School Improvement Under Test-Driven Accountability: A Comparison of High- and Low-Performing Middle Schools in California

CSE Report 717

Heinrich Mintrop

National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) / University of California, Berkeley

Tina Trujillo

National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) / University of California, Los Angeles

May 2007

Center for the Study of Evaluation
National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing
Graduate School of Education & Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1522
(310) 206-1532

Project 1.1 Comparative Analyses of Current Assessment and Accountability Systems; Strand 4: The California School Accountability System and the Improvement of Low-Performing Schools
Heinrich Mintrop, Project Director

The work reported herein was supported under the under the Educational Research and Development Centers Program, PR/Award Number R305B960002, as administered by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT UNDER TEST-DRIVEN ACCOUNTABILITY: A COMPARISON OF HIGH- AND LOW-PERFORMING MIDDLE SCHOOLS IN CALIFORNIA

Heinrich Mintrop
CRESST/University of California, Berkeley
Tina Trujillo
CRESST/University of California, Los Angeles

Abstract

Based on in-depth data from nine demographically similar schools, the study asks five questions in regard to key aspects of the improvement process and that speak to the consequential validity of accountability indicators: Do schools that differ widely according to system performance criteria also differ on the quality of the educational experience they provide to students? Are schools that have posted high growth on the state's performance index more effective organizationally? Do high-performing schools respond more productively to the messages of their state accountability system? Do high- and low-performing schools exhibit different approaches to organizational learning and teacher professionalism? Is district instructional management in an aligned state accountability system related to performance?

We report our findings in three results papers[1] (Mintrop & Trujillo, 2007a, 2007b; Trujillo & Mintrop, 2007) and this technical report. The results papers, in a nutshell, show that, across the nine case study schools, one positive performance outlier differed indeed in the quality of teaching, organizational effectiveness, response to accountability, and patterns of organizational learning. Across the other eight schools, however, the patterns blurred. We conclude that, save for performance differences on the extreme positive and negative margins, relationships between system-designated performance levels and improvement processes on the ground are uncertain and far from solid. The papers try to elucidate why this may be so.

This final technical report summarizes the major components of the study design and methodology, including case selection, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis techniques. We describe the context of the study as well as descriptive data on our cases and procedures.

School improvement is an intricate business. Whether a school succeeds in improving is dependent on a host of factors. Factors come into play that are internal and external to the organization. The motivation and capacity of the workforce, the

[1] The three reports are entitled *Accountability Urgency, Organizational Learning, and Educational Outcomes: A Comparative Analysis of California Middle Schools; The Practical Relevance of Accountability Systems for School Improvement: A Descriptive Analysis of California Schools;* and *Centralized Instructional Management: District Control, Organizational Culture, and School Performance.*

strength of interactions among staff and among staff and leaders, a school's programs for students' cognitive, emotional and social development, and its specific improvement strategies are to a large degree under the control of schools. The supply of material and human resources, the design of sound policies, regulations, and incentives, and the provision of technical assistance are to a larger degree externally generated, primarily by districts and states, but also by nonstate third-party providers. Fundamentally, the school is situated in the socioeconomic status and culture of the community it serves and in an educational market competition for students. As these multiple factors interact with each other, they produce idiosyncratic constellations that make success in school improvement efforts an uncertain and contingent outcome for individual schools.

Notions of success or failure in school improvement are rooted in definitions or imaginings of the good school. Because the aims of schooling and education are plentiful, often contradictory, and held in uneasy juxtaposition, such definitions and imaginings are not all captured with straightforward means-ends calculations. As a school marshals its forces to improve on one indicator, it may lose out on another. For example, improved standards of achievement may be concomitant with increased grade retention and dropout. A "relentless" focus on basic literacy may curtail space for higher cognitive complexity and creativity. Schools are to integrate society's weaker and more vulnerable individuals and populations, and at the same time sort for meritocratic selection, and so on. This uneasy juxtaposition of multiple and at times mutually exclusive aims has led to intense ideological battles around quality in the realm of politics and discourse and to a pragmatic, nonrationalistic muddling through in the realm of practice. Accountability systems are designed to introduce a greater degree of rationality into school improvement.

