DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 831 UD 027 426

TITLE Project for Secondary School Improvement. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Middle Cities Education Association, Mich.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 23 Nov 88
GRANT G008541040
NOTE 155p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Environment; *Educational Improvement; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Management Development; Models; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; School Effectiveness; Secondary Education; *Secondary Schools; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Schools Projects; *Michigan

ABSTRACT

This two-part report comprises a description of an urban school improvement project in Michigan and the final evaluation report of the project. The Project for Secondary School Improvement was a 3-year program designed to assist secondary schools in 19 Michigan districts in implementing improvement models based on the research on effective schools and effective teaching. The program's first year focused on training five-person teams in a Madeline Hunter model called Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI). During years two and three, the project was split into two strands comprised of 26 school teams that used the School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research model and 11 schools that used an extension of the EEEI model. Services included ten days of training for the schools that selected the Effective Schools model, assisting districts to develop support and plans, and support for all 37 schools. Overall, the program fulfilled its purpose to enhance teaching skills, improve building-level climate factors, increase administrator skills, and encourage the development of district-wide improvement plans. Recommendations for the improvement of administrator training and district-wide policy development are suggested. The following materials are appended: (1) a report on a strategic planning workshop; (2) an executive report submitted by the project director and two consultants; (3) a copy of the effective teaching inventory questionnaire and a statistical tabulation of the responses; (4) a summary of telephone interviews with teachers and principals; (5) a summary of the second-year telephone interviews; and (6) a copy of the inventory of effective schools concepts and the statistical tabulation of the responses. (FMW)

FINAL REPORT

ON

A PROJECT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

COVER SHEET

Grantee Organization:

Middle Cities Education Association
517 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

Grant No.:

G008541040

Project Dates:

Starting Date: 09/01/85
Ending Date: 08/31/88
Number of Months: 36

Project Director:

Michael A. Boulus
Lynn A. Benore (Project Coordinator)
517 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034
Telephone: (517) 355-1720

Fund Program Officer(s):

Charles Thomas

Grant Award:

Year 1:	$ 109,431
Year 2:	115,700
Year 3:	154,769
Total:	$ 379,900

SUMMARY

The Project for Secondary School Improvement was a three-year program designed to assist secondary schools in nineteen urban Michigan districts implement improvement models based upon the research on effective schools and effective teaching. The program's first year focused on training five-person teams in a Madeline Hunter model called Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI). During years two and three, the project was split into two strands: twenty-six (26) school teams chose the model of School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research and eleven (11) schools remained with an extension of the EEEI program entitled EEEI Implementation. Schools that chose the effective schools model were provided ten days of training, over two years, to develop and implement a written school improvement plan. Besides working with teams from those thirty-seven secondary schools, the project also assisted their school districts to develop support and to formulate district improvement plans.

Lynn A. Benore
Project Coordinator
Middle Cities Education Association
517 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034
Phone: (517) 355-1720

"Final Report of Project to Improve Secondary Education"

"Evaluator's Report on The Project to Improve Secondary Education"

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: "A Project to Improve Secondary Education"

Grantee: Middle Cities Education Association
517 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

Contact: Lynn A. Benore
Project Coordinator
(517) 355-1720

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Project for Secondary School Improvement was formulated as a response to a request from Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA) school districts involved in an earlier FIPSE project (1983-1985) which focused on improving leadership capacity of elementary school principals. Middle Cities Education Association is a consortium of 27 urban districts in Michigan committed to cooperative, constructive action to enhance educational services for member districts.

Member district superintendents asked MCEA to extend improvement efforts to teacher-principal teams at the secondary level with two emphases: implementing a Madeline Hunter model training program to improve teacher effectiveness; and implementing a program to enhance the building learning climate. This project was originally intended to provide three years of training and support to sixteen (16) secondary school teams of teachers and building administrators from eight (8) member districts, as well as eight (8) district central office teams. The program was subsequently expanded to include thirty-seven (37) teams from nineteen (19) districts.

At the project's conclusion several of the intended outcomes cited in the original proposal were achieved by some or all of the school teams, including: increased knowledge and understanding of the research on effective schools and effective teaching; understanding and partial, or total, implementation of models of effective teaching and effective schools; development of a cadre of trainers to present the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction at local sites; increased knowledge and understanding by central office teams of the research on effective teaching, effective schools, and the role of the building principal as instructional leader.

PURPOSE

The Project was developed to address the growing concerns about the effectiveness of public education, especially secondary school education and the teaching/learning needs of urban children. In the last several years there have been

dozens of major studies of schools which focused on the need to greatly improve public K-12 education. A frequent theme suggests that past and present methods of teacher and administrator education contribute to the problems of our schools. At the same time, informed educators also are aware that we now have the research basis for making meaningful and significant improvements in education.

Present programs of in-service education are also open to criticism for frequently being limited and poorly structured. MCEA district representative cited need for training in instructional leadership including: 1) increasing knowledge, understanding, and practice of effective teaching skills; 2) clinical supervision of instruction; and 3) school improvement planning.

BACKGROUND & ORIGINS

The Project for Secondary School Improvement grew out of a long term commitment to improving the quality of education for urban children in the member districts of the Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA).

The present emphasis on school improvement was initiated in June 1981 at a three-day seminar for superintendents focusing on the Effective Schools Research of Ronald Edmonds and Lawrence Lezotte. As a result of that seminar, during the 1981-82 year member district superintendents requested the opportunity to be among the first districts nationally to pilot programs of School Improvement Based Upon Effective Schools Research. Even though the Edmonds research indicated that in the effective school the building administrator plays a critical role as instructional leader, the 1981-82 program did not directly present specific ways to help principals improve in their role. To address this issue, MCEA staff submitted a proposal to FIPSE in the Spring of 1983 to develop a two year program of instructional leadership training for elementary principals.

As the elementary project progressed there was a concern on the part of member district superintendents that an improvement program be initiated at the secondary level. Larry Lezotte, who had worked as a consultant and presenter on the elementary program, indicated that having the entire school improvement team actually present at each workshop would enhance future programs' success. In addition more involvement and communication with central office personnel was perceived as a need. The current FIPSE project plan of action was written to take the above factors into account.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project was designed to meet four educational needs at the secondary building and district levels. They are:

1. The need to enhance the instructional skills' behavior of secondary staffs and principals.
2. The need to enhance the building learning climate factors which are associated with increased achievement.

3. The need to improve the secondary school administrators' capacity to initiate and maintain an instructional skills and school improvement program that will result in increased student achievement.
4. The need for local districts to develop district-wide instructional skills improvement programs, including policies related to this goal, and long-range implementation plans and strategies to support coordinated teacher and school improvement efforts.

To address those needs the Madeline Hunter model of teacher effectiveness training was used during the Project's first year. During the second and third years a training model for school improvement was used based upon the Edmonds and Lezotte research on effective schools.

There were three major parts to the first-year program: instructional skills training for building-level teams; training for district teams in the instructional skills as well as school improvement planning; and training of instructional skills trainers.

During the second and third years there were three program modifications which resulted from our experiences in the first year. One modification gave participating school teams the opportunity to chose from two program strands for the secon and third years. One strand was consistent with the original proposal to move into the Effective Schools Research; the other stand permitted school teams to deepen their understanding and application of the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction. A second modification changed the original proposal plan that called for "Training of Trainers" workshops in the summer of 1986 followed by informal, local meetings during the 1986-87 year and a reconvening of workshops in summer of 1987. MCEA staff decided to hold four (4) weekend workshops during the 1986-87 school year to provide stronger support. The third modification resulted as we reviewed the second year program with Dr. Lezotte, where it was determined that to most appropriately implement the school improvement planning process teams needed to look at areas beyond school climate, and the entire team should be in attendance at each school improvement workshop. The format for the second and third years of the project thus included four parts: continuation of Training of EEEI Trainers group; continuation with district-level teams in programs and support for district planning for improvement; eleven (11) building-level teams involved in the EEEI Implementation Strand; and twenty-six (26) building-level teams involved in the School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research Strand.

For the twenty-six (26) schools in the program strand based upon Effective Schools Research the project staff developed three parallel workshop groups (Effective Schools Strand: Groups A, B, C), each having approximately seventy participants. Three two-day workshops were held during the 1986-87 school year and two two-day sessions were conducted in the 1987-88 year. The workshops were devoted to having teams: define "effectiveness"

for their buildings; develop school mission statements which are a description of the ideal toward which subsequent improvement efforts should be directed; determine the student performance measures they would use to measure their effectiveness; conduct a disaggregated analysis of student outcomes which tells the school staff how well it is achieving both quality and equity in student performance for various groups of students (i.e., based on racial/ethnic, gender, social class); conduct a faculty needs assessment survey which indicates the perception of the extent to which the correlates of effective schools are in existence at each building; and develop a three to four year written school improvement plan having at least three improvement objectives that are intended to move them closer to the "ideal" school described in their mission statement. Time was also devoted to helping teams learn how to involve the rest of the faculty and students in the improvement process.

During the project's third year the project staff was able to provide visits by experienced improvement facilitators to all project schools. These two facilitators visited each school team for four half days throughout the year, assisting them with their unique implementation issues.

PROJECT RESULTS:

Both the project evaluator and the project facilitators have provided extensive final reports which detail the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The project extended the knowledge and application of effective schools and effective teaching research to the secondary schools in nineteen (19) urban districts in Michigan, and assisted districts with understanding elements of quality professional development programs, and, to a lesser extent, assisted them in moving toward a district-level improvement planning process which supports the building-level efforts.

MCEA districts have been asked by Michigan State Department of Education representatives to make presentations and the Michigan Education Association (MEA) has asked the project coordinator to be part of a state-wide professional development conference to share implications of school-based improvement models. Project results have been shared through the national network of schools with which Dr Larry Lezotte works to implement effective schools research. MCEA staff members have also begun to work closely with the North Central Association (NCA) which accredits Michigan secondary schools. North Central recently developed an outcomes-based evaluation option and MCEA assisted North Central personnel in demonstrating the close relationship between that option and the Effective Schools Research planning process taught in the FIPSE project.

A strong indicator of ongoing commitment of MCEA districts was the approval of a permanent professional development position on the MCEA staff, funded by Association resources and with superintendents approved the position, requesting emphasis on continuing to expand and update in-service programs focusing on effective schools and effective teaching research.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Project for Secondary School Improvement was a three-year program designed to assist secondary schools in nineteen urban Michigan districts implement improvement models based upon the research on effective schools and effective teaching.

In reviewing the project, staff developed the following conclusions which may be of interest to others considering a similar effort:

1. The project would be strengthened if it primarily focused on either the effective teaching model (EEEI) or the effective schools model (School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research).
2. School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research is a multi-year effort and is most successful when the entire school improvement team is directly involved in the complete training.
3. It is important to give school district leaders a clear understanding of the desirable make-up of the school team prior to training as well as knowledge of the amount of time needed to meet regularly.
4. School improvement teams need on-site assistance from well qualified facilitators to keep them moving forward and to help them overcome obstacles to implementation.
5. It is very important to spend adequate time having schools consider their vision and mission. This underlies all subsequent planning and implementation decisions.
6. Working with schools from many districts across the state presented some problems but it is our impression to perform well among the nineteen districts outweighed the problems associated with such a design.

FINAL REPORT

ON

A PROJECT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

Submitted to:

Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education

Submitted by:

Lynn A. Benore
Project Coordinator
Middle Cities Education Association
517 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034
(517) 355-1720

November 23, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Project for Secondary School Improvement was formulated as a response to a request from many of the Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA) school districts that had been involved in an earlier FIPSE project (1983-1985) which focused on improving leadership capacity of elementary school principals. Middle Cities Education Association is a consortium of 27 urban districts in Michigan which was formed in 1973 out of a common need and committed to cooperative, constructive action to enhance educational services for member districts. All districts are core city districts of their metropolitan areas and, as such, serve many poor children. Middle Cities Education Association is a non-profit corporation affiliated with Michigan State University, and its office is housed in the College of Education at MSU.

Due to the perceived success of the elementary improvement project funded by FIPSE, member district superintendents asked for an opportunity to extend improvement efforts to teacher-principal teams at the secondary level with two emphases: implementing a Madeline Hunter model training program to improve teacher effectiveness; and implementing a program to enhance the building learning climate. This project was funded in September of 1985 and was originally intended to provide three years of training and support to sixteen (16) secondary school teams of teachers and building

administrators from eight (8) member districts, as well as eight (8) district central office teams. The program was subsequently expanded to include thirty-seven (37) teams from nineteen (19) districts. During the first year of the program, building-level teams participated in ten (10) days of in-service in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI), while central office teams participated in five (5) days of training in an overview of the EEEI model as well as training to enhance understanding and support of quality staff development programs.

The second and third years of the program were originally intended to focus on improving school learning climate but that program was modified in two significant ways. First, the program was broadened to include a model entitled School Improvement Based Upon Effective Schools Research using work of Ronald Edmonds and Lawrence Lezotte. School teams received ten (10) days of training (over two years) in that approach to improvement. Second, several schools felt the need for more extended, intensive capacity building in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction and did not feel they could also handle the effort involved in moving into the Effective Schools program; those schools were thus allowed the option of remaining with two additional years of in-service designed to continue training and support for implement the EEEI model more widely.

At the project's conclusion several of the intended outcomes cited in the original proposal were achieved by

some or all of the school teams, including: increased knowledge and understanding of the research on effective schools and effective teaching; understanding and partial, or total, implementation of models of effective teaching and effective schools; development of a cadre of trainers to present the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction at local sites; increased knowledge and understanding by central office teams of the research on effective teaching, effective schools, and the role of the building principal as instructional leader. Two outcomes that were not accomplished include: having districts develop policies and written district improvement plans to support building-level improvement programs; and development of specific district professional development policies.

PURPOSE

The Project was developed to address the growing concerns about the effectiveness of public education, especially secondary school education and the teaching/learning needs of urban children. In the last several years there have been dozens of major studies of schools which focused on the need to greatly improve public K-12 education. A frequent theme suggests that past and present methods of teacher and administrator education contribute to the problems of our schools. At the same time, informed educators also are aware that we now have the research basis for making meaningful and significant improvements in education. Benjamin S. Bloom states:

> A major revolution has taken place during the past decade in educational research and our understanding of some of the factors that directly influence learning in or out of the schools. As a result, student learning can now be improved greatly and it is possible to describe the favorable learning conditions that can enable virtually all students to learn to a high standard.

A major reason for not applying this new research on effective schools and teaching is the time lag between the preservice training of the majority of teachers and administrators and the recent research findings. This conclusion has been supported by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the report, High School: Report on American Secondary Education.

There has also been criticism of pre-service programs offered by colleges and universities. In The Effective Principal, Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield noted there is "rarely little correspondence between formal coursework and on-the-job capability of an administrator." Mortimer Adler's Paideia Proposal argues the same position in relation to pre-service education for teachers.

> Skillfulness is developed best by practice under supervision; that is, by coaching. All the skills of teaching are intellectual skills that can be developed only by coaching, not by lecture courses in pedagogy and teaching methods such as are now taught in most schools or departments of education and are now required for certification.

Present programs of in-service education are also open to criticism for frequently being limited and poorly structured. Even when in-service is available, it is often ineffective in achieving meaningful impact toward

improvement. Within the Middle Cities Education Association districts at the time the project proposal was written (1984-85) the predominant model for delivery of in-service was periodic "one shot" programs with little planned follow-up activities.

To help further define the problem of secondary school improvement within urban districts such as MCEA represents, Middle Cities staff members contacted representatives of high schools and middle schools to discuss their views of in-service needs at the secondary level. These administrators cited need for training in instructional leadership including: 1) increasing knowledge, understanding, and practice of effective teaching skills; 2) clinical supervision of instruction; and 3) school improvement planning. They also felt that involvement of superintendents in the proposed programs would be of benefit to insuring district support. Elementary principals in our previous school improvement program have also cited need for district-level support as an issue. District-level participation would take the form of providing leadership toward school improvement through a school board's primary policy-making function which will give direction, endorsement, and support to the process of change necessary for development of improved building-level performance.

As the project progressed, the perception of the need to be addressed changed in several ways. As the project progressed the project staff recognized even more clearly

the need not only for a long-term commitment to improvement, but also the need to more fully understand and plan for individual school site follow-up in between workshops. This is particularly critical at the secondary school level where the size and structure of the school organization makes it difficult to communicate internally and promote needed faculty involvement to effect significant school-wide changes.

Related to the issue of secondary school organization is the problem of helping participants in the program learn how to function as a team, a task made especially difficult given the isolated nature of the teaching profession. Even when members are able to function well as an important planning team, they may encounter difficulty in persuading and effectively involving other faculty members "outside" the team to join the improvement process. Sometimes those faculty members who were not selected to be team members, and thus directly take part in the FIPSE-sponsored training, were resentful or did not understand the approach. At the same time team members often needed more assistance in clarifying their role in improvement, how to involve others, learning to facilitate and/or delegate responsibilities and powers to the larger faculty rather than trying to have six to ten team members "do it all."

Another clarification of the problem centered around the issue of district level understanding and support of the improvement methods to be used at the building level. The

original proposal recognized this and was developed to include strategies and activities to respond to this concern. The Project, however, had as its central purpose the long-term training of building-level personnel who would then be capable of initiating and sustaining school improvement programs; most project resources and activities focused on that purpose while having as a secondary concern the need to garner more district level efforts.

We underestimated the importance of the need for cohesiveness and a common direction for improvement that may not occur if the district central office personnel are not as deeply committed to, or involved in, improvements district-wide that are consistent with those being undertaken at the building level. The real problem thus becomes how to most effectively bring district-level planning for improvement along at the same time buildings are moving along. A danger with working first at the district level is that school improvement can be perceived as a "top down" mandate; however, when individual schools first become more deeply committed and involved than their central office and school boards there is the problem of lack of support, or the wrong kind of support, due to the absence of a common vision or purpose between the school and the larger district.

