parent activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>The school facilitates ways for parent involvement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>The school assists parents' efforts and interests of child's activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>The school systematically evaluates the effectiveness of parent participation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>The school uses parent and community members in classroom activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Teachers design specific learning activities that parents and students will carry out in their classrooms/learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>A majority of parents participate in parent involvement activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Most parents profit in parent learning environment at school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Parent participation includes the development and scheduling an encouraging environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>The school evaluates the quality of relationships with parents (e.g., newsletters, parent advisory groups, PTA/PTO, etc.).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>The school provides parents of handicapped children in preschool programs for the education of their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Parents are committed to school goals and expectations and communicate such expectations and support to their children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>The school establishes a good relationship with the parents and the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>