How one defines and imagines the good school has consequences for the specific dynamics of organizational development one engages in. A notion of quality that centers on the big ideas of human knowledge, cultural relevance, teachers as founts of knowledge, intense personal relationship between learners and teachers, and community accountability will set different accents in organizational development than one that centers on proficiency, curriculum alignment, teachers as transmitters of knowledge, and test-driven accountability. But the relationship between educational goals and the dynamic of organizational development is bi-directional. While in earlier historical periods educational goals may have driven organizational change dynamics (as in the school wars of the sixties), the current

phase of high-stakes accountability rests on an inversion of this relationship. It does not seem to be fueled as much by political, ideological, or moral zeal about aims, but foremost by certitudes about rational principles of organizational development and productivity that are borrowed from the world of business. Thus, ideas about organizational development drive educational aims and notions of quality that come into prominent view.

The model of organizational development that underlies the current accountability system in California and the recent federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (2002) revolves around state standards, assessments, and goal setting based on a small set of quantitative indicators, most notably test scores that are condensed in the Academic Performance Index (API) and, since passage of NCLB, measurement of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The California state government steers districts and schools with API and AYP target scores calculated to keep schools on a continuous path of improvement.

In this research, we ask:

- Do schools that differ widely according to system performance criteria also differ on the quality of the educational experience they provide to students?
- Are schools that have posted high growth on the state's performance index more effective organizationally?
- Do high-performing schools respond more productively to the messages of their state accountability system?
- Do high- and low-performing schools exhibit different approaches to organizational learning and teacher professionalism?
- Is district instructional management in an aligned state accountability system related to performance?

To more fully assess educational quality, we complement standardized test data with student questionnaire, classroom observation, and writing sample data. In order to judge schools' organizational effectiveness, response to accountability, and organizational learning patterns, we rely primarily on teacher questionnaire and semistructured interview data. To gain an understanding of the districts within which the schools are nested, we use a particular set of questionnaire and interview data that are tailored to the district context.

The questionnaires' effective schools measures were adapted from existing studies. The majority of accountability-specific measures were developed

specifically for this project. The observation protocol and writing sample rubrics drew from previously validated instruments.

This preliminary report is divided into several parts: case sampling, instrumentation and data collection, and data analysis. We report our findings for each research question in the form of a set of papers.

Case Sampling

Our school sampling procedure aimed at identifying high-growth and low-growth middle schools within the state or federal accountability system. The schools are located in urban environments and serve traditionally disadvantaged student populations. Our aim was to research schools that were relatively successful or unsuccessful according to the criteria of the California accountability system. Our underlying measure is therefore the school API and its growth over time. After predicting annual API scores from school characteristics, we looked at schools with unusually high residuals.

Our sampled group consists of schools that grew well above or well below average on the API over a period of 4 years from 1999 to 2003, controlled for school characteristics. The API was the single most important measure for California school performance during this period. NCLB and AYP did not become a major factor in the state until after our sampling period.

We used data from the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) that contain annual API score data as well as information on school characteristics of 8,970 schools in California (California Department of Education [CDE], 2005). We focused on only low-performing schools that ranked below average on their 1999-2000 API scores. We limited our study to deciles 1 through 4 in 1999 state rank. Only middle or junior high schools were selected that had a complete record of 4 years of API scores and demographic information. Schools in our final sample had a proportion of at least 60% enrollment of disadvantaged minority populations (African American and Hispanic students); high poverty rates as indicated by at least 50% of free or reduced price lunch (FRPL) participation; at least 20% of students with limited English proficiency; and an urbanicity score of at least 3 (= urban fringe). We excluded schools with total enrollment exceeding 2,500 students and charter schools, magnet schools, and year-round schools. The latter restriction cut out large numbers of schools in Southern California's low-performing districts, but for ease of matching school conditions the limitation was necessary.

We predicted API scores based on the School Characteristics Index (SCI), which is a composite index of the demographic characteristics (i.e., percentage of pupils with FRPL, percentage of English Language Learners, ethnic background, student mobility) and a proxy for school capacity (i.e., percentage of teachers with full credentials). The SCI is a variable contained in the state database. The state uses this variable to calculate schools' *similar schools rank*.