BACKGROUND & ORIGINS

The Project for Secondary School Improvement grew out of

a long term commitment to improving the quality of education for urban children in the member districts of the Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA). As stated earlier, MCEA is currently a consortium of twenty-seven (27) urban districts (outside of Detroit) in Michigan, whose purpose is to work together in an effort to positively impact the K-12 education program of urban children. At the time of the project's initiation there were twenty-four (24) member districts. The member districts serve a large proportion of poor and minority students for their area. The organization speaks for nearly 300,000 students and collectively represents the equivalent of the fifth largest district in the country. Member districts include: Albion, Ann Arbor, Battle Creek, Bay City, Beecher (Flint), Benton Harbor, Buena Vista, Flint, Grand Rapids, Highland Park, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Midland, Monroe, Muskegon, Muskegon Heights, Niles, Plymouth-Canton, Pontiac, Port Huron, Saginaw, Southfield, Traverse City, Waterford, Willow Run, and Ypsilanti. Our offices are located in the College of Education at Michigan State University and we are affiliated with the University by action of the Michigan State University Board of Trustees. The MCEA Board of Directors is made up of superintendents from member districts. The MCEA Executive Director is Dr. Michael A. Boulus who serves in that capacity half time and serves on the Michigan State University faculty half time.

Middle Cities Education Association has, since its

inception, sponsored programs designed to help districts more appropriately educate their students. Previous long term programs include development of an elementary reading and mathematics instructional management system and coordination of a five year, federally-sponsored program to develop training activities and materials to encourage migrant parents to become actively involved in their children's education, including packets of materials in Spanish and English entitled, Parents and Children Growing Together and Games to Grow With.

The present emphasis on school improvement was initiated in June 1981 when one of our member district superintendents, Dr. Foster Gibbs of Saginaw, invited all of the superintendents to a three-day seminar to learn more about the Effective Schools Research of Ronald Edmonds and Lawrence Lezotte. At that time Dr. Edmonds had just accepted a position at MSU working with Dr. Lezotte to form a School Improvement Center. As a result of the seminar member district superintendents requested the opportunity to be among the first districts nationally to pilot programs of School Improvement Based Upon Effective Schools Research.

As a result, during the 1981-82 year, five teams (consisting of the superintendent, director of research and evaluation, assistant superintendent for curriculum, a principal, and a teacher) from nineteen (19) districts attended six days of in-service presented by Drs. Edmonds and Lezotte and sponsored by Middle Cities . The purpose of

that series was to gain a greater understanding of the research basis on school effectiveness so that the teams could attempt to implement the findings at one school in their district.

Although that initial six-day series helped some district members have an understanding of the research, first attempts at implementation met with mixed success. A concern which surfaced early was that, even though the Edmonds' research indicated that in the effective school the building administrator plays a critical role as instructional leader, the initial program did not directly present specific ways to help principals improve in their role. To address this issue, MCEA staff submitted a proposal to FIPSE in the Spring of 1983 to develop a two year program of instructional leadership training for elementary principals. That project involved training in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction, in-service on the correlates of effective schools, and development of a school improvement plan. About one fourth of the elementary school principals from seventeen (17) of the member districts were involved in that program between September, 1983 and August, 1985.

As that initial FIPSE project progressed, principals in the program indicated that they felt isolated in terms of their efforts in trying to use this research; they indicated it was often difficult to get the faculty to understand the changes they were trying to accomplish both in their roles

as instructional leaders and in developing and implementing a school-wide improvement plan.

To respond to these concerns, during the second year of the training the project staff was able to involve a "lead" teacher from the schools in training. This gave the principals support and an opportunity to discuss and practice their newly learned effective teaching and clinical supervision skills with a faculty member who understood the training. It also offered somewhat more support to the principal's efforts to develop a school plan based on effective schools research, and the rest of the faculty had the opportunity to learn about the process from a "lead" colleague with whom they could collaborate.

While including a lead teacher improved the elementary project, there was a concern on the part of member district superintendents that an improvement program be initiated at the secondary level. When MCEA first considered this move to the secondary level it was evident from our previous experiences that such change is a slow, difficult process, and best chances for success come through faculty commitment and involvement. Larry Lezotte, who had worked as a consultant and presenter on the elementary program, indicated that having the entire school improvement team actually present at each workshop would enhance future programs' success. In addition, as indicated earlier in this report, more involvement and communication with central office personnel was perceived as a need.

The current FIPSE project plan of action was written to take the above factors into account. Because of the level of intensity of the program, which would include more district-level involvement and six-to ten-person building teams of teachers and administrators, the project staff initially proposed working with one high school and one middle school from each of eight districts. Sending entire teams of building-level personnel to intensive in-service programs over a three-year period was a new approach for nearly all of the member districts. Past programs had involved only individuals who were primarily trying to improve their own leadership skills. This new approach called for a building to become involved and to select a team of people who were to collaboratively involve the entire faculty in changing the school organizaiton. In addition, district-level teams, including superintendents, would be required to attend eight days of in-service the first year alone, with possibilities of further training during the second and third years of the program. The proposal writers made the criteria for MCEA districts' participation the strongest yet generated from our organization.

Even with the more stringent requirements for participation, nineteen (19) of the MCEA districts requested to participate in the current project as compared to eight (8) districts the project was originally designed to accommodate. To respond to this level of interest the

project staff suggested to superintendents that either eight districts be randomly selected for participation or that the entire nineteen districts agree to be assessed a fee to cover the costs associated with more than doubling the program size. Although districts were already expected to pay all travel, lodging and substitute costs for their participants during the project's three years, all nineteen districts opted for the additional fee to expand the program.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project was designed to meet four educational needs at the secondary building and district levels.
As taken from the original proposal, they are:

1. The need to enhance the instructional skills' behavior of secondary staffs and principals.

2. The need to enhance the building learning climate factors which are associated with increased achievement.

3. The need to improve the secondary school administrators' capacity to initiate and maintain an instructional skills and school improvement program that will result in increased student achievement.

4. The need for local districts to develop district-wide instructional skills improvement programs, including policies related to this goal, and long-range implementation plans and strategies to support coordinated teacher and school improvement efforts.

To address those needs the Madeline Hunter model of teacher effectiveness training was used during the Project's first year. During the second and third years a training model

for school improvement was used based upon the Edmonds and Lezotte research on effective schools.

At the beginning of the project superintendents were given an overview of the program and were asked to select one high school and one middle school to participate. In all, thirty-seven (37) schools were selected; one district chose to include only its high school in the program. There were three major parts to the first-year program: instructional skills training for building-level teams; training for district teams in the instructional skills as well as school improvement planning; and training of instructional skills trainers.

Five-person teams, consisting of a principal and four teachers, were given ten (10) days of in-service in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction. The training was conducted in five two-day sessions held in Lansing between October, 1985 and May, 1986. The teams were divided into four groups (A,B,C,D) of about 45 participants each to take part in the program. During the in-service training participants received background on a series of thirteen instructional and clinical supervision skills, taught lessons in practice simulations using the skills, and received structured feedback on success in using the skills. Between workshops every team developed a schedule of practice sessions and each school was assigned a "coach" who had previous experience in using the skills and could supervise others. Coaches were required to visit the school

at least twice between each workshop to observe participants' use of the skills; they were also required to send the project staff a brief one-page coaching report indicating whether this activity took place.

In the second part of the first year program, central office teams consisting of the superintendent, assistant superintendent and a board member received eight days of in-service between November, 1985 and August, 1986. The first three days of training provided them a condensed EEEI program similar to that in which the building teams were involved. Participants took an active part in learning and practicing four of the thirteen segments of that larger training. During the fourth and fifth days of training these teams focused on the staff development implications of such an intensive training model.

At a three-day seminar in August, 1986 the district teams focused on the Effective Schools Research of Edmonds and Lezotte and the Strategic Planning work Dr. Shirley McCune. Keynote speakers for the session were Dr. Lezotte and Dr. McCune, both of whom focused on the importance of a long-range plan to positively change the urban secondary school. Appendix A more fully describes that session.

The third part of the first year program (1985-86) consisted of selection and training of twenty program participants to become trainers of others in their districts. These twenty people met for ten days in the summer of 1986 in an intensive program which assisted them in being able to present the EEEI model.

As the project's second year (1986-87) got underway there were three program modifications which resulted from our experiences in the first year and from our consultants' experiences with school improvement efforts.

The first modification was to give participating school teams the opportunity to chose from two program strands for the second and third years. One strand was consistent with the original proposal to move into the Effective Schools Research; the other stand permitted school teams to deepen their understanding and application of the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction. The project staff felt this modification was appropriate based upon the variations in implementation of the model in the 19 districts. Several school teams did not feel prepared to expand their knowledge and skills beyond the classroom-level instructional skills improvements to other school-wide areas of improvement. As a result of this change eleven (11) schools opted for the Effective Instruction Implementation Strand and twenty-six (26) schools chose to move into the School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research Strand.

A second modification concerned the Instructional Skills Trainers' workshops. The original proposal called for "Training of Trainers" workshops in the summer of 1986 followed by informal, local meetings during the 1986-87 year and a reconvening of workshops in summer of 1987. After discussion with participants, MCEA staff decided to hold four (4) weekend workshops during the 1986-87 school year.

This provided stronger support than the more informal small group meetings at regional locations. Because of that change there were fewer Training of Trainers' workshop days during summer of 1987, but the new trainers were prepared and were able to be presenters at a series of four, five-day EEEI summer workshops for teachers who were beginning training in the model.

The third modification concerned the make up of the teams for the School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research Strand. Originally, the proposal called for the five-person teams that started the project to focus primarily on school climate issues during the second and third years while a new group of five people from each school would receive six days of EEEI training. As we reviewed the program with Dr. Lezotte, it was determined that to most appropriately implement the school improvement planning process teams needed to look at planning in areas beyond school climate. Also, the entire team should be in attendance at each school improvement workshop, rather than being split in two models. Thus we requested that each school send all ten (10) of its participants together, and that group would form the school improvement team.

The format for the second and third years of the project thus included four parts: continuation of Training of EEEI Trainers group; continuation with district-level teams in programs and support for district planning for improvement; eleven (11) building-level teams involved in the EEEI

Implementation Strand; and twenty-six (26) building-level teams involved in the School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research Strand. The following paragraphs will briefly describe the 1986-87 and 1987-88 years for each of these four parts.

With twenty-six (26) schools in the program strand based upon Effective Schools Research, and with each school having teams of seven to ten members, the project staff developed three parallel workshop groups (Effective Schools Strand: Groups A, B, C) each having approximately seventy participants. Three two-day workshops were held during the 1986-87 school year and two two-day sessions were conducted in the 1987-88 year. The workshops were devoted to having teams: define "effectiveness" for their buildings; develop school mission statements which are a description of the ideal toward which subsequent improvement efforts should be directed; determine the student performance measures they would use to measure their effectiveness; conduct a disaggregated analysis of student outcomes which tells the school staff how well it is achieving both quality and equity in student performance for various groups of students (i.e., based on racial/ethnic, gender, social class); conduct a faculty needs assessment survey which indicates the perception of the extent to which the correlates of effective schools are in existence at each building; and develop a three to four year written school improvement plan having at least three improvement objectives that are

intended to move them closer to the "ideal" school described in their mission statement. Time was also devoted to helping teams learn how to involve the rest of the faculty and students in the improvement process.

District-level teams and project principals took part in a two-day program in the fall of 1986 and a three-day program in spring of 1987 presented by Dr. Marc Becker, Director of Research and Evaluation, Glendale (Arizona) Union High School District, which focused on development of criterion-referenced tests (CRT's) at the local district level. This is particularly important given the scarcity of appropriate standardized student achievement data at the secondary level, and especially when such student outcome data is critically important to school improvement based on Effective Schools Research.

Rather than call the district-level teams together in the summer of 1987, as was originally planned, the project staff felt it was more appropriate to spend time visiting with each of the nineteen (19) district teams individually during the project's final year (1987-88). These on-site visits were led by Dr. C. Robert Muth who was the MCEA Executive Director until his retirement in 1987. The purpose of the visits was to review the progress each of the schools had made over the course of the program and to discuss with the district-level teams their own planning efforts, particularly focusing on ways they would continue to support the schools after the project's conclusion.

Participants in the EEEI (Instructional Skills) Implementation Strand received five additional days of in-service during the 1986-87 year and met again as a group one time in 1987-88. The training content included development of peer coaching skills among teachers which is an informal classroom observation process developed by Beverly Showers at the University of Oregon. This process is less complex than the clinical supervision model learned in the program's first year. Its purpose is to have pairs of teachers consistently observe in each other's classrooms and have instructional discussions based upon a five-step peer coaching process. This less formal approach to instructional discussions can more fully involve all faculty in an ongoing model of instructional improvement.

Along with learning the steps in the peer coaching process the teams were also expected to develop a written plan which described how they would arrange for thirty (30) to forty (40) hours of training in the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction for other faculty members and provide for consistent coaching to assure they are receiving appropriate support to maintain and strengthen skills learned. School teams were encouraged to call upon people from their district or a nearby MCEA district who have been involved in the Training of Trainers workshops through this FIPSE grant. To provide even more in-building support to the school team, an additional five faculty members received thirty hours of EEEI training as part of the project.

During the project's third year the project staff was able to provide visits by experienced improvement facilitators to all project schools. These two facilitators visited each school team for four half days throughout the year, assisting them with their unique implementation issues. This service was an addition to the original project, but was perceived as a particularly valuable resource as school teams began to "take ownership" for concepts learned in the workshops.

PROJECT RESULTS:

Both the project evaluator and the project facilitators have provided extensive final reports which detail the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The project evaluator, Dr. Grace Iverson, Director of Research and Evaluation for Lansing (Michigan) School District gives a detailed description of the evaluation of the project's intended outcomes and is included at the end of this report. The report entitled "Secondary School Improvement Project Executive Report" (Appendix B) by C. Robert Muth, Barbara Jacoby and Joan Messer gives their perceptions of progress as of May, 1988, including recommendations for future action. The project coordinator will limit her comments in this section to some additional perceptions of the project results, including dissemination and continuation activities.

The project extended the knowledge and application of effective schools and effective teaching research to the secondary schools in nineteen (19) urban districts in Michigan. It also assisted districts with understanding elements of quality professional development programs, and, to a lesser extent, to assist them in moving toward a district-level improvement planning process which supports the building-level efforts.

As a result of this program several MCEA districts have been asked by Michigan State Department of Education representatives to make presentations at programs around the state. The Michigan Education Association (MEA) has asked the project coordinator to be part of a state-wide professional development conference to share implications of school-based improvement models. A major way project results have been shared is through the national network of schools with which Dr. Larry Lezotte works to implement effective schools research. Dr. Lezotte now heads the National Center for Effective Schools, which is housed in Okemos, Michigan, close to the MSU campus. At the time this project began, to his knowledge our program brought together the largest number of secondary schools to implement the research at that level. The successes and concerns experienced in our project have, we believe, been helpful to others both in Michigan and nationally as they plan their effective schools programs.

Dissemination has also occurred through the funding last

year of a secondary school improvement project by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. That project includes three MCEA districts not in the FIPSE program as well as two suburban districts near Battle Creek. The program has significantly benefited from modifications which were made as a result of the experiences MCEA staff had through their involvement in the FIPSE project. Those newly involved schools also now have other school teams in Michigan to call upon as they move through the program.

Through this FIPSE project, MCEA staff members have begun to work closely with the North Central Association (NCA) which accredits Michigan secondary schools. North Central recently developed an outcomes-based evaluation option piloted for the first time in 1987-88. MCEA assisted North Central personnel in demonstrating the close relationship between that new NCA option and the Effective Schools Research planning process taught in the FIPSE project. Several MCEA district high schools have selected the new NCA evaluation method to replace the traditional seven-year review process for accreditation, and several FIPSE project principals are serving on visitation committees to schools piloting the program. It is anticipated the North Central Association outcomes evaluation option will greatly advance our dissemination efforts not only in Michigan, but in the entire eighteen-state NCA region.

Selection of the NCA outcomes evaluation and accreditation option and involvement in the Kellogg program are two

major ways that Middle Cities districts have demonstrated commitment to continuing the secondary school improvement initiative of the FIPSE project. Although districts have not progressed as much as their participating schools in developing district improvement plans, several have requested the MCEA staff members continue to work with them to accomplish that. Most districts also requested that the project facilitators continue to meet with individual school improvement teams on-site four to five times during the year after the project's conclusion (1988-89) to assist with completing written plans where necessary and to help with implementation issues. School teams have been invited to Lansing for two one-day meetings (Fall and Spring) this year to share their progress with each other.

A strong indicator of ongoing commitment of MCEA districts was the approval of a permanent professional development position on the MCEA staff, funded by Association resources. Superintendents approved the position, requesting emphasis on continuing to expand and update in-service programs focusing on effective schools and effective teaching research. The director of professional development recently surveyed member districts to determine the kinds of continued services desired and found the programs requested to be highly supportive of, and related to, the knowledge base of effective schools and effective teaching research implementation.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Project for Secondary School Improvement was a three-year program designed to assist secondary schools in nineteen urban Michigan districts implement improvement models based upon the research on effective schools and effective teaching. The program's first year focused on training five-person teams in a Madeline Hunter model called Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI). During years two and three, the project was split into two strands: twenty-six (26) school teams chose the model of School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research; eleven (11) schools remained with an extension of the EEEI program entitled EEEI Implementation. Schools that chose the effective schools model were provided ten days of training, over two years, to develop and implement a written school improvement plan. Besides working with teams from those thirty-seven secondary schools, the project also assisted their school districts to develop support and to formulate district improvement plans.

In reviewing the project, the project staff developed the following thoughts, suggestions, and conclusions which may be of interest to others considering a similar effort:

1. The project would be strengthened if it primarily focused on either the effective teaching model (EEEI) or the effective schools model (School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research). Teams required more time than originally thought to fully understand and successfully implement either of those models.

2. School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research is a multi-year effort and is most successful when the entire school improvement team is directly involved in the complete training.

3. It is important to give school district leaders a clear understanding of the desirable makeup of the school team prior to training as well as knowledge of the amount of time needed to meet regularly. It is critical that districts recognize support, and organize efforts that give time to accomplish the development of the plan at the building level.

4. School improvement teams need on-site assistance from well qualified facilitators to keep them moving forward and to help them overcome obstacles to implementation. We were able to provide that on-site assistance during the third year, but it would have been most helpful throughout the entire project. In addition, districts should develop their own district school improvement facilitators prior to, or along with the training for building-level teams.

5. It is very important to spend adequate time having schools consider their vision and mission. This underlies all subsequent planning and implementation decisions. Schools need to reach consensus and clearly articulate their purpose and values to all who work in them and all who are "clients" of the school (i.e., parents, students, the community).

6. Working with schools from many districts across the state presented some problems, including: more difficulty in visiting sites as regularly as would occur if working in only two or three local districts; communication concerns, especially when having to deal with organizational structures of many districts; difficulty bringing participants together regularly at a common site due to costs and travel time needed. While we recognize those concerns, it is our impression that the benefits of inter-school and inter-district communications, support, and a desire to perform well among the nineteen districts in the program, were of great value and outweighed the problems associated with such a design.

EVALUATOR'S REPORT
ON
"THE PROJECT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT"

Submitted to:

Middle Cities Education Association
and
Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education

Submitted by:

Dr. Grace Iverson
Director of Research and Evaluation
Lansing School District
Lansing, Michigan

November 15, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation report represents a final accounting of a three year project designed to enhance instructional skills on the part of secondary school staffs and principals, improve building level learning climate factors, increase secondary school administrator ability to initiate and maintain instructional skills and school improvement programs, and encourage local school districts to develop district-wide improvement programs. The program was implemented during the school years 85-86, 86-87, and 87-88. The long term outcome of the project is to increase student achievement.

Supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) and implemented by the Middle Cities Education Association (MCEA). The Project for Secondary School and Teacher Improvement listed nine outcomes in the original proposal. They were divided into five outcomes at the building level and four outcomes at the district level. (See Table 1)

Table 1
FIPSE Outcomes as Stated In the Proposal

Building Level

1. Observable changes in project participants knowledge, understanding, and ability to use specific instructional skills that facilitate student learning.

2. Observable changes in the instructional supervision skills of building administrators. This includes the ability to observe, diagnose the teaching actions, provide positive reinforcement for appropriate use of instructional skills by the teacher, and provide guidance and corrective feedback to the teacher.

3. Development of a cadre of local MCEA district instructional skills trainers to extend the outcomes of #1 and #2 within the district and beyond the life of the project.

4. Development of an in-building support base, the School Improvement Team, to plan for and implement an ongoing school teacher inservice program.

5. Observable changes in the School Improvement Teams' ability to asses the existing school learning climate and work with the staff and students to develop and implement climate improvement objectives.

District Levels

1. Observable changes in the central administration's knowledge, understanding and application of specific instructional skills that facilitate learning.

2. Observable changes in the central administration's knowledge, understanding, and support of the principals' roles as instructional leaders.

3. Development of district-wide (K-12) policies to support school and teacher improvement, including specific plans, objectives, and activities designed to implement those policies.

4. Development of specific plans to support ongoing professional development including policy direction and resource allocation.

Two compatible, well-respected training models were used as the major method for reaching the outcomes. They were an instructional effectiveness model called the Essential Elements of Effectiveness Instruction (EEEI) and a school improvement model called Effective Schools. The instructional effectiveness portion of the project generally focused on the teacher and the decisions he/she makes each day in the classroom setting; school effectiveness dealt with the total school -- its environment, mission, goals, outcomes. Each model is based on research which, in the

past decade, has been applied in school settings. Each takes the position that teachers and schools can make a difference, especially for those students who have historically been underserved, the poor and minority students.

While it is not the intent of this report to outline step-by-step the project's implementation, it is necessary to provide the reader a brief description of what indeed did occur in order for the outcomes, which are the major focus of this report, to be understood. A more detailed documentation of the project's implementation will be written and submitted to the funding agency by the Project Coordinator.

The reader should understand that many ongoing evalution activities occurred which were used to improve the program while it was being implemented. This report is being written for accountability purposes. Its main audience is the funding agency. However, the Project staff and participants will make use of its contents as they move forward with similar programs.

The sources of information that have been used to develop this evaluation report are as follows:

1. Participant reports of skills levels attained at the beginning and end of the Project.
2. Participant evaluations of the training sessions for all three years of the Project.
3. Telephone surveys of participants conducted at end of the Year 1 and Year 2 of the Project.

4. Visitations, by the evaluator to some of the workshop sessions over the three years of the project.

5. Reviews of reports on the Project written by others, both internal and external to the Project.

6. Miscellaneous archival data which exists in the project files such as agendas, attendance logs, project notes.

The format for the remainder of the report will be as follows: a brief description of each year's program is offered. That description will be followed by a discussion of the major outcomes for each year of the Project. Finally, after discussing each year as a specific segment, the writer will talk about the overall outcomes of the Project.

YEAR 1: 1985-86

The Program

The first year of the Project had as its major focus training teams of secondary school teachers and administrators in the instructional effectiveness model called the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction, or EEEI. This was accomplished by providing five, two-day workshop sessions to teams representing 19 school districts and 37 schools. Both middle/junior high schools and high schools were represented. The workshop content consisted of in-depth, hands-on training in the EEEI model and in clinical supervision. In between sessions, coaching provided to school building teams provided practice of the skills learned. The original proposal planned for service to only eight school districts but because of MCEA superintendent interest in, and willingness to financially support additions to the project, 19 school districts were served. The 37 schools from these 19 districts were broken into four training groups and called FIPSE Groups A, B,C, and D.

In addition to the teachers and principals from the 37 schools who were trained, the Project offered an even more intensive series of training opportunities to 20 selected teachers and principals from the 19 districts. These twenty individuals displayed special interest and/or skills in EEEI and were willing to become trainers of others. This more

intensive training was developed and offered in an attempt to build "internal-to district" capabilities.

Central level personnel including superintendents and school board members were also targeted for Project services. Five days of training emphasizing instructional supervision and central support systems was provided. In addition to this five days of training, a strategic planning workshop was offered to the superintendents during the summer of 1986. All project districts participated. Appendix A documents the contents of the Strategic Planning Workshop.

In an attempt to work towards building support for the Project and its goals, university personnel at several teacher training colleges and universities (Michigan State University, Central Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University, Saginaw Valley State College, and Spring Arbor College were invited to participate in the workshops offered to the school teams and central staff.

Outcomes for Year 1, 1985-1986

The evaluator used three major sources of information to establish the outcomes for Year 1 of the Project:

1. A pre/post skills self-report inventory was given to team members at the beginning and end of the year. An analysis of the inventories was done for two of the four groups that undertook the five days of EEEI training, groups A & B.

2. Participant evaluations of the workshops were collected after each session. The format for these evaluations included both rankings and open ended questions. The evaluations of Group B were looked at in depth.

3. A telephone interview was conducted by the evaluator with 21 of the participants representing groups A & B.

Other sources of information included formal and informal discussions with the Project Coordinator and reviews of archival documents such as program staff reports, agendas, and attendance logs.

Outcome #1: The project generated a great deal of interest in and commitment to the training models (EEEJ and Effective Schools).

Discussion of Outcome #1: The fact that once superintendents in MCEA heard of the Project they requested and got the number of districts served from 8 to 19 indicates that those project goals having to do with district level commitment to the Project were immediately being addressed and that immediate progress was made toward their accomplishment. District superintendents not only petitioned for an expansion of districts served but backed that request up with additional dollars provided to increase the expansion. A report prepared for the Project authored by Robert Muth, Barbara Jacoby and Joan Messer, titled "Secondary School Improvement Project Executive Report," has the following statement which is appropriate to repeat.

> The first indication of superintendent support came when they insisted that the project be expanded from 8 to 19 districts and that each district be assessed a 5,000 dollar annual fee for participation.

Appendix B includes the total report.

In addition to the fee, superintendents needed to expend money for the cost of released time and expenses for participants to attend the Lansing based training workshops.

Outcome #2: The project increased the skills of participants in implementing the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI) model.

Discussion of Outcome #2: This outcome directly relates to the project goals promising that at the building level there would be "observable changes in projects participants' knowledge, understanding, and ability to use specific instructional skills that facilitate student learning" ... and..."observable changes in the instructional supervision skills of building administrators."

Review of pre and post self-assessment inventories asking participants to rank their skills at the beginning and end of the EEEI training indicates growth in their knowledge, understanding, and ability to use the EEEI model. A detailed analysis of these responses is located in Appendix C. Table 2 below summarizes that more detailed information.

Table 2
Summary of Self Assessment Inventory
for Group A & B
Percentages of Respondents Ranking
Skills Level as Effective

Concept	Pre-Treatment	Post-Treatment	Percent Gain
1 Selecting an objective at the correct level of difficulty	44	71	27
2. Listing Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain	20	51	31
3. Teaching an objective by selecting correct student behaviors for instruction	46	71	25
4. Using a task analysis process	27	51	24
5. Monitoring the learners progress and adjusting the teaching throughout a learning task	46	81	35
6. Listing the principles of learning	21	78	57
7. Diagnosing the components of the teaching act	22	64	42
8. Labeling the parts of a lesson as you see it	31	76	45
9. Script taping a lesson	15	51	36
10. Grouping data for a reinforcement conference	16	69	53
11. Selecting a reinforcement conference objective	13	75	62
12. Planning a reinforcement conference	15	62	47
13. Conducting a reinforcement conference	12	56	44

Some summary comments about Table 2 follow:

1. The three concepts which saw the greatest amount of growth over the year were: selecting a reinforcement conference objective, listing the principles of learning, grouping data for a reinforcement conference.

2. The three areas that the greatest percentage of participants felt they knew the most about at the end of the year were: monitoring the learner's progress and adjusting the teaching throughout the learning task, listing the principles of learning, and labeling the parts of a lesson.

3. The three areas that saw the least amount of growth over the year were: using a task analysis process, teaching an objective by selecting the correct student behaviors for instruction, selecting an objective at the correct level of difficulty.

4. The three areas that the least number of participants felt that they had learned adequately were: listing Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain, using a task analysis process, and script taping a lesson. Just over half felt that they had effective skills in these areas.

A review of a subset of participant evaluations of the training (Group B) indicated that when asked to rank three statements regarding the value of the training, in nearly all cases, well over 80% of the participants gave the training positive marks. Participants were asked to rank the following statements from Strongly Disagree (#1) to Strongly Agree (#5):

What I learned from this in-service will be used by me in carrying out my work responsibilities.

What I learned from this inservice will probably impact students learning.

I would recommend this in-service to others.

Table 3 provides the readers with more details regarding the participant's rankings.

A final measure of Outcome #2 was a telephone survey conducted by the writer at the end of year #1. Twenty-one telephone interviews with members of the A & B groups indicated that the training was valued because of its focused, in-depth nature and its emphasis on practice, modeling and follow-up. Appendix D contains a summary of the interviews.

Outcome #3: A cadre of specially trained persons in EEEI was developed.

Discussion of Outcome #3: The "Training of Trainers" program was implemented. Twenty persons were selected and ten days of training during the summer of 1986 occurred. This training continued into Year 2 of the Project for a series of week-end meetings. This training relates to the building level goal which promised to develop local trainers who would be available beyond the life of the Project.

Outcome #4: Superintendents and their central staff increased their understanding of and skills in EEEI and effective schools.

Discussion of Outcome #4: Two MCEA sponsored activities assisted in achieving this outcome which is related to the district-level goals that promised "...observable changes in the central administration's knowledge, understanding, and application of specific instructional skills that facilitate learning..." and "...observable changes in the

TABLE 3
FIPSE YEAR I
Percentages of Positive Ratings to Three Statements From a Subgroup (Group B) of Participants

	10/14/85 N=51	10/15/85 N=51	11/11/85 N=46	11/12/85 N=46	12/03/85 N=33	12/04/85 N=33	03/19/86 N=30	03/20/86 N=30	05/13/86 N=28	05/14/86 N=28
What I learned from this orkshop will be used by me in carrying out my responsibilities	76%	90%	92%	93%	76%	90%	93%	93%	82%	79%
What I learned from this in-service will probably impact student learning	80%	88%	91%	96%	94%	88%	89%	93%	78%	78%
I would recommend this in-service to others	88%	92%	91%	88%	91%	88%	80%	100%	92%	88%

NOTE: Each day was ranked separately.
Not every respondent rated every statement.

central administration's knowledge, understanding, and support of the principal's role as instructional leader." A review of the Superintendents' and central staffs' evaluations of the five days of training revealed that participants were enthused about the content of the presentations and the movement that their districts could or would make toward applying what both EEEI and Effective Schools could offer. These evaluations are on file in the MCEA office. While the evaluator would readily admit that a positive attitude towards the training is a far cry from "observable changes," she believes it is an appropriate response from the leadership of the districts involved.

YEAR 2: 1986-1987

The Program

The plan for Year 2 of the Project was modified somewhat based on participant feedback. Several school teams expressed concern with the Project's plan to move from the effective instruction model to the school effectiveness model. As a result, the Project provided for two program options for Year 2. One option was designed for schools wishing to work in more depth on effective instruction (EEEI); the second strand was consistent with the original Project plan to move from Effective Instruction to Effective Schools.

Of the 37 schools participating in the Project, 11 chose to take part in the strand dealing with additional training in EEEI. Those teams received five days of additional training in 86-87. For the remainder of the schools who chose to continue with the original plan team membership was expanded to allow for up to ten. For purposes of this evaluation report the writer will focus on the School Effectiveness portion of Year 2. The MCEA office has on file information relative to the outcomes of training for the EEEI strand.

The 26 school teams that chose to move towards the Effective Schools option received three, two day training sessions in 1986-1987. The teams learned how to conduct an assessment survey designed to determine building needs as

related to school effectiveness. They also learned how to disaggregate students' achievement data to determine equity among various groups. In addition, time was spent on developing school mission statements and developing strategies to involve all faculty members, not just the team members, in school improvement.

The Trainer of Trainers program also continued during Year 2 with the core group of teachers who were identified in Year 1. This group, as was mentioned previously, continued on with four weekend workshops during 86-87. During the summer of 1987 those newly trained presenters gave five days of training to teachers from Middle Cities districts at four regional workshops.

Outcomes for Year 2, 1986-1987

The evaluator used two major sources of information to establish the major outcomes of Year 2 of the Project:

1. Participant evaluations of the workshops were available. After each session, participants were asked to evaluate the training. The format for these evaluations included both rankings and open ended questions.

2. A telephone interview was conducted by the evaluator with participants in the effective schools option representing groups A & B. In addition, program staff conducted telephone interviews of staff members in various project schools.

Other sources of information included formal and informal discussions with the Project Coordinator and reviews of archival documents such as program staff reports, agendas, and attendance logs.

Three of the outcomes of Year 1 were continued into Year 2. They are:

1. Superintendents continued their interest in and commitment to the training models (EEEI and Effective Schools). This is evidenced by the continued financial commitment of the districts to sending teams for training.

2. The Project increased the skills of participants in implementing the Essential Elements of Effective Instruction (EEEI) model. This is evidenced by the willingness of the Project to modify the plan for Year 2 and provide more EEEI training to 11 school districts.

3. The cadre of specially trained persons in EEEI was continued during Year 2. Project files document these continued services which consisted of a series of weekend meetings and presentations by the cadre during the summer of 1987.

In addition to the continuation of the three outcomes listed above, the major outcomes for Year 2 involve the establishment of School Improvement Teams in 26 schools. The team members' abilities to implement school improvement models were increased over the course of the year. This outcome directly relates to the two Project goals that promise the establishment of in-building teams and the improvement of team members' abilities to assess the school learning climate, and develop and implement climate improvement objectives.

A review of a sub-set of participants' (Group B) evaluations of the training indicated that when asked to rank three statements regarding the value of training, two of the three sessions were highly ranked. Participants were

asked to rate the following statements from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5):

What I learned from this in-service will be used by me in carrying out my work responsibilities.

What I learned from this in-service will probably impact students learning.

I would recommend this in-service to others.

Table 4 provides the readers with more details regarding the participants' rankings.

Table 4
FIPSE YEAR 2
Percentages of Positive Ratings to
Three Statements from a Sub-Group (B) of Participants

	9/24/86 N=50	11/25 N=34	4/28 N=NA
What I learned from this work-shop will be used by me in carrying out my responsi-bilities	81%	59%	90%
What I learned from this in-service will probably impact student learning	82%	50%	80%
I would recom-mend this in-service to others.	94%	68%	97%

NOTE:
1. Not every respondent ranked every statement.
2. Both days of the training were evaluated in one setting; this is different than in Year 1.

Another measure of Year 2 outcomes was a telephone survey conducted by the writer at the end of Year 2 just as she did at the end of Year 1. Twenty-five telephone interviews with members if the A & B groups indicated that the building level teams had indeed implemented a variety of first steps in the school improvement process. Consistent with the results of the self assessment inventories reported later in this report participants felt that they had made the most progress in developing school mission statements, conducting needs assessments, forming teams, and involving others in the buildings. See Appendix E for a summary of the telephone interviews.