Since the basis for API changed over the years, shifting from norm-referenced to standards tests, API scores from year to year for our study period are not directly comparable. For example, from 1999 to 2001, API scores for each school were heavily dependent on the SAT-9 tests; but in 2001, the results from the California Standards Tests (CST) were incorporated into the 2001 API score. Due to these changes in the composite factors for API scores, year-to-year changes in school API scores are unstable (Linn & Haug, 2002), and thus, a simple comparison of growth over time is not acceptable. Therefore, we used a factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) to predict a school's yearly API base score after adjusting for SCI and 1999 state ranking for a given school. The factorial ANOVA performs an analysis of variance with multiple classification variables. Since in the factorial design, every level of every variable is paired with every level of every other variable, this is a useful statistical tool for data for which year-to-year comparisons are difficult:

API = Year + Year * InitStat + Year * SCI + SCI + e

InitStat: Initial 1999 state ranking

e: Growth residuals

Using this model, we identified high-growth schools and low-growth schools. Then we ranked schools in each group according to growth residuals and identified those with residuals in the top and bottom quartiles of our distribution. These schools performed unexpectedly well or poorly, above or below what could be predicted by background factors. We ended up with 46 high-growth and 55 low-growth schools that satisfied all of our requirements.

Case Selection

Next, we recruited high-growth and low-growth schools that were matched as closely as possible with regard to demographics, poverty, English Language Learners, and size. This would enable us to largely control for background characteristics and more clearly separate out effects from organizational factors that were our primary research interest. Being of similar background, the schools should

also have had a similar baseline API in 1999 so that differences between high-growth and low-growth schools would not be confounded by different baselines.

Recruitment for our study turned out to be more challenging than expected. We discovered that accountability pressures were taking their toll on schools. While districts were often interested in our study and principals reluctant supporters, staff often balked. Many schools declined to participate. It was easier to recruit high-growth schools, but recruitment of low-growth schools was truly a problem. Oftentimes, principals and staff said that they could simply not afford to expend resources on a study that would not benefit them directly. Our proposition that we could contribute information on school improvement was not appealing either. Many low-performing schools had already experienced various waves of evaluations and audits, so that information was presumably not their most pressing need. We managed to recruit nine schools: four designated as low performing and five as high performing. Table 1 shows the performance scores for the nine schools that chose to participate in the study.

As Table 1 shows, schools in the "low" category differ from those in the "high" category by having lower absolute API performance and lower growth from 1999 to 2005, the last year we collected data. Although the distance between top-performers in the low category and bottom-performers in the high category diminished over time, most differ by more than half a standard deviation from the nine-school mean in absolute API performance. Overall, mean API for the high group is 660, for the low group 587, a 73-point difference that is statistically significant at the .01 level. Movement in state ranks corroborates these group differences. All nine schools started in 2000 either in the lowest or second lowest API decile. Four years later, the four schools classified as low either declined or remained in the lowest rank, while by contrast, the five schools classified as high moved up at least one decile; one school moved up three deciles.

While the two groups differed in API performance, both in absolute and relative terms, they were quite similar demographically. None of the school background indicators displayed in Table 2 show statistically significant differences across groups, though they differ within groups. Three of the four schools in the low group tended to be economically more challenged as indicated by higher FRPL participation, whereas schools in the high group had higher proportions of English Learners. Two schools (Schools I and C) had relatively lower proportions of African American and Hispanic students, but a high proportion of Hmong students.

Table 1

Academic Performance Scores of the Nine Selected School Cases

	Low				High				
	F	D	I	C	H	G	A	E	B
1999 API	478	503	478	481	442	521	489	523	445
2005 API	573	573	598	604	642	653	653	670	683
Score difference	95	70	120	123	200	132	164	147	238
Standard deviations from 2005 mean API[a]	–1.3	–1.3	–0.7	–0.6	0.4	0.6	0.6	1.0	1.3
2000 State rank	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1
2004 State rank[b]	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3	4

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

[a]$M = 628$; $SD = 41.5$. The mean is calculated as the unweighted average of the 9 schools' API scores and is slightly biased. The unbiased mean of the high and low groups is 624. Significant differences of means were tested using the Mann-Whitney test ($z = -2.47$, $p = 0.0135$).

[b]The 2004 rank was the last available score at the time of data collection.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Nine Selected School Cases, 2004-05[a,b]

	Low				High				
	F	D	I	C	H	G	A	E	B
Enrollment	866	1,100	1,031	991	1,818	705	1,628	780	868
African American (%)	3	4	9	12	0	1	5	6	1
Hispanic (%)	88	84	56	59	97	59	75	81	93
English Learners (%)	29	22	39	26	44	31	43	18	28
Free/Reduced lunch (%)	97	59	100	100	77	85	83	69	78
Parent Education[c]	1.81	2.13	2.09	2.25	1.81	2.02	2.09	2.18	2.03

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

[a]Source: California Department of Education.

[b]All means are statistically insignificant between high and low groups using the Mann Whitney test.