A final measure of Year 2 outcomes was a telephone survey the Project staff conducted in late spring of 1987 attempting to find out whether or not the training in school improvement was reaching beyond just those school based team members who were coming to Lansing for the training. The Project staff randomly chose 11 out of 26 schools in the Project and randomly selected 10 percent of the teachers to survey. Fortyfour telephone interviews were held. In contrast to the telephone survey discussed above, these teachers were not project participants but were staff members who the Project over the long term wants to affect. The Project Director felt that the results were positive; the evaluator would agree. The major findings are listed below:

41 out of 44 respondents (93.2%) were aware of the school improvement project at their school.

31 out of the 41 respondents knew who their school improvement team members were. 10 of 41 (24 4%) respondents did not know who their team members were.

29 out of 41 (70.7%) respondents felt that they had received an adequate introduction or overview of the school improvement process so that they could participate in future activities.

25 out of 41 (61.0%) respondents had seen a draft of their school's mission statement while 16 out of 41 (39.0%) respondents had not seen a draft of the statement.

Year 3: 1987-1988

The Program

The plan for Year 3 of the Project was to continue training in the Effective Schools research and implementation. Major emphasis was on writing and implementing school improvement plans. This involved providing on-site support by Project staff. In order to assist each team with specific needs two Project facilitators assisted staff in visiting school teams and providing individual team-by-team support.

In addition the school-level teams regrouped in Lansing for two sessions, one in the Fall and one in the Spring. A major focus of these sessions was to provide a forum for inter-district sharing and problem solving as well as providing further training in developing a school improvement plan.

Year 3 also saw the continuation of training for those school districts who in Year 2 chose to continue with more in depth Effective Instruction training. However, the discussion of Year 3 outcomes will emphasize the School Effectiveness strand of services.

Outcomes for Year 3, 1987-1988:

The evaluator used three major sources of information to establish major outcomes for Year 3 of the Project:

1. A pre/post skills self-report inventory given to team members in the fall of 1986 (Year 2)

at the beginning of the training and re-administered at the end of the training, in the spring of 1988 (Year 3). An analysis(Year 3). An analysis of this training was conducted for two groups, Groups A & B.

2. Participant evaluations of the workshops were available. After each session participants were asked to evaluate the training. The format for these evaluations included both rankings and open ended questions.

3. A report titled,'"Secondary School Improvement Project, Executive Report." Written by Project Director, Robert Muth and Project consultants Barbara Jacoby and Joan Messer, the document cites evidence of Project accomplishments that were compiled through on-site, district interviews and through assessing the progress of each team and district towards the Project goals.

Other sources of information includes formal and informal discussions with the Project Coordinator and reviews of archival documents such as program staff reports, agendas and attendance logs.

As was the case in Year 2, Year 3 saw continued interest in and commitment to the training models by school superintendents as evidenced by the financial commitment of the districts to sending teams to Lansing for training. Year 3 also saw a continuation of effective instruction training for those school district teams who desired to continue.

The major outcome for Year 3 was the continued training of and support for those district teams that were implementing school improvement programs in their buildings. A review of pre and post self-assessment inventories asking

participants to rank their "level and understanding" of school effectiveness concepts and the "level of use of the concepts" at their building indicates positive growth from the beginning of Year 2 to the ending of Year 3. A detailed analysis of these responses is located in Appendix F. Table 5 below collapses that more detailed information.

TABLE 5
Summary of Self Assessment Inventory for Groups A & B
Percentages of Respondents Ranking Skill Levels as Effective and Ranking Use of Concepts at Their Building as Adequate

Concept	Level of Understanding		Level of Use	
	Pre/post Treatment	Gain	Pre/post Treatment	Gain
1. The research on School Effectiveness	29/88	59	12/45	33
2. The characteristics (correlates) of an effective school	32/94	62	14/57	43
3. Purpose/use of the school improvement team	34/92	58	13/72	59
4. Use of school widee needs assessment to determine areas for improvement	34/92	58	21/73	52
5. Development of a written school mission statement	37/94	57	19/87	68
6. The disaggregated analysis of the distribution of achievement	15/79	64	11/49	38
7. Design of a plan for school-based improvement process	23/86	63	12/63	51
8. Implementing a school-based process of improvement	21/85	64	16/85	69

Concept	Level of Understanding Pre/post Treatment	Gain	Level of Use Pre/post Treatment	Gain
9. Methods of sustaining a school-based improvement process	19/87	68	9/47	38
10. Evaluation of a school improvement process	20/87	67	9/42	33
11. The research on teacher effectiveness	56/81	25	27/49	22
12. Applying the research on teacher effectiveness to planned programs of school improvement.	22/84	62	12/37	25

Some summary comments regarding Table 5 are appropriate:

1. The rankings for "understanding" the concepts are higher than are the rankings for actually putting those concepts into place at the building level. This seems a logical outcome -- understanding comes before implementation.

2. The concepts of school effectiveness which saw the greatest increase in participants understanding over the course of the year were: the disaggregated analysis of the distribution of achievement as a basis for determining school effectiveness, implementing a school based improvement process, methods of sustaining a school based improvement process, and evaluation of a school improvement process.

3. The concepts of school effectiveness which participants ranked as being used at the building more at the end of the year as opposed to the beginning of the year were: development of a written school mission statement, purpose/use of the school improvement team, and implementing a school-based process of improvement.

A review of a sub-set of participants' (Group B) evaluations of the two Lansing sessions indicated that when asked to rank three statements regarding the value of training, the sessions were highly ranked.

TABLE 6
FIPSE YEAR 3
Percentages of Positive Ratings to Three Statements
From a Sub-Group (B) of Participants

	Fall Session	Spring Session
	N=40	N=23
What I learned from this in-service will be used by me in carrying out my work responsibilities	83%	91%
What I learned from this in-service will probably impact on student learning	85%	78%
I would recommend this in-service to others	78%	91%

Finally, the Executive Report located in Appendix B outlines the following accomplishments for school improvement teams as of June, 1988:

1. Each building planning team has developed a mission statement and has had it approved by staff.

2. Each building team was also successful in obtaining information regarding staff perceptions of the learning climate.

3. Each building team has also made a careful analysis of the results and prioritized the findings as of June, 1988. All but two buildings have shared this with staff.

4. Twenty buildings have collected, or are in the process of collecting student outcomes data.

5. Nineteen buildings have either determined their goals or are in the process of doing so.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

The sections preceding have looked at the outcomes for the Project for Secondary School and Teacher Improvement for each of the three years of the Project. This last section of the report goes back to the original Project goals and looks at the overall effect of the project in terms of accomplishments. The section is organized as follows:

1. Goals which have been most successfully achieved.
2. Goals which have seen partial achievement.
3. Goals which have seen the least progress in terms of attainment.

GOALS MOST SUCCESSFULLY ACHIEVED BY THE PROJECT:

Building Level

1. Observable changes in project participats knowledge, understanding and ability to use specific instructional skills that facilitate student learning.

2. Observable changes in the instructional supervision skills of building administrators. This includes the ability to observe, diagnose the teaching actions, provide positive reinforcement for appropriate use of instructional skills by the teacher, and provide guidance and corrective feedback to the teacher.

3. Development of a cadre of local MCEA district instructional skills trainers to extend the outcomes of #1 and #2 within the district and beyond the life of the project.

4. Development of an in-building support base, the School Improvement Team, to plan for and implement an ongoing school teacher in-service program.

Discussion

The outcomes described for each year of the Project document well that the majority of the projects' resources

were spent on working with and attaining those goals listed above. It was with the building level teams that the most positive outcomes were seen. Training in instructional skills and school improvement was provided and was not only well received by participants but was utilized back in the buildings. A telling comment about these building level goals is found in the Executive Report submitted by Muth, Jacoby and Messer located in Appendix B. In talking about the strand dealing with and Effective Schools, they wrote:

> Teacher Team members in every building have worked many hours beyond their contracted days for no extra compensation. Interest, enthusiasm and a strong sense of commitment were very obvious in almost all team members. In 21 of the buildings the teachers reported that this was the first time they have believed they could work together as a staff and make significant changes in the life of the school and the learning of the students.

GOALS WHICH HAVE BEEN PARTIALLY ACHIEVED:

Building Level

5. Observable changes in the School Improvement Teams' ability to assess the existing school learning climate and work with the staff and students to develop and implement climate improvement objectives.

Discussion

The evaluator considers this goal as partially achieved rather than fully achieved because the Project ended before building plans could be implemented. Building teams did become able to assess existing school learning climates and to work with staff and students to develop climate improvement objectives. However few were able to, in the life of the grant, actually implement new school improvement

programs. The Project does plan to call the groups together in school year 88-89 to hear about implementation and provide additional support to teams. This will be done outside the support of the grant but will be a natural outgrowth of the Project.

District Level

1. Observable changes in the central administration's knowledge, understanding and application of specific instructional skills that facilitate learning.

2. Observable changes in the central administration's knowledge, understanding, and support of the principals' roles as instructional leaders.

Discussion

The above two district level goals are considered partially achieved based on the training that was provided and based on the financial support that central administrators had to commit to for the project to be implemented. However, after the first year the Project, given its commitment to expand the number of districts served, chose to focus resources on building level staff. The Executive Report (Appendix B) discusses this outcome.

> Although district level actions were clearly suggested in the proposal, the Project staff was not as aggressive in dealing with central office personnel as they were in working with school based teams.

The staff gave some reasons for this decision:

1. The expansion, with no additional funds, from 8 districts served to 19.

2. The ability of the Project staff to demand policy changes.

3. The realization that organizations may require different priorities.

4. The belief on the part of some school districts that change needed to be made first at building levels.

5. The lack of a district wide school improvement model to disseminate.

In spite of these barriers the Project staff reported that at the district level: 14 districts had adopted mission statements, seven school districts had appointed district level school improvement teams, eight districts had developed and adopted district level school improvement plans, and 12 districts had developed and adopted policies in support of school improvement.

GOALS WHICH HAVE SEEN THE LEAST PROGRESS:

District Level

3. Development of district-wide (K-12) policies to support school and teacher improvement, including specific plans, objectives, and activities designed to implement those policies.

4. Development of specific plans to support ongoing professional development including policy direction and resource allocation.

Discussion

The Executive Report (Appendix B) states:

"Our impression was that few districts adopted comprehensive policies directly related to a long-range school improvement plan." While Superintendents were supportive of the Project in terms of time and money for the project and the Project can take credit for this commitment, it did not extend to large scale policy changes in most of the districts. The discussion above cites the reasons why

the Project staff felt that these goals were not achieved to the degree desired by the Project.

The evaluator submits to the funding agency that the Project for Secondary School and Teacher Improvement was successful in accomplishing its purpose. As taken from the original proposal, the project was to enhance instructional skills on the part of secondary school staffs and principals, improve building level learning climate factors, increase secondary school administrator ability to initiate and maintain instructional skills and school improvement programs, and encourage local school districts to develop district-wide improvement programs. The Project did attain these purposes. The best evidence for this judgement comes from the vast amount evaluation data collected from the participants themselves which indicates a high degree of success for the Project.

APPENDIX A

Strategic Planning Workshop Report
by,
Kristine L. Mika

Introduction

This report represents the highlights of the presentations at the Stategic Planning Workshop at Sugar Loaf Mountain Resort on August 6-8, 1986. The presenters included Dr. Lawrence Lazotte, Dr. Shirely McCune, Dr. Gary Mathews, and Mr. Dan Howe.

The presenters spoke to the participants about the theory and practice of strategic planning for effective schools at the secondary level. Each speaker allowed for questions from the participants. Highlights of each presentation are outlined below followed by concluding remarks.

Speaker, Dr. Lawerence Lazotte

In his presentation on "Effective Schools at the Secondary Level", Dr. Lawrence Lazotte brought into focus the future role of the secondary school and the conflicts with which these institutions are facing today. Currently, schools are experiencing and responding to new demands in the services they present to their community. Unfortunately, under the current orgainzational and operational methods schools utilize, they are being pulled in many directions. Dr. Lazotte points out three demands schools are attempting to respond to today. Those being:

1) Custodial Care: providing service in which more responsibilty of working with the developing youngster is appropriated to the schools' curriculum.

2) Sorting and Selecting: schools, especially at the secondary level, are being asked to identify students according to ability, achievement, interests, etc.

3) Maintaining an Institution of Teaching and Learning: one of which provides an eduation to all.

Lazotte pointed out that high schools are steeped in traditional procedures which have been effective for preparing students to enter and contribute to the maintenance of the industrial society. Yet, because of the new demands of today's informational society, current school procedures are outdated. Dr. Lazotte points out that schools today lack systematized procedures to abandon [these methods] in an organized fashion so that new demands may be met with more efficiency and effectiveness.

Lazotte concluded his remarks by adding that, in order for secondary schools to become effective institutions of the informational society, they must develop a mission statement. This statement must reflect the primary function of the school and provide for its role of leading the community in which it serves toward a productive future. Lazotte suggests that schools begin with an examiniation of the current working environment from the standpoint of the staff. In this way, those systems which are traditional, but ineffective, may be reviewed for revision and/or elimination within the context of the school's mission statement.

Speaker, Dr. Gary Mathews

Dr. Mathews reported on his experience with strategic planning at the high school level. Dr. Mathews reinforced some of the ideas introduced by Dr. Lazotte, that one must first examine what is currently happening within the schools. In order to investigate a school, Dr. Mathews encouraged the establishment of a data base using information that has already been gathered.

Information is found in many places such as, the student cummulative files, listings of student scores, attendance records. These pieces of information need to be pulled together in an efficient way so that the data may be accessed appropriately. There is no need to collect new information until existing data has been organized.

In closing, Dr. Mathews emphasized that change must be schoolwide and it must include both teachers and principals in order for the changes to take place and be maintained. Only then can high expectations for learning will be taken seriously by staff and students.

Speaker, Mr. Dan Howe

Mr. Howe discussed his experiences in the development of planning for school improvement. His emphasis was on staff development, stating that, historically, teaching has been an isolated activity. Teachers have become accustomed to working alone, away from other teachers and administrators. Mr. Howe pointed out that schools which are effective must bring the staff together in a positive environment where working together is

a common and expected activity.

Dr. Howe suggested that in order to work on developing an effective school plan, there were several elements of strategic planning that must be considered, such as a) orientating toward the future; b) developing a mission as stated by Dr. Lazotte; c) have a widespread involvment with the staff; 4) become proactive rather than reactive (take community leadership). Begin strategic planning with asking questions about what the purpose of schooling is now and will be for the future. Some questions Dr. Howe suggested were:

1) Where are we now?

2) Where should we be?

3) What business are we in?

4) Given furture trends, what business should we be in?

5) What programs do we provide well?

6) What needed programs could we provide?

Mr. Howe state four conditions of school improvement. Those were:

1) Time: Allow time for each step in the process of examining the data, making changes and monitoring and adjusting over time.

2) Leadership: Should be an internal and external activity. Administrators need to promote staff development and encourage more interaction. Externally, schools must become leaders within the community, take risks in developing and implementing new programs/curriculum.

3) Training: Expand on teacher training. Provide support and encouragement to teachers to develop their skills as well as allocating more monies to workshops and inservices.

4) Community Involvement: The schools should become a more integral part of the community, providing services such as those described by Dr. Lazotte.

Speaker, Dr. Shirley McCune

Dr. McCune addressed the issue of "Strategic Planning for Education". Dr. McCune introduced her topic by stating that educators must change because society has changed. Economic/demographic organization of society has shifted from an industrial age to the information era. The nature of work has changed, and as a result this society has moved from a predominantly blue collar culture to intellectual work. This has caused a crisis in adult learning. As jobs of the old order are eliminated, workers must learn new skills so that they may become more desirable perspective employee.

In the past, schools have responded to the industrial society's needs and taught work skills appropriate for the factory worker. Now schools must respond to the changes in society by teaching those skills which will enable the worker to become a part of the future. Dr. McCune suggests that in order for schools to do this, they must change their valuses and their attitudes. Schools must strategically plan for the future of the information society.

Dr. McCune suggested that schools apply strategic planning so that they may begin to become the leaders of the community and develop and maintain the vision of the future. Strategic planning, as defined by Dr. McCune, is a change methodology, a management tool, a means of evaluating progress, a way of managing and a way of thinking. Steps in strategic planning include:

I. Planning to Plan

II. Development of the Plan

III. Implementation of the Plan

IV. Implementation Monitor

V. Evaluation and Renewal

The first step in strategic planning is to plan. Schools must ask a series of questions which enables administrators and staff to explore how they view the future and how to develop a vision for the future. Those questionswhich include:

1) What are the future goals of this school?, this community?

2) What changes need to be made in staff development?, curriculum?, in our celivery systems?, etc.

3) What services must we provide?

4) How are we, the schools, accountable to ourselves? to the community?

Answers to these questions provide starting points for the planning stages and the planners. An examination of the data that schools have already collected, but have not managed or analyzed in a systematic way, that enables them to look at the past to make decisions about the future.

In planning to plan, educators must examine the trends of future economics in terms of socio-political, national, regional, and community. This means that educators must begin to read outside of their professional fields of interest. They must define the trends that will enable them to identify what needs will have to be addressed. These trends are forecasts for the future needs for schools, both in terms of services and systems

of delivery.

The second step for schools in their strategic planning is to develop the plan for the future schools. This includes developing a mission statement for the school. Steps to create a mission statement are: a) Data; b) Information; c) knowledge; d) Vision; e) Shared Vision; f) Act Vision.

The development of a mission statement should be a product of the administration and staff working together and based on the information ascertained from the data collected by the schools from internal and community sources. Consequently, input - even within the realm of feedback - should be from everyone regarding how they want to be represented in the community.

Step III of strategic planning is the actual implementation of the plan. Developing and implementing new educational programs which reflect the needs of society such as keyboard skills rather than typing.

Step IV is monitoring the new programs and policies. Are they working properly? In what ways can they be improved? Is the staff prepared to teach properly? Step IV is a form of formative evaluation.

Step V is the evaluation of the programs. In the society of high tech, fiber optics, etc., programs may become outdated very quickly. Therefore, a systematic plan of action must be in place as a method of the school's accentuating the school as a community leader developer of community growth.

Conclusion

In summation, the speakers at the Strategic Planning Workshop all emphasized the following points:

1) Schools must examine what their role has been in the past, how they have operated, served, and provided services to their students and community.

2) Schools must determine what needs of the community for which they will be expected to accept responsibility.

3) Schools must respond to those needs, not as reactive, but as proactive future planners. Consequently, schools must become the leaders of the future.

4) Therefore, schools must develop a plan of action which provides appropriate education through its systematic needs assessment/evaulative processes.

APPENDIX B

Middle Cities Education Association

Secondary School Improvement Project

Executive Report

Submitted By

Dr. C. Robert Muth - Project Director

Dr. Barbara Jacoby - Project Consultant

Dr. Joan Messer - Project Consultant

June 20, 1988

DISTRICT LEVEL PROGRESS REPORT

Leadership development at the district level was a significant part of the project. One of the four citied needs stated:

> 4. The need for local districts to develop district-wide instructional skills improvement programs, including policies related to this goal, and long-range implementation plans and strategies to support coordinated teacher and school improvement efforts.

We supported this need by the following proposal statements:

> The most effective means available for district-level decision-makers (central office administrators and boards of education) to support and provide leadership toward school improvement comes through a school board's primary policy making function. There is need to develop board policy which will give direction, endorsement, and support to the process of change necessary for the development of more effective school programs....Schools have not accepted the responsibility for well planned, coordinated professional development programs for their own staffs.... We believe that school districts must show a capacity to improve education from within, within the classroom and within the total district.

We emphasized the role of the superintendent and the tie-in with policies:

> As the teacher creates the climate in the classroom, the principal creates the climate in the school and the superintendent creates the climate in the district. The principal and the superintendent must be instructional leaders and school policies and practices should provide the framework for broad implementation of district goals.

The specific requirements for project participation included:

> Each district, through its District Improvement Team will be required to develop policies that support a coordinated on-going program of school and teacher improvement within its district. It will also be required to have written strategies which describe how the districts will actually implement the improvement policies."

Workshops were developed for these central office objectives of the project and were held during the summer of 1986 and 1987 and during the first year of the project. The workshops were general in nature and were comprised of presentations by experts and successful administrators in the field. Specific policy development workshops were not presented nor were hands-on workshops on the procedural and organizational approaches to district wide instructional planning. We learned early on in working with school teams that off-site workshop time was not adequate for supporting change and, in the second and third year of the project, established on-site consultant support to the school teams. We did not follow the same procedure with the central office staffs nor did we follow-up to push for the establishment of district level teams. Although district level actions were clearly suggested in the proposal, the project staff was not as aggressive in dealing with central office as they were in working with school based improvement teams. There were many reasons for this perceived project shortcoming. They were:

1. Because of the expansion of the project from 8 to 19 school districts (with no added project supervision) the logistics and general management of the training program took all the project leadership time.

2. As we worked with superintendents in early workshops we realized we were not in a position to demand policy changes, and we realized that there were differing philosophies on the use, and overuse, of policy to effect change.

3. We realized that each superintendent-board relationship was unique and personal and that other organization requirements might be priorities.

4. In some districts it was intentionally decided that the best way to effect district change was to first demonstrate building level change.

5. And last, we realized that we did not have a district-wide school improvement model to present and that such a model would have to be developed as a project sub-goal.

However, regardless of this rationalization great progress was made by each district. The project director, Dr. Muth and the two consultants, Dr. Jacoby and Dr. Musser, made a visit to each project school district and met with the superintendent and members of the individual school planning teams. These interviews revealed that 14 of the school districts had adopted mission statements, 2 had statements in progress and 3 had not prepared statements. Seven districts appointed district school improvement teams that included teachers, one district was in the process of appointing a team, six districts utilized other mechanisms for planning - cabinet, curriculum council, etc. and five indicated no specific central school improvement planning team. Eight districts had developed and adopted district school improvement plans, four districts had such plans in progress and seven indicated no central plan. Twelve districts indicated the development and adoption of policies in support of school improvement; some of the seven that did not, passed board resolutions or established board goals.

Our impression was that few districts adopted comprehensive policies directly related to a long-range school improvement plan. All 19 districts indicated that they were compiling and disseminating outcome data back to the individual schools. For the most part, this was test data but in many cases it also included the interpretation of such data in terms of district needs or goals. Eight districts

disaggregated data at the central office level and one district was in the process of doing so; the other ten districts either did not disaggregate or depended upon the individual school building to accomplish the task. Although not part of the project or of the direct interview questions, we tried to ascertain the level of central office monitoring for goal achievement at the building level and classroom level. We found substantial follow-up by the central office with the building (principal) but less monitoring to the classroom level.

In our judgement the progress shown is indicative of superintendents' commitment to school improvement and support to the project. All indicated that the project had helped them in working toward the achievement of their own goal agendas. The first indication of superintendent support came when they insisted that the project be expanded from 8 to 19 districts and that each district be assessed a $5000.00 annual fee for participation. The superintendents converted the proposal from a select district project to a Middle Cities project.

The biggest overt indication of support was in district budgetary commitments to school improvement. We estimate that about $400,000 was budgeted by the 19 districts for professional development and school improvement in 1982-83 (the start of the FIPSE elementary project) and on the basis of a telephone survey we conservatively estimate that approximately $4,000,000 was spent in 1987-88. These expenditures included the aforementioned fee, the cost of release time for attendance at project and local workshops and in-service. But more importantly, it included personnel added to school staffs as

Directors of School Improvement, Directors of Professional Development and Curriculum Directors with professional development responsibilities and in-house trainers in effective teaching. Almost all districts have added personnel with specific responsibilities for professional development. One district has a staff of six trainers in the area of professional development and effective teaching. Many districts have hired consultants outside of the project to provide staff training on effective schools development support. The staff feels that a great transformation in school operational philosophy and practice has taken place in the direction of the improvement of teaching, the improvement of building leadership, the focus of district goals and the improvement of learning.

The project outcomes as presented in the proposal were:

District Levels

1. Observable change in the central administration's knowledge, understanding and application of specific instructional skills that facilitate learning.

2. Observable changes in the [illegible]al administration's knowledge, understanding, and suppor[illegible]rincipal's roles as instructional leaders.

3. Development of district-wide (K-12) policies to support school and teacher improvement, including specific plans, objectives, and activities designed to implement those policies.

4. Development of specific plans to support ongoing professional development including policy direction and resource allocation.

With the rationalizations accepted for the implementation limitations presented in reference to outcomes three and four, we

believe the project outcomes have been met. In fact, we submit that unprecedented progress was made and that the base for full implementation of actions to meet the cited needs has been established.

Progress usually increases or broadens the recognition of needs and we will present our recommendations for continued district emphasis and a continuing supportive role for Middle Cities. These recommendations will follow the individual building section of this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

1. ROLE OF SUPERINTENDENT

The role of the superintendent cannot be overemphasized as the district leader. He/she is the role model for his/her leadership team, sets the educational agenda, establishes the district's vision of the future, and evidences the behaviors expected of subordinates. This may seem to elicit an obvious response, but the superintendent must reaffirm his belief system in every action. Our observation was that the most comprehensive and effective school improvement programs existed where the superintendent played an active role in the process.

Our opinion is that establishing a district vision requires visibility. Our recommendation is for the superintendent to find and structure time to be a visible presence in the schools of the district and especially with his district planning team and school teams.

2. ROLE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Boards of Education have personalities and each superintendent must work with his/her board in the best way dictated by the situation. But board involvement, approval and support of a long-range school improvement plan seems desirable if not necessary if the superintendent, in working with the entire staff, is to effect change. Our observation is that the most comprehensive school improvement programs carried explicit board support. As a basis of support for the superintendent and as a means of legitimizing communication with the staff and community, we recommend that boards of education provide more policy support to school improvement.

3. CENTRAL OFFICE PLANNING

A written long-range plan is the essential vehicle for change. It gives focus to the organizational operation, it clarifies roles and responsibilities, sets resource priorities and provides a measuring instrument for progress. For best transition from plan to program a planning team with broad representation is most productive. Time and leadership must be provided the team and organizational planning data needs to be available. We recommend the establishment of district school improvement planning teams with substantial representation of teachers and other personnel. The team could also include board and citizen representation.

4. FOCUS OF ORGANIZATION GOALS AND ACTIONS

One of the condemnations of education has been its chosing of fads and innovations. It has been accused of "hit" and "miss" efforts. School improvement through "Effective Schools" and "Effective Teaching" is not a fad; it is what schools have been about from the beginning. We have seen evidence of multiple or changing thrusts to meet school improvement needs. Although we are not critical of any district's effort or program, we believe every program and every action should knowledgeably contribute to the central goal and plan of the district. The entire staff needs to know that a unity of programing exists that optimally contributes to the overall plan. This is especially important as schools face severe budget cuts that could stall school improvement programs. School improvement is an organizational philosophy that undergirds school operations regardless of the extent or limitation of resources -- in fact, the philosophic commitment must increase as resources diminish. We recommend that

professional development and school improvement programing be planned to contribute directly and consistently to the goals and plan of the district.

5. MANAGEMENT DATA

Schools generally do not generate and use adequate management data. Schools could do a better job with data that is available and need to initiate a long term program of originating data that is not now available. Especially needed is data to measure classroom effectiveness at the high school - what should be the curriculum objectives, is the content being taught and taught effectively? An on-going monitoring system needs to be established to answer these questions. We recommend that the superintendent appoint a committee to look into the long term need for management data. The committee could include the research (testing) person, representatives of project teams and others. We deem the lack of management data a serious obstacle to school improvement planning.

6. LEADERSHIP PERSONNEL

It was very clear that a good principal's leadership resulted in effective school improvement plans and programs. There is no substitute for excellent building leadership. For many principals the project provided a new opportunity for developing, expressing, and demonstrating their innate abilities and capabilities. For a few others it was "game-playing" as usual. A building improvement program cannot be effective without the principal's support. Our observation was that leadership was needed to bring the entire staff along on the

school improvement train. We recommend that the superintendent develop a personal three year program to build and develop better leadership teams. High schools present a unique challenge for change.

7. EMPOWERMENT OF TEACHERS

We mentioned teachers' participation under several previous recommendations but, because of its importance, we present it as a stand-alone recommendation. We gained increased respect for the willingness, enthusiasm and capacity of teachers to work for school improvement. In come cases we feel that the teachers were carrying the principal along until he/she finally got into the race. We have to use the professional commitment of teachers much more effectively, and use and support their enthusiasm and there exists a latent desire and capability for teachers' participation in school improvement and that it is waiting for stimulation and motivation. It's not just a situation of letting it happen -- the principal must be a positive catylist for change (Superintendents cannot permit the principal, either by overt or covert actions to stifle positive change.)

We recommend that the superintendents use every opportunity to commend, support and encourage teachers' involvement and to recognize the legitimacy of their involvement in educational planning and decision making..

8. IMPORTANCE OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION

We encountered several instances of perceived void of communication or mis-communication. Communication provides the link-pins to the coordinated operation of complex organizations.

Yet, it seems to be a universal shortcoming of organizations, including schools. If organization constituents are to participate in efforts toward goal achievement they must know the what and the why of their roles. Communication needs to be both vertical and horizontal if all members are to work toward common goals. Communication should not just direct from the top but ask for and recognize positive contributions, to cite achievements, to give continuing expression to the superintendents beliefs and vision and to provide a medium where different units can feed off each others accomplishments. As an example, when the project staff met with the superintendent and the school teams in some cases, it was the first time that the high school and middle schools teams had meet together. We recommend that the superintendents give special attention to establishing a consistent communication system regarding school improvement goals, expectations, action plans, achievements and needs.

Recommendations For Middle Cities

1. Continued Support to Project Teams.

As part of the district interview sessions, the superintendents and team members were asked what could and should MCEA do to support the continuation of local progress? Suggestions were:

A. Continue to hold team meetings twice a year on a regional or statewide basis. It was thought that a continuing networking program would help to maintain motivation and provide for a valuable exchange of information.

B. Without exception, the interviewees felt that the MCEA on-site consultant service was essenetial to keeping teams moving by providing strategic help. This service should be continued but could be on a less intensive level.

C. It was also felt that the MCEA staff should continue to provide relevant literature on effective schools, the change process, etc. Some also expressed a desire for a scheduled newsletter that could serve as a vehicle for effective ideas and procedures.

2. Broadening MCEA Services

Based on their work with the school teams and the district interviews, the project staff suggests the following areas of extended services or new services to MCEA districts:

A. MCEA has developed staff talent and capacity over the past few years. Lynn Benore, Ron Valutis and consultants Barbara Jacoby and Joan Messer are probably

the state's foremost specialists in implementing effective schools and effective teaching programs. Their talents should be extended to all MCEA districts as well as help project districts expand their pilot programs to district-wide programs.

B. How can the MCEA staff serve a broader role in professional development? We believe that MCEA could expand its initiative in granting state approved inservice credits and help local districts design goal related inservice programs.

C. We gave considerable emphasis to district Data Management Systems, MCEA could provide some leadership in developing standard packages that could be adapted by local districts. The Kellogg Project could be used to help develop such a package.

D. An adequate output monitoring system requires a curriculum of common learnings, including a hierarchical sequence of learning objectives for, at a minimum, each required secondary course. A measure of the criteria of the achievement of such learning objectives is also necessary. This is a very complex, time consuming and expensive project. It seems MCEA could provide leadership in achieving participatory consensus of such objectives as a helpful starting point for local adoption and adaptation. We suggest that a lot of duplicate local work could be avoided and local districts may be able to move more rapidly in developing an effective learning

output monitoring system. Efficient data management systems and learning output monitoring systems seem to be the missing link to more effective management of education.

E. School improvement planning, strategic planning and policy development in support of planning seems to be a district need. Could and should MCEA provide support to local districts as they address these needs?

F. Finally, we recommend that some indepth discussion with superintendents take place as to if and how MCEA could support them in their roles as district leaders and how they can best develop their boards of education as policy supporters of improved education. The bottom line of effective schools must be student outcomes -- how can this become the unifying central goal of superintendent/board relations and efforts?

BUILDING LEVEL PROGRESS REPORT

INTRODUCTION

During the first year of the project, each building team in a district received intensive training in effective teaching. In the second year, the building teams had an option of either pursuing more comprehensive training in effective teaching or receiving training in effective schools. Twenty-six schools chose to work in the area of effective schools while 12 decided to continue training in effective teaching.

I. EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Much of the work accomplished in this project was done at the building level through the use of building level planning teams. These teams varied in size from 4 members in one building to 15 in another. The composition of the teams remained fairly stable so that there was adequate carry-over of personnel from one year to the next. Several teams have established a procedure for the rotation of members so that a large percentage of staff will eventually have the opportunity to participate as a team member.

All the building teams functioned in a similar way, that is, the team members did the actual tasks of the school improvement planning process, but then solicited input from staff for reaction and suggestion. It was apparent that approximately half the building teams had devised a workable mechanism for adequately gathering this information from staff while the others were more haphazard in their approach. The evidence of this involvement was shown by the degree of knowledge and interest of staff when asked, "What is happening in your building in school improvement?" Building teams with a prescribed communication system were sure that most staff could answer this question correctly. Those teams that communicated

randomly were less sure.

A close look at the collective accomplishments of the teams indicate that, on the whole, the buildings have made significant progress in planning for school improvement. For example:

Mission Statement

Each building planning team has developed a mission statement and has had it approved by staff. The length of the process and number of drafts varied considerably but all were successful in obtaining staff consensus. Since it is the mission statement which drives the rest of the planning process, this first step was significant and served as a major breakthrough for many building teams.

Learning Climate Survey

Each building team was also successful in obtaining information regarding staff perceptions of the learning climate. Twenty-one of the twenty-six building staff took either the Connecticut or Glendale assessment which is based on the correlates of effective schools. The other five building teams used an adaptation of these surveys or an instrument constructed by their district evaluation office. Each building team has also made a careful analysis of the results and prioritized the findings. As of June, 1988, all but two buildings have shared this information with staff.

Data Collection

The buildings in the project began to pull further apart when it came to the collection of student outcome data and archival data. Out of a total of 26 buildings, 20 have collected, or in the process of collecting, student outcomes data. Of the six which have not yet done so, five are high schools and one is a middle school. It appears to be more difficult for high schools than middle schools to make the decision to collect data related to student achievement. Furthermore, middle schools had more data readily available and seemed eager to begin the task. On the whole, middle school building planning teams thought of student outcome data as necessary information that was needed for planning while high school teams were more "suspect".

The buildings which gathered information called archival data (i.e. - number of suspensions, tardys, discipline referrals, minority representation in specified classes, relationship of GPA to attendance, etc.) had a similar numerical look. All but eight building teams collected a variety of archival data. Of the eight buildings which have not yet done so, six are high schools and two are middle schools. It was at this point in the school improvement planning process that building teams began to more fully utilize other staff members. Committees were established, frequently with planning team members as participants, to collect the needed data. In addition, this was the first time that many building teams asked for assistance from personnel outside their building.

Evaluation and research

office employees were utilized as well as computer operators and local testing specialists.

Data Disaggregation

The next step in the school improvement planning process is the disaggregation of the data collected. Again, the majority of buildings in the project which had collected student outcome and/or archival data also disaggregated the data. Specifically, only seven buildings have not done so - five high schools and two middle schools. Most of the building teams found it necessary to use their own members or other staff to do the disaggregation. The task of disaggregation seemed to be new to those central office people who had assisted with data collection. There was also a lack of updated useful information on social class (ie: mother's or father's level of education) in most central offices which could be used for purposes of disaggregation. Therefore, approximately half of the teams constructed their own letter or questionnaire which was sent to parents of their students asking for current data.