[c]1 = Not a high school graduate; 5 = Graduate school.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

Data collection was organized in four phases:

- pilot study interviews;
- initial interviews and school, state, and census records;
- survey data from students and teachers, classroom observation data, and student work samples; and
- follow-up interviews.

Initial interview protocols, a database for school records, student questionnaires, teacher questionnaires, classroom observation protocols, and work sample rubrics were developed prior to data collection in the case study schools and after the pilot study. Protocols for the last phase of data collection were developed after we finished analyzing data from the first three phases. This allowed us to pursue school-specific hunches based on preliminary findings and deepen our understanding of the cases. A brief overview of developed instruments follows.

Pilot Interviews

The pilot study interviews served two functions: They helped familiarize us with the workings of the California accountability system on the ground, and they gave us a sense of organizational processes that unfolded in schools as a result of pressure and support mechanisms in the state's low-performing schools program (II/USP). We focused on topics such as problem awareness, sense of urgency, leadership style, strength of work team, use of data for decision making, micropolitical processes, district policies, instructional programs, dynamics of instructional change, and the role of external consultants (e.g., II/USP assistance providers), as well as oral history accounts of school development. Interviews were fairly unstructured to give us room to explore unexpected leads. We visited four schools and talked to a total of about 45 interviewees.

Interviews

Initial interviews in the focal cases for the main study were conducted with administrators and teachers in leadership roles. They helped familiarize us with basic conditions and organizational processes, leadership dynamics, the role of the accountability system, and the school's development over the last 5 to 6 years. Interview topics were similar to the ones listed for the pilot study interviews.

However, this time around, the interview guide was more structured and focused more strongly on instructional and curricular issues.

Follow-up interviews were conducted with administrators and teachers from the content areas on which the school focused its improvement efforts. In most cases, these were English language arts teachers; in a few cases, math teachers were interviewed as well. In this round, we inquired more specifically about each school's instructional program and change strategies, oftentimes concentrating on issues of professional development and teacher learning.

In total, we conducted 157 interviews with administrators, classroom teachers, and teachers on special assignment, using semistructured protocols. See Appendices A and B for copies of both protocols.

School Records

We collected a set of data from school records, the California Department of Education, and the U.S. Census Bureau that helped in understanding community characteristics, school capacity, students' opportunity to learn, organizational structure, and experiences with the accountability system. These data were aggregated in a database designed using FileMaker Pro, which allowed us to easily generate queries comparing schools' background characteristics. Table 3 summarizes the type of data and the years for which they were collected.

In addition, impressions of the state of facilities (e.g., cleanliness, orderliness, state of repair) were noted with the help of a rating sheet that was completed by two independent observers. See Appendix C for a copy of this recording sheet.

Program Inventory

To better understand the nature of schools' improvement efforts, and in particular, how each school focused resources such as time, money, and staff, we kept records of all programs, reform models, or formal activities aimed at increasing student performance. To enable comparisons among schools, we assigned a 5-point "prescriptiveness" score to each program/model/activity. This score measured teachers' flexibility in selecting materials, assessments, student activities, and questions or prompts.

Table 3

School Background Data and Years of Collection

Data	Years
Demographics and population characteristics	
Enrollment	04-05
Urbanicity level	04
Ethnicity	04-05
Free and Reduced-Price Lunch eligibility	99-05
English Learners	99-05
Mobility rate	99-05
Parent education	99-05
Title I status	99-05
Suspension rate	01-04
Expulsion rate	01-04
Family income (median and per capita)	2004
Families living below poverty level/Own versus rent/Median house value	2004
Educational attainment (percentage of adults with less than a high school diploma)	
Learning conditions	
Per-pupil spending (district)	03-04
Availability of substitute teachers	04-05
Classroom availability	04-05
Average class size	01-04
Students per computer	03-04
Instructional time	04-05
Curriculum	04-05
Special programs (magnet, gifted, remedial, etc.)	04-05
Curricular differentiation	04-05
Extra-curricular activities	04-05
Personnel	
Teacher certification (credential, out of area)	01-04
Teacher absentee rate	04-05
Teacher turnover	01-05
Administrative turnover	01-05
Non-instructional staff	03-04
State and federal performance indicators	
Schoolwide Academic Performance Index	99-05
Statewide and similar schools rank	00-04
Awards/Intervention programs (II/USP, Recognition, Program Improvement, etc.)	99-05
Schoolwide Adequate Yearly Progress	03-05

The criteria for "prescriptiveness