Goal Setting and Plan Development

An analysis of the disaggregated student outcomes data and the learning climate survey leads to the development of goals - both short and long-range. Most of the buildings are currently at this step in the planning process. Specifically, 19 buildings have either determined their goals or are in the process of doing so. Six high schools and two middle schools are not yet at this step. The building planning teams have involved staff in the prioritizing of needs and goal develop

ment. A complete school improvement plan, based on the data collected and the determined goals has been written by 3 of the building teams. The teams were also successful in involving the staff in plan writing, thus having immediate staff buy-in to the improvement activities which are to occur over the next two to three years. Each building was able to begin implementation of their plan this year.

Personnel

Superintendents played a very important role in the school improvement planning process. For the purpose of this report, this role was characterized as being either active or passive in nature. A "passive" role was indicated by evidence that the superintendent's involvement was limited to budget and/or policy support. Superintendents' who also provided this assistance as well as actively participating with the team(s), were considered to have an "active" role. While the "active" superintendent may not have attended all of the team meetings, he let the teams know through actions and words that school improvement was a very important part of his agenda. He also asked to be kept informed of the team's progress and was perceived by school staff to place a high priority on school improvement. Fourteen districts were involved in this project; the majority of superintendents more closely resembled a "passive" superintendent.

If the superintendent tended to be "active", each building in the district in this project was proceeding satisfactorily through the planning process. However, in the districts where the superintendent tended to be less "active", the middle schools generally proceeded forward while the high schools worked at a much slower pace, or, in three cases, just disbanded the process for a period of time.

The building principal, assistant or executive principal, was vital to the success of the school improvement planning process. It was evident that in those buildings where the process was moving forward satisfactorily, the administrator exhibited leadership skills and was able to stay on the school improvement track. In the buildings where the process has not proceeded on an even course, the building administrator has either not had sufficient leadership skills and/or found it necessary to shift focus to other matters.

Teacher team members in every building have worked many hours beyond their contracted days for no extra compensation. Interest, enthusiasm and a strong sense of commitment were very obvious in almost all team members. In 21 of the buildings the teachers reported that this was the first time they have believed they could work together as a staff and make significant changes in the life of the school and the learning of the students.

II. EFFECTIVE TEACHING

Seven districts, or twelve buildings, were involved with effective teaching training. Two of these districts were also part of the FIPSE school improvement project. Of these seven districts, three were able to successfully provide training for teachers and administrators through the use of their own trained personnel. As a direct result of this project, these three districts have implemented a Staff Development Department which is primarily responsible for district effective teaching training. Teams from the other four districts have a plan for implementation of effective teaching training which includes a building team responsible for providing workshops and small group seminars. The level of success of this plan implementation varied significantly from building to building. The key to successful effective teaching training with adequate follow-up was, once again, the commitment and involvement of the building principal and the support of the superintendent.

III. PROJECT OUTCOMES

This project had five intended outcomes at the building level, and overall it appears that these outcomes have been met. The outcomes were:

1. Observable changes in project participants' knowledge, understanding, and ability to use specific instructional skills that facilitate student learning.

2. Observable changes in the instructional supervision skills of building administrators. This includes the ability to observe, diagnose the teaching actions, provide positive reinforcement for appropriate use of instructional skills by the teacher, and provide guidance and corrective feedback to the teacher.

3. Development of a cadre of local MCEA district instructional skills trainers to extend the outcomes of #1 and #2 within the district and beyond the life of the project.

4. Development of an in-building support base, the School Improvement Team, to plan for and implement an on-going school improvement in-service program.

5. Observable changes in the School Improvement Teams' ability to assess the existing school learning climate and work with the staff and students to develop and implement learning improvement objectives.

IV. GENERALIZATIONS

1) Middle schools are further along in the process than high schools.

2) When the superintendent was actively involved, high school and middle schools made significant progress.

3) If the superintendent was passively involved, the tendency was for middle schools to move forward but high school to make slower progress.

4) Middle schools could work independent of an active superintendent, but high schools had much more difficulty.

5) Principal buy-in was cruical for progress to occur - building teams made significant progress where the principal was committed to school improvement based on effective schools and/or effective teaching research.

6) Building teams made little, if any, progress if the principal was not actively involved.

7) If the high school was involved in a traditional North Central Association evaluation, school improvement halted during that time - no attempt was made to integrate the two processes.

8) There was hesitancy on the part of more high school than middle school teams to collect student outcome data. It was common for high schools to have only MEAP (and possibly DAT) information on all students. This is a reflection of district testing program priorities and need for K-12 student outcome data.

9) Most building teams collected and disaggregated their own student outcome and archival data; central office provided minimal assistance, if any.

10) Most building teams did not have a district mission statement from which they could build (or find support for)their building mission.

11) The process of setting goals based on data appeared to be new and difficult for most building teams.

12) Communication was a common problem - few buildings/districts had a well designed communication mechanism (team with staff, building to building, central office with the building/staff).

13) A question arises as to the depth of knowledge of many staff members (those not on teams) of school/teacher effects on research and steps in the planning process.

14) Some confusion exists for building staff and central office personnel between school effects research and teacher effects research.

15) In buildings furthest along in the process, the district had a few clearly defined priorities, and school improvement was one of them. In buildings least far along, the district had a general lack of focus (either too many priorities or school improvement was not a priority).

16) An outside facilitator was the catalyst for many buildings to move forward in the process.

17) Districts need to update their social class/parents' level of education data on student record forms.

18) Effective teaching training needs to be structured so that regular opportunities are available for feedback regarding instructional strategies.

19) High quality training with consistency in understanding of concepts is necessary in effective teaching training.

APPENDIX C

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
1. Selecting an objective at the correct level of difficulty and complexity...	A: (43)	4.65 (2)	20.93 (9)	23.26 (10)	39.53 (17)	11.63 (5)	A: (26)	3.85 (1)	3.85 (1)	30.77 (8)	42.31 (11)	19.23 (5)
	B: (46)	4.35 (2)	28.26 (13)	30.43 (14)	34.78 (16)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	6.90 (2)	13.79 (4)	41.38 (12)	37.93 (11)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	4.50 (4)	24.72 (22)	26.97 (24)	37.08 (33)	6.74 (6)	WTD. %: (55)	1.82 (1)	5.45 (3)	21.82 (12)	41.82 (23)	29.10 (16)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
2. Listing Bloom's taxonomy of the cognotive domain...	A: (43)	16.28 (7)	46.51 (20)	16.28 (7)	9.30 (4)	11.63 (5)	A: (26)	3.85 (1)	23.08 (6)	38.46 (10)	19.23 (5)	15.38 (4)
	B: (46)	6.52 (3)	41.30 (19)	32.61 (15)	19.57 (9)	0.00 (0)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	13.79 (4)	20.69 (6)	31.03 (9)	34.48 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	11.24 (10)	43.82 (39)	24.72 (22)	14.61 (13)	5.62 (5)	WTD. %: (55)	1.82 (1)	18.18 (10)	29.10 (16)	25.45 (14)	25.45 (14)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
3. Teaching an objective by selecting correct teacher and student behaviors for instruction...	A: (43)	6.98 (3)	25.58 (11)	13.95 (6)	39.53 (17)	13.95 (6)	A: (26)	7.69 (2)	3.85 (1)	23.08 (6)	38.46 (10)	26.92 (7)
	B: (44)	9.09 (4)	29.55 (13)	22.73 (10)	31.82 (14)	6.82 (3)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	20.69 (6)	44.83 (13)	31.03 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (87)	8.05 (7)	27.59 (24)	18.40 (16)	35.63 (32)	10.34 (9)	WTD. %: (55)	40.00 (2)	40.00 (2)	21.82 (12)	41.82 (23)	29.09 (16)

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
4. Using a task analysis process...	A: (43)	16.28 (7)	34.88 (15)	25.58 (11)	16.28 (7)	6.98 (3)	A: (26)	0.00 (0)	19.23 (5)	34.62 (9)	34.62 (9)	11.54 (3)
	B: (46)	15.22 (7)	32.61 (15)	21.74 (10)	26.09 (12)	4.35 (2)	B: (27)	0.00 (0)	7.41 (2)	37.04 (10)	37.04 (10)	18.52 (5)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	15.73 (14)	33.71 (30)	23.60 (21)	21.35 (19)	5.62 (7)	WTD. %: (53)	0.00 (0)	13.21 (7)	35.85 (19)	35.85 (19)	15.09 (8)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
5. Monitoring the learner's progress and adjusting the teaching throughout a learning task...	A: (43)	2.33 (1)	16.28 (7)	32.56 (14)	30.23 (13)	18.60 (8)	A: (26)	0.00 (0)	11.54 (3)	15.38 (4)	38.46 (10)	34.62 (9)
	B: (46)	10.87 (5)	21.74 (10)	23.91 (11)	36.96 (17)	6.52 (3)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	13.79 (4)	37.93 (11)	48.28 (14)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	6.74 (6)	19.10 (17)	28.09 (25)	33.71 (30)	12.36 (11)	WTD. %: (55)	0.00 (0)	5.45 (3)	15.09 (8)	39.62 (21)	41.82 (23)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
6. Listing the principals of learning...	A: (43)	2.33 (1)	46.51 (20)	23.26 (10)	13.95 (6)	13.95 (6)	A: (26)	7.69 (2)	7.69 (2)	19.23 (5)	30.77 (8)	34.62 (9)
	B: (46)	10.87 (5)	39.13 (18)	34.78 (16)	13.04 (6)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	10.34 (3)	58.62 (17)	31.03 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	6.74 (6)	42.70 (38)	29.21 (26)	13.48 (12)	7.87 (7)	WTD. %: (55)	3.64 (2)	3.64 (2)	14.55 (8)	45.45 (25)	32.73 (18)

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
7. ...posing the components of the teaching act...	A: (43)	9.30 (4)	44.19 (19)	18.60 (8)	18.60 (8)	9.30 (4)	A: (25)	0.00 (0)	16.00 (4)	32.00 (8)	32.00 (8)	20.00 (5)
	B: (46)	15.22 (7)	30.43 (14)	36.96 (17)	15.22 (7)	2.17 (1)	B: (28)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	25.00 (7)	46.43 (13)	28.57 (8)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	12.36 (11)	37.08 (33)	28.09 (25)	16.85 (15)	5.62 (5)	WTD. %: (53)	0.00 (0)	7.55 (4)	28.30 (15)	39.62 (21)	24.53 (13)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
8. Labeling the parts of lesson as you see it...	A: (43)	11.63 (5)	32.56 (14)	16.28 (7)	13.95 (6)	25.58 (11)	A: (26)	0.00 (0)	11.54 (3)	19.23 (5)	34.62 (9)	34.62 (9)
	B: (45)	13.33 (6)	35.56 (16)	28.89 (13)	17.78 (8)	4.44 (2)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	0.00 (0)	17.24 (5)	48.28 (14)	34.48 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (88)	12.50 (11)	34.09 (30)	22.73 (20)	15.91 (14)	14.77 (13)	WTD. %: (55)	0.00 (0)	5.45 (3)	18.18 (10)	41.82 (23)	34.55 (19)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
9. Script taping a Lesson...	A: (43)	58.14 (25)	18.60 (8)	6.98 (3)	9.30 (4)	6.98 (3)	A: (26)	3.85 (1)	23.08 (6)	19.23 (5)	26.92 (7)	26.92 (7)
	B: (46)	32.61 (15)	39.13 (18)	15.22 (7)	10.87 (5)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	13.79 (4)	37.93 (11)	31.03 (9)	17.24 (5)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	44.94 (40)	29.21 (26)	11.24 (10)	10.11 (9)	4.49 (4)	WTD. %: (55)	1.82 (1)	18.18 (10)	29.09 (16)	29.09 (16)	21.82 (12)

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
10. Grouping data for reinforcement conference...	A: (43)	51.16 (22)	25.58 (11)	9.30 (4)	6.98 (3)	6.98 (3)	A: (25)	8.00 (2)	20.00 (5)	20.00 (5)	28.00 (7)	24.00 (6)
	B: (46)	32.61 (15)	36.96 (17)	13.04 (6)	15.22 (7)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	13.79 (4)	51.72 (15)	31.03 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	41.57 (37)	31.46 (28)	11.24 (10)	11.24 (10)	4.49 (4)	WTD. %: (54)	3.70 (2)	11.11 (6)	16.66 (9)	40.74 (22)	27.77 (15)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
11. Selecting a reinforcement conference objective...	A: (43)	44.19 (19)	27.91 (12)	13.95 (6)	4.65 (2)	9.30 (4)	A: (26)	3.85 (1)	15.38 (4)	19.23 (5)	34.62 (9)	26.92 (7)
	B: (44)	31.82 (14)	43.18 (19)	13.64 (6)	9.09 (4)	2.27 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	10.34 (3)	51.72 (15)	34.48 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (87)	37.93 (33)	35.63 (31)	13.79 (12)	6.90 (6)	5.75 (5)	WTD. %: (55)	1.82 (1)	9.09 (5)	14.55 (8)	43.64 (24)	30.91 (17)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
12. Planning the reinforcement conference...	A: (43)	51.16 (22)	18.60 (8)	13.95 (6)	6.98 (6)	9.30 (4)	A: (26)	7.69 (2)	19.23 (5)	26.92 (7)	15.38 (4)	30.77 (8)
	B: (46)	30.96 (17)	30.43 (14)	19.57 (9)	10.87 (5)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	20.69 (6)	41.38 (12)	34.48 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	43.82 (39)	24.72 (22)	16.85 (15)	8.99 (8)	5.62 (5)	WTD. %: (55)	3.64 (2)	10.91 (6)	23.64 (13)	29.09 (17)	32.73 (18)

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	(# of people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
13. Conducting a reinforcement conference...	A: (43)	48.84 (21)	23.26 (10)	13.95 (6)	2.33 (1)	11.63 (5)	A: (26)	7.69 (2)	23.08 (6)	26.92 (7)	11.54 (3)	30.77 (8)
	B: (46)	34.78 (16)	36.96 (17)	17.39 (8)	8.70 (4)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	27.59 (8)	41.38 (12)	27.59 (8)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	41.57 (37)	30.34 (27)	15.73 (14)	5.62 (5)	6.74 (6)	WTD. %: (55)	3.64 (2)	12.73 (7)	27.27 (15)	27.27 (15)	29.09 (16)

Effective Teaching Inventory
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	(# of people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
13. Conducting a reinforcement conference...	A: (43)	48.84 (21)	23.26 (10)	13.95 (6)	2.33 (1)	11.63 (5)	A: (26)	7.69 (2)	23.08 (6)	26.92 (7)	11.54 (3)	30.77 (8)
	B: (46)	34.78 (16)	36.96 (17)	17.39 (8)	8.70 (4)	2.17 (1)	B: (29)	0.00 (0)	3.45 (1)	27.59 (8)	41.38 (12)	27.59 (8)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (89)	41.57 (37)	30.34 (27)	15.73 (14)	5.62 (5)	6.74 (6)	WTD. %: (55)	3.64 (2)	12.73 (7)	27.27 (15)	27.27 (15)	29.09 (16)

1986-87

DATE: _____

EFFECTIVE TEACHING INVENTORY

Last 4 digits of your home phone number: _____
(for purpose of matching pre & post)

RATING SCALE

1. Presently Unaware (I feel ready for introduction.)
2. Presently Aware (I've been introduced but feel that I need more.)
3. Presently Understand (I feel that I understand the concept, but I need to apply it in "real life".)
4. Presently apply (I feel that I apply this in my "real life" and need more in-depth study.)
5. Presently Analyze (I feel comfortable to help others learn this information.)

PLEASE RATE YOURSELF IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS:

1. Selecting an objective at the correct level of difficulty and complexity.
   1 2 3 4 5

2. Listing Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive domain.
   1 2 3 4 5

3. Teaching an objective by selecting correct teacher and student behaviors for instruction.
   1 2 3 4 5

4. Using a task analysis process.
   1 2 3 4 5

5. Monitoring the learner's progress and adjusting the teaching throughout a learning task.
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Listing the principles of learning.
   1 2 3 4 5

7. Diagnosing the components of the teaching act.
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Labeling the parts of lesson as you see it.
   1 2 3 4 5

9. Script taping a lesson.
   1 2 3 4 5

10. Grouping data for a reinforcement conference.
    1 2 3 4 5

11. Selecting a reinforcement conference objective.
    1 2 3 4 5

12. Planning the reinforcement conference.
    1 2 3 4 5

13. Conducting a reinforcement conference.
    1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D

Summary of Telephone Interviews
with Selected Teachers and
Principals Participating in the
1985-86 Project for Secondary
School and Teacher Improvement

As one portion of the evaluation of the Middle Cities Association Project, titled "A Project for Secondary School and Teacher Improvement", telephone interviews were conducted with 21 selected participants. These phone interviews followed a structured questionnaire format (attached).

The questions asked for the following types of information:

1. The quality of the workshops in terms of format, content, and presenters.
2. The impact training has had on building level and/or classroom level activities.
3. The status of future plans.
4. Recommendations regarding project direction.

An attempt was made to assure that one teacher and one principal from each district participating in what has been titled the Fipse A & B groups was interviewed. This generally held true with two exceptions - two teachers and one principal were interviewed in Ann Arbor and only a principal was interviewed in Plymouth-Canton. No superintendents, central office or college personnel were interviewed. Ninety-eight teachers and principals were listed as participating in Groups A & B. The 21 interviews completed then represent approximately 21% of the total group. No special criteria were used to select the 21 respondents. Attempts were made to have a balance between middle school and high school respondents. Care was taken that all respondents were not of one gender.

What follows is a summary of the results of these interviews formatted around the four information areas discussed above.

Quality of Workshops

A majority of the participants reported high satisfaction with the quality of the training. What most counted to participants was the practicality and usefulness of what was presented. Several respondents commented that their usual staff development experiences consisted of "one shot" sessions on a variety of topics. Practice, coaching, and follow-up were non-existent. Further, there was little relationship to what was learned and actual classsroom practice. In contrast, this training was exemplary because of its focused, in-depth nature and emphasis on practice, modeling and follow-up. Several respondents felt that taking the project off site gave it more status*. While praise for the project was by far the typical response, there were some respondents who mentioned aspects of the program they felt were weak:

1. Some felt the content of the workshops could have been condensed. The feeling was the sessions were too "drawn out."

2. Some felt that the instruction was uneven; some presenters were better than others.

3. Related to number 2, some named a specific presenter they felt was weak, an equal number made a point of praising that same presenter.

4. Many felt the examples used with the content were oriented exclusively to the elementary level teacher/administrator; some strongly made this point.

One of the questions asked how much previous experience the respondent had with the content of the workshop. Most persons had what could be described as limited experience with effective teaching principles and few had experienced the content in any depth. Representatives from one district reported that they

*If a comment has been made by three or more persons it is considered appropriate for inclusion.

had been heavily involved and felt they were at a more advanced level than the workshops provided. In a few cases, the respondents reported no prior knowledge of the workshop content. A generalized statement would describe the participants interviewed as having an awareness of the training content but not having the focused, in-depth emersion into the principles of effective instruction that the training intended to provide.

Impact on Classroom/Building Practices

One of the strengths of the program from the view of those interviewed was that the methodologies learned did indeed make a difference in the way teachers taught and the way students learned. Perhaps the most descriptive way to portray this is to provide some direct quotes from teachers.

> I have been using the techniques ... I have seen the results ... It has shown me how to get (students) involved ... (I) worked at involvement of all students.
>
> Everytime I organize a lesson, I make a conscious effort to use the essential elements.
>
> I demand more (of the student) ... I see better results.
>
> Students ... (are) finishing their assignments ... I had had trouble motivating my students.

The above quotes are typical of what most teachers had to say about the effects of the training on their classroom practices.

In those districts where practice and coaching were provided between sessions the program was seen as stronger and having more school-wide impact. In a few cases, the respondents mentioned that central office personnel had been a part of the coaching and practice or that superintendents had called the teams together to discuss the project. In most cases, participants did get together between sessions at least at the building team level. Practice most often occurred by having team members visit rooms and practice scriptaping and

conferencing and also by having coaches available to team members.

Some teachers and principals reported that they shared what they had learned with their building-level colleagues by using staff meeting time to talk about the training sessions and what was being learned. Only one respondent reported that no practice between sessions occured. Some of the coaching and practicing at some sites was already planned well before the Middle Cities Project. However, for most sites this project was the catalyst that provided momentum for persons to take what was learned in the sessions to the school setting and beyond.

Status of Future Plans

One of the measures of long term impact is whether or not the project is likely to be turn-keyed into district-level staff development programs. Most respondents indicated that their districts did plan to work to involve more teachers and principals in effective teaching methodologies and to continue to train those who have already participated. While the types of plans for follow-up differed from one school district to another, what follows are the more predominant examples.

1. Providing school district-sponsored effective instruction workshops that reach staff beyond those involved in the Middle Cities Project.

2. Piggybacking onto intermediate school district efforts by sending teams of teachers to these effective instruction sessions.

3. Participating in the Training of Trainers project sponsored by Middle Cities. Several respondents were invited to take more in-depth training so that they could be a resource in their home districts.

4. Continuing, as teams, to be part of the Middle Cities Project in the coming year.

Not all respondents could tell of future planning. Respondents who expressed concern that there was no central level support for the project were the ones most likely to not know what the future direction was. However, where support for the project was visible at all levels (classroom, building, central), respondents usually could discuss future plans.

Project Direction

At the request of the project staff, respondents were asked preferences for the content of the second year sessions. The project can continue to refine and re-enforce the skills dealing with effective instruction or can move on to the area of school climate. While there was some support for continuing with effective instruction, a majority of respondents felt that dealing with school climate would be a better choice and most of those persons were, in fact, expecting that direction.

Summary

The move of the Middle Cities Association to expand its effective instruction staff development activities to the middle and high schools was viewed by nearly all those participants interviewed as a welcome and much needed professional growth experience for themselves and for their colleagues. Most respondents indicated that Middle Cities either was the impetus for expanding training efforts in effective instruction at the district level or helped add to or re-enforce already existing efforts. There was concern evidenced regarding the length of the training, 10 days, the "uneveness" of some of the presenters and the use of "elementary level" methods. These are areas that the project should address as the next phase of the program begins.

Prepared By: Grace Iverson
August, 1986

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

NAME	TITLE	SCHOOL	DISTRICT
Milo White	Principal	Pioneer High School	Ann Arbor
Robin Wax	Teacher	Pioneer High School	Ann Arbor
June Griffin Hagen	Teacher	Tappan Intermediate	Ann Arbor
Tim Tobin	Asst. Principal	Central High School	Bay City
Ben Gibson	Teacher	Central High School	Bay City
DeWain Molter	Principal	Dolan Middle School	Beecher
Holly Gunderson	Teacher	Dolan Middle School	Beecher
James N. Rutter	Principal	Benton Harbor High	Benton Harbor
Olivia James	Teacher	Benton Harbor High	Benton Harbor
Osborne D. Burks	Principal	Ricker Middle School	Buena Vista
Thomas J. Tatten	Principal	Canton High School	Plymouth-Canton
E. Darryl Lee	Asst. Principal	Central High School	Pontiac
Michael McIntyre	Teacher	Central High School	Pontiac
Thomas N. Barris	Principal	Webber Middle School	Saginaw
Brenda Palmateer	Teacher	Webber Middle School	Saginaw
Daniel J. Hogan	Principal	Southfield High School	Southfield
Robert Pearce	Teacher	Southfield High School	Southfield
Mercedies Wauddy	Principal	West Middle School	Ypsilanti
Donald Davis	Teacher	West Middle School	Ypsilanti
Ken Wilson	Principal	Southwestern High	Flint
Bonnie Martinson	Teacher	Southwestern High	Flint

SECONDARY GROUPS
MIDDLE CITIES EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
FIPSE

STRUCTURED PARTICIPANTS PHONE INTERVIEW

Person Interviewed _____ School Assignment _____

Type of Interview _____ District Assignment _____

How much experience did you have with the content of the workshops prior to your participation?

Lots ___ Some ___ Little ___ None ___ Other _____

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

How did you get involved or hear about the FIPSE project?

Volunteered ___ Assigned ___ Asked to Participate ___ Other _____

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Did the project live up to your expectations?

Yes ____ No ____

Why? _____

_____

_____

4. How has your district supported your participation?

5. Were you able to practice what you had learned between sessions?

Yes _____ No _____

5a. Was the practice helpful to you? Yes _____ No _____

How? _____

If not, why not? _____

6. Are there any plans to follow-up with that practice on a formal or informal base?

Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

7. Has your team been getting together this year?

How has that worked?

How are you using the skills you learned in the project?

9. How has what you've learned impacted on student achievement?

10. Do you have any recommendations for next year's project?

What would you recommend for project direction?

11. Are there any other comments you want to make re: FIPSE?

APPENDIX E

MIDDLE CITIES EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
PROJECT FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT
TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY
YEAR 2, 1986-1987

This report discusses the outcomes of the second year of a Middle Cities Association (MCA) sponsored program titled "A Project For Secondary School Improvement". This project, supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), has had and continues to have a focus on training secondary school level administrators and teachers in the research about and implementation of teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness models. Middle Cities had successfully provided a similar program for elementary level staff and sought funding from FIPSE for a secondary school level program. Year one of the project emphasized instructional effectiveness, specifically the model called Instructional Theory Into Practice or ITIP.

At the end of year one of the program, the writer conducted telephone interviews of a subset of participants in the project. The written summary of those interviews, along with other evaluation information, was used by project staff to plan for year two of the project, conducted in the 1986-87 school year. The reader is reminded that the project was open to MCA member districts who formed training teams. These teams were generally made up of classroom teachers from one or more schools, one or more administrators from each school, and, in some cases, central office staff. The focus of all training has been on the school as the unit of change, thus the emphasis on sending school teams.

Some training options were provided to year two teams. Teams could continue with the ITIP model of teacher effectiveness training and pursue that model in more depth than previous year's training allowed, or they could move into school effectiveness training and implementation. It was this latter option that most school districts chose to pursue.

This report deals with participants' perceptions of the training offered in school effectiveness. It is acknowledged that while this information is important to document in terms of accountability to the funding agency, there were additional evaluation activities that occurred throughout the program year which assisted the project staff in adjusting their plans where appropriate.

At the end of the school year, 1986-87, 25 participants in the project were interviewed by telephone. These phone interviews followed a structured questionnaire format (attached). The questions were designed to gather information on the following aspects of the second year of the program.

1. Successes/disappointments in implementing the first steps of a school improvement process
2. Impact training has had or is expected to have on student learning
3. Status of future plans
4. Help provided from the project staff
5. Recommendations regarding project direction

The telephone interviews focused on staff members in fourteen of the 27 participating districts. These 14 districts were grouped together for training purposes into what has been called FIPSE A & B groups. An attempt was made to

talk with one principal and one teacher from each of the 14 A & B districts; that was possible in ten districts. In four districts, only an interview with an administrator was able to be scheduled. No special criteria were used to select the 25 respondents. Attempts were made to have a balance between middle school and high school interviews. What follows is a summary of the results of these interviews formatted around the five information areas discussed above.

SUCCESSES/DISAPPOINTMENTS FOR BUILDING TEAMS IN IMPLEMENTING THE FIRST STEPS OF A SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS

Participants reported that their building level teams had indeed implemented a variety of first steps in the school improvement process. The most frequent activity reported was the development of a mission statement. Other areas of activity frequently mentioned were: team level work sessions, total building staff meetings designed to share the school improvement process, identifying and/or implementing a needs assessment process. Less frequently mentioned activities were developing student outcomes statements and developing systematic communication procedures between the teams and the total building staff. In nearly every case, the person interviewed was able to tell of specific school improvement initiatives that were begun as a result of the training sessions sponsored by the project. Those activities mentioned are, in the judgment of the evaluator, appropriate "first steps" in the process of implementing a school improvement model.

The most positive outcome reported for the second year of the project was the way that teams worked together for a common purpose. Because team members were from different departments in a secondary school, staff members interacted with colleagues that they previously had only known slightly. One respondent typified this feeling with the comment that the project had encouraged across department communication. When asked what was the biggest disappointment respondents had a variety of answers: attitudes of other staff at the building, lack of administrative support, lack of time to implement the model, were the most frequently mentioned concerns in this area.

IMPACT TRAINING HAS HAD OR IS EXPECTED TO HAVE ON STUDENT LEARNING

Nearly all respondents felt that the implementation of the school improvement model would, in the long term, positively impact school success. A few respondents felt that results were already being observed in terms of student achievement. The potential for positively affecting student achievement through the school improvement process was acknowledged; yet most felt that this goal would be reached over a longer period of time than two years participation provided.

STATUS OF FUTURE PLANS

Twenty-two of the 25 respondents answered this question positively, indicating that they and their team members were looking forward to continuing on with the project. Nearly all of these 22 respondents were able to describe two or three next steps for the team to accomplish as they implement a school improvement process. The most frequently mentioned next activities were either administering a needs assessment questionnaire or analyzing the results of a needs assessment already administered. Other frequently mentioned activities were developing a school improvement plan, disaggregating student achievement data, involving more staff at the building level, getting a mission statement approved and replacing team members lost to layoffs, transfers or

resignations. Three respondents gave negative responses to this query indicating they knew of no plans or expected no movement. Therefore, 88% of the respondents could clearly give the interviewer some definitive plans that indicated a commitment to continued work with the implementation of the model.

HELP PROVIDED FROM THE PROJECT

One of the concerns that the program coordinator had was whether or not respondents perceived that the project was available for support. In order to make such support available their were some parts of the training sessions purposely set aside on the afternoon of the second day for teams to work with project staff. In addition, project staff made themselves available to visit districts on their campuses to discuss program issues and lend support. Respondents were asked two questions; did the team members take advantage of the time set aside on the training days and did the team have someone from the project staff visit. The respondents indicated that they took more advantage of the extra time offered during the workshops than they did of the offer to visit the sites. Over half, 68%, or 17 respondents, said they stayed to meet with project personnel at least once, but only 7, 28%, indicated that staff had been invited to the district. For those who either stayed at the training sessions to meet staff or had staff visit on-site, the results were positive with respondents indicating that taking advantage of this help meant that they were better able to work through the process.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING PROJECT DIRECTION

There were a variety of recommendations. The four most frequently mentioned recommendations were: 1) have project staff visit buildings on-site whether or not they are invited, 2) keep Larry Lezotte involved in the project, 3) keep using resource people who have implemented the model elsewhere and 4) keep building in to the program interaction between districts. When asked whether or not they had any further comments regarding the project, seventeen of the 25 respondents indicated that they were pleased with their participation in the project and they felt that what they were doing was important. Some typical comments were:

- those people are great
- Dr. Lezotte and staff have done a fantastic job
- the project has real worth in terms of dealing with students who aren't making it
- sessions have gone well
- very good project

Of the 8 other responses, only one was negative indicating concern as to whether or not there was administrative support in the district for the project, the remaining seven respondents either gave additional recommendations for future project activities which were included above or had nothing further to say.

SUMMARY

During the second year of The Project for Secondary School and Teacher Improvement, most school teams chose to work in the area of effective schools. Nearly all of those participants who responded to a telephone interview, felt that this second year the project was a positive and helpful

one for them. Based on these interviews, the evaluator concludes that the project is on target and is having positive results in reaching training goals. This conclusion is based on the responses of interviewees who, in nearly every case, indicated a commitment to continuing with those tasks necessary to implement school improvement models based on the effective schools research.

Prepared By: Grace Iverson

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Name	District	School
James Bahling (p)	Albion	Washington Gardner Junior High
Carmilia Hawkins	Albion	Washington Gardner Junior High
Milo White (p)	Ann Arbor	Pioneer High School
Jeannie Lombard	Ann Arbor	Pioneer High School
Chester Hughes (p)	Beecher	Beecher High School
Leola Harris	Beecher	Beecher High School
Ken Wilson (p)	Flint	Southwestern High School
Bob Ebmeyer	Flint	Southwestern High School
Don Ellis (p)	Jackson	Parkside Middle School
Craig Cunningham	Jackson	Parkside Middle School
Ben Bonin (p)	Muskegon	Bunker Junior High School
Caron Farmer	Muskegon	Bunker Junior High School
Carl Western (p)	Muskegon Heights	Muskegon Heights High School
Francis Wright	Muskegon Heights	Muskegon Heights High School
Sherwood Quick (p)	Niles	Lardner Middle School
Tom Tatten	Plymouth-Canton	Canton High School
Julie Lavey	Plymouth-Canton	Canton High School
Wilson Smith (p)	Saginaw	Saginaw High School
Sharon Floyd	Saginaw	Saginaw High School
Dan Hogan	Southfield	Southfield High School
Art Carinci	Southfield	Southfield High School
Dick Ayling (p)	Traverse City	Traverse City High School
Ray Mellberg (p)	Willow Run	Edmondson Middle School
Debbie Clarke (ap)	Ypsilanti	Ypsilanti High School
Lynn Allison	Ypsilanti	Ypsilanti High School

p = Principal ap = Assistant Principal

Appt made for _____ May, 87

SECONDARY GROUPS
MCA FIPSE 2
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

erson Interviewed _____ District Assignment _____

Date of Interview _____ School Assignment _____

Role _____

1. Did you participate in FIPSE last year?

   Yes ____ No ____

   Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. How did you get involved in the FIPSE Project?

   Volunteered ____ Assigned ____ Asked to Participate ____

   Participated last year ____ Other _____

   Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Did the project live up to your expectations?

   Yes _____ No _____

   Why/why not? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. How has your district supported your participation in this project?

5. What activities do you and your teammates work on or implement between sessions?

- Do you see these activities as helpful?

  How? _____

  If not, why not? _____

6. There were some sessions scheduled on the afternoon of the 2nd day for individual teams or individuals to meet with the consultants. Was your team able to take advantage of this service?

Yes ____ No _____

Comments:

7. Project staff were also available to visit districts on their campuses to discuss program issues. Was your team able to have someone visit?

Comments:

8. What plans does your team have for the coming year?

Comments:

9. From your view, has any of your work and/or the work of your team impacted on student learning?

9a. Do you anticipate that it will in the future? _____

10. What has been the most positive aspect of the project to date?

For you? _____

10a. For your school? _____

11. What has been the biggest disappointment?

For you? _____

11a. For your school? _____

12. Do you have any recommendations for the project for next year?

13. Do you have any other comments regarding the project?

APPENDIX F

"Level of Understanding"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
1. The research on school effectiveness...	A: (55)	20.00 (11)	12.73 (7)	32.73 (18)	27.27 (15)	7.27 (4)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	17.07 (7)	41.46 (17)	41.46 (17)
	B: (54)	14.81 (8)	29.63 (16)	31.48 (17)	20.37 (11)	3.70 (2)	B: (22)	4.55 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	40.91 (9)	54.55 (12)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	17.43 (19)	21.11 (23)	32.11 (35)	23.85 (26)	5.50 (6)	WTD. %: (63)	1.59 (1)	0.0 (0)	11.11 (7)	41.27 (26)	46.03 (29)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
2. The characteristics (correlates) of an effective school...	A: (55)	16.36 (9)	12.73 (7)	34.55 (19)	21.82 (12)	14.55 (8)	A: (41)	2.44 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.88 (2)	34.15 (14)	58.54 (24)
	B: (54)	11.11 (6)	40.74 (22)	20.37 (11)	20.37 (11)	7.41 (4)	B: (22)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.55 (1)	22.73 (5)	72.73 (16)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	13.76 (15)	26.61 (29)	27.52 (30)	21.10 (23)	11.01 (12)	WTD. %: (63)	1.59 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.76 (3)	30.16 (19)	63.49 (40)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
3. Purpose/use of the school improvement team...	A: (55)	14.55 (8)	25.45 (14)	20.00 (11)	29.09 (16)	10.91 (6)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	2.44 (1)	7.32 (3)	19.51 (8)	70.73 (29)
	B: (54)	14.81 (8)	37.04 (20)	20.37 (11)	22.22 (12)	5.56 (3)	B: (22)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	4.55 (1)	22.73 (5)	72.73 (16)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	14.68 (16)	31.19 (34)	20.18 (22)	25.69 (28)	8.26 (9)	WTD. %: (63)	0.0 (0)	1.59 (1)	6.35 (4)	20.63 (13)	71.43 (45)

"Level of Understanding"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
4. Use of a school-wide needs assessment to determine areas for improvement...	A: (54)	18.52 (10)	20.37 (11)	27.78 (15)	18.52 (10)	14.81 (8)	A: (39)	2.56 (1)	0.0 (0)	7.69 (3)	10.26 (4)	79.49 (31)
	B: (53)	24.53 (13)	15.09 (8)	26.42 (14)	16.98 (9)	16.98 (9)	B: (21)	4.76 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	33.33 (7)	61.90 (13)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (107)	21.50 (23)	17.76 (19)	27.10 (29)	17.76 (19)	15.89 (17)	WTD. %: (60)	3.33 (2)	0.0 (0)	5.00 (3)	18.33 (11)	73.33 (44)
5. Development of a written school mission statement...	A: (55)	25.45 (13)	21.82 (12)	21.82 (12)	18.18 (18)	12.73 (7)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	2.44 (1)	2.44 (1)	12.20 (5)	82.93 (34)
	B: (54)	24.07 (13)	24.07 (13)	12.96 (7)	29.63 (16)	9.26 (5)	B: (22)	4.55 (1)	0.0 (0)	4.55 (1)	4.55 (1)	86.36 (19)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	24.77 (27)	22.94 (25)	17.43 (19)	23.85 (26)	11.01 (12)	WTD. %: (63)	1.59 (1)	1.59 (1)	3.17 (2)	9.52 (6)	84.13 (53)
6. The disaggregated analysis of the distribution of achievement as a basis for determining school effectiveness...	A: (53)	47.14 (25)	16.98 (9)	26.42 (14)	9.43 (5)	0.0 (0)	A: (40)	0.0 (0)	5.00 (2)	22.50 (9)	25.00 (10)	47.50 (19)
	B: (54)	50.00 (27)	12.96 (7)	16.67 (9)	14.81 (8)	5.56 (3)	B: (22)	9.09 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	36.36 (8)	54.55 (12)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (107)	48.60 (52)	14.95 (16)	21.50 (23)	12.15 (13)	2.80 (3)	WTD. %: (62)	3.23 (2)	3.23 (2)	14.52 (7)	29 (18)	50.00 (31)

"Level of Understanding"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
7. Design of a plan for a school-based improvement process...	A: (55)	25.45 (14)	29.09 (16)	16.36 (9)	25.45 (14)	3.64 (2)	A: (41)	0.0 (0))	4.88 (2)	7.32 (3)	29.27 (12)	58.54 (24)
	B: (54)	37.04 (20)	18.52 (10)	27.78 (15)	12.96 (7)	3.70 (2)	B: (22)	9.09 (2)	0.0 (0)	9.09 (2)	31.82 (7)	50.00 (11)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	31.19 (34)	23.85 (26)	22.02 (24)	19.27 (21)	3.67 (4)	WTD. %: (63)	3.17 (2)	3.17 (2)	7.94 (5)	30.16 (19)	55.55 (35)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
8. Implementing a school-based improvement process...	A: (55)	30.91 (17)	23.64 (13)	23.64 (13)	16.36 (9)	5.45 (3)	A: (40)	0.0 (0)	2.50 (1)	7.50 (3)	47.50 (19)	42.50 (17)
	B: (53)	35.85 (19)	26.42 (14)	16.98 (9)	16.98 (9)	3.77 (2)	B: (22)	4.55 (1)	9.09 (2)	9.09 (2)	36.36 (8)	40.91 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (108)	33.33 (36)	25.00 (27)	20.37 (22)	16.67 (18)	4.63 (5)	WTD. %: (62)	1.61 (1)	4.84 (3)	8.06 (5)	43.55 (27)	41.94 (26)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
9. Methods of sustaining a school-based improvement process...	A: (55)	29.09 (16)	38.18 (21)	9.09 (5)	20.00 (11)	3.64 (2)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	9.76 (4)	53.66 (22)	36.59 (15)
	B: (54)	46.30 (25)	22.22 (12)	16.67 (9)	11.11 (6)	3.70 (2)	B: (22)	9.09 (2)	4.55 (1)	4.55 (1)	40.91 (9)	40.91 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	37.61 (41)	30.28 (33)	12.84 (14)	15.60 (17)	3.67 (4)	WTD. %: (63)	3.17 (2)	1.59 (1)	7.94 (5)	49.21 (31)	38.10 (24)

"Level of Understanding"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
10. Evaluation of a school improvement process...	A: (55)	29.09 (16)	25.45 (14)	21.82 (12)	20.00 (11)	3.64 (2)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	2.44 (1)	7.32 (3)	48.78 (20)	41.46 (17)
	B: (54)	48.15 (26)	25.93 (14)	9.26 (5)	11.11 (6)	5.56 (3)	B: (22)	9.09 (2)	4.55 (1)	4.55 (1)	50.00 (11)	31.82 (7)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (109)	38.53 (42)	25.69 (28)	15.60 (17)	15.60 (17)	4.59 (5)	WTD. %: (63)	3.17 (2)	3.17 (2)	6.35 (4)	49.21 (31)	38.10 (24)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
11. The research on teacher effectiveness...	A: (55)	5.56 (3)	16.67 (9)	14.81 (8)	31.48 (17)	31.48 (17)	A: (40)	2.50 (1)	0.0 (0)	12.50 (5)	32.50 (13)	52.50 (21)
	B: (53)	11.11 (6)	20.37 (11)	20.37 (11)	33.33 (18)	14.81 (8)	B: (22)	9.52 (2)	0.0 (0)	14.29 (3)	28.57 (6)	47.62 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (107)	8.41 (9)	18.69 (20)	17.76 (19)	32.71 (35)	23.36 (25)	WTD. %: (62)	4.84 (3)	0.0 (0)	12.90 (8)	30.65 (19)	50.00 (31)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
12. Applying the research on teacher effectiveness to planned programs of school improvement...	A: (55)	20.00 (11)	18.18 (10)	32.73 (18)	20.00 (11)	9.09 (5)	A: (41)	2.44 (1)	0.0 (0)	14.63 (6)	46.34 (19)	36.59 (15)
	B: (53)	30.19 (16)	15.09 (8)	39.62 (21)	13.21 (7)	1.89 (1)	B: (21)	9.52 (2)	0.0 (0)	4.76 (1)	33.33 (7)	52.38 (11)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (108)	25.00 (27)	16.67 (18)	36.11 (39)	16.67 (18)	5.56 (6)	WTD. %: (62)	4.84 (3)	0.0 (0)	11.29 (7)	41.94 (26)	41.94 (26)

"Level of Use at Your Building"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	(# of people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
1. The research on school effectiveness...	A: (54)	12.96 (7)	55.56 (30)	22.22 (12)	7.41 (4)	1.85 (1)	A: (41)	7.32 (3)	2.44 (1)	41.46 (17)	29.27 (12)	19.51 (8)
	B: (52)	30.77 (16)	28.85 (15)	25.00 (13)	11.45 (6)	3.85 (2)	B: (19)	10.53 (2)	21.05 (4)	31.58 (6)	15.79 (3)	21.05 (4)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	21.70 (23)	42.45 (45)	23.58 (25)	9.43 (10)	2.83 (3)	WTD. %: (60)	8.33 (5)	8.33 (5)	38.33 (23)	25.00 (15)	20.00 (12)
2. The characteristics (correlates) of an effective school...	A: (54)	18.52 (10)	38.89 (21)	27.78 (15)	12.96 (7)	1.85 (1)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	12.20 (5)	31.71 (13)	39.02 (16)	17.07 (7)
	B: (52)	25.00 (13)	40.31 (22)	19.23 (10)	9.62 (5)	3.85 (2)	B: (19)	5.26 (1)	0.0 (0)	36.84 (7)	31.58 (6)	26.32 (5)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	21.70 (23)	40.57 (43)	23.58 (25)	11.32 (12)	2.83 (3)	WTD. %: (60)	1.66 (1)	8.33 (5)	33.33 (20)	36.66 (22)	20.00 (12)
3. Purpose/use of the school improvement team...	A: (53)	28.30 (15)	33.96 (18)	22.64 (12)	11.32 (6)	3.77 (2)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	2.44 (1)	19.51 (8)	51.22 (21)	26.83 (11)
	B: (52)	30.77 (16)	36.54 (19)	21.15 (11)	9.62 (5)	1.92 (1)	B: (29)	0.0 (0)	10.23 (2)	31.58 (6)	36.84 (7)	21.05 (4)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	29.25 (31)	34.91 (37)	21.70 (23)	10.38 (11)	2.83 (3)	WTD. %: (60)	0.0 (0)	5.00 (3)	23.33 (14)	46.66 (28)	25.00 (15)

"Level of Use at Your Building"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses-					GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses-				
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
4. Use of a school-wide needs assessment to determine areas for improvement...	A: (54)	25.93 (14)	27.78 (15)	24.07 (13)	12.96 (7)	9.26 (5)	A: (41)	2.44 (1)	2.44 (1)	19.51 (8)	26.83 (11)	48.78 (20)
	B: (53)	30.19 (16)	30.19 (16)	20.75 (11)	11.32 (6)	7.55 (4)	B: (18)	5.56 (1)	0.0 (0)	27.78 (5)	11.11 (2)	55.56 (10)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (107)	28.04 (30)	28.96 (31)	22.43 (24)	12.15 (13)	8.41 (9)	WTD. %: (59)	3.39 (2)	1.69 (1)	22.03 (13)	22.03 (13)	50.85 (30)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
5. Development of a written school mission statement...	A: (54)	31.48 (17)	29.63 (16)	20.37 (11)	11.11 (6)	7.41 (4)	A: (41)	0.0 (0)	2.44 (1)	9.76 (4)	21.95 (9)	65.85 (27)
	B: (52)	36.54 (19)	29.62 (14)	17.31 (9)	11.54 (6)	7.69 (4)	B: (20)	10.00 (2)	5.00 (1)	0.0 (0)	25.00 (5)	60.00 (12)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	33.96 (36)	28.30 (30)	18.87 (20)	11.32 (12)	7.55 (8)	WTD. %: (61)	3.28 (2)	3.28 (2)	6.56 (4)	22.95 (14)	63.93 (39)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
6. The disaggregated analysis of the distribution of achievemnet as a basis for determining school effectiveness...	A: (52)	44.23 (23)	23.08 (12)	23.08 (12)	9.62 (5)	0.0 (0)	A: (40)	7.50 (3)	2.50 (1)	45.00 (18)	17.50 (7)	27.50 (11)
	B: (51)	56.86 (29)	23.53 (12)	7.84 (4)	5.88 (3)	5.88 (3)	B: (19)	10.53 (12)	10.53 (2)	:21.05 (4)	36.84 (7)	21.04 (4)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE:	50.49 (52)	23.30 (24)	15.53 (16)	7.77 (8)	2.91 (3)	WTD. %: (59)	8.47 (5)	5.08 (3)	37.29 (22)	23.73 (14)	25.42 (15)

"Level of Use at Your Building"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses-					GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses-				
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
7. Design of a plan for a school-based improvement process...	A: (54)	37.04 (16)	29.63 (12)	22.22 (12)	7.41 (4)	3.70 (2)	A: (41)	4.88 (2)	0.0 (0)	24.39 (10)	36.59 (15)	34.15 (14)
	B: (52)	44.23 (23)	28.85 (15)	13.46 (7)	7.69 (4)	5.77 (3)	B: (19)	21.05 (4)	0.0 (0)	31.58 (6)	21.05 (4)	26.32 (5)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	40.57 (43)	29.25 (31)	17.92 (19)	7.55 (8)	4.72 (5)	WTD. %: (60)	10.00 (6)	0.0 (0)	26.67 (16)	31.67 (19)	31.67 (19)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
8. Implementing a school-based improvement process...	A: (54)	37.04 (20)	33.33 (18)	16.67 (7)	7.41 (4)	5.56 (3)	A: (40)	0.0 (0)	2.50 (1)	7.50 (3)	47.50 (19)	42.50 (17)
	B: (52)	44.23 (23)	32.69 (17)	3.85 (2)	15.38 (8)	3.85 (2)	B: (22)	4.55 (1)	9.09 (2)	9.09 (2)	36.36 (8)	40.91 (9)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	40.57 (43)	33.02 (35)	10.38 (11)	11.32 (12)	4.72 (5)	WTD. %: (62)	1.61 (1)	4.84 (3)	8.06 (5)	43.55 (27)	41.94 (26)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
9. Methods of sustaining a school-based improvement process...	A: (54)	44.44 (24)	27.78 (15)	20.37 (11)	5.56 (3)	1.85 (1)	A: (41)	2.44 (1)	19.51 (8)	26.83 (11)	36.59 (15)	14.63 (6)
	B: (52)	59.62 (31)	26.92 (14)	1.92 (1)	7.69 (4)	3.85 (2)	B: (19)	26.32 (5)	5.26 (1)	31.58 (6)	15.79 (3)	21.05 (4)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	51.89 (55)	27.36 (29)	11.32 (12)	6.60 (7)	2.83 (3)	WTD. %: (60)	10.00 (6)	15.00 (9)	28.33 (17)	30.00 (18)	16.66 (10)

"Level of Use at Your Building"
Percentages of Responses

CONCEPT	GROUP (# people)	PRE-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5	GROUP (# people)	POST-EVALUATION -Responses- 1	2	3	4	5
10. Evaluation of a school improvement process...	A: (54)	48.15 (26)	20.37 (11)	24.07 (13)	5.56 (3)	1.85 (1)	A: (40)	5.00 (2)	7.50 (3)	40.00 (16)	35.00 (14)	12.50 (5)
	B: (52)	63.46 (33)	19.23 (10)	5.77 (3)	5.77 (3)	5.77 (3)	B: (19)	31.58 (8)	15.79 (3)	21.05 (4)	10.53 (2)	21.05 (4)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	55.66 (59)	19.81 (21)	15.09 (16)	5.66 (6)	3.77 (4)	WTD. %: (59)	13.56 (8)	10.17 (6)	33.90 (20)	27.12 (16)	15.25 (9)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
11. The research on teacher effectiveness...	A: (53)	15.09 (8)	32.08 (17)	32.08 (17)	16.98 (9)	3.77 (2)	A: (40)	2.50 (1)	7.50 (3)	40.00 (16)	32.50 (13)	17.50 (7)
	B: (52)	21.15 (11)	21.15 (11)	23.08 (12)	28.85 (15)	5.77 (3)	B: (19)	15.79 (3)	5.26 (1)	31.58 (6)	21.05 (4)	26.32 (5)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (106)	17.92 (19)	26.42 (28)	27.36 (29)	22.64 (24)	4.72 (5)	WTD. %: (59)	6.78 (4)	6.78 (4)	37.29 (22)	28.81 (17)	20.34 (12)
		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
12. Applying the research on teacher effectiveness to planned programs of school improvement...	A: (52)	38.46 (20)	26.92 (14)	23.08 (12)	7.69 (4)	3.85 (2)	A: (41)	4.88 (2)	14.63 (6)	41.46 (17)	29.27 (12)	9.76 (4)
	B: (51)	41.18 (21)	25.49 (13)	21.57 (11)	9.80 (5)	1.96 (1)	B: (18)	16.67 (3)	5.56 (1)	50.00 (9)	11.11 (2)	16.67 (3)
	WEIGHTED PERCENTAGE: (103)	39.81 (41)	26.21 (27)	22.33 (23)	8.74 (9)	2.91 (3)	WTD. %: (59)	8.47 (5)	11.86 (7)	44.07 (26)	23.73 (14)	11.86 (7)

1986-87

Code: Last 4 digits of your home phone: _____

DATE: _____

Inventory of Effective Schools Concepts

Rank yourself on the following concepts according to your understanding and your school's level of use. "1" reflects little or no understanding, while "5" reflects a very high understanding; "1" reflects little or no use, while "5" reflects a high level of use. Circle the appropriate response in each column.

	Your Level of Understanding	Level of Use at your Build:
1. The research on school effectiveness	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. The characteristics (correlates) of an effective school.....	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Purpose/use of the school improvement team.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Use of a school-wide needs assessment to determine areas for improvement....	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Development of a written school mission statement.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. The disaggregated analysis of the distribution of achievement as a basis for determining school effectiveness.....	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Design of a plan for a school-based improvement process.....	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Implementing a school-based process of improvement.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Methods of sustaining a school-based improvement process.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Evaluation of a school improvement process.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. The research on teacher effectiveness	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	Your level of Understanding	Level of Use at your Building
12. Applying the research on teacher effectiveness to planned programs of school improvement.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

13. In not more than three statements describe what you personally expect to gain from the next two years in this program:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

14. What changes do you expect in your school as a result of your team's participation?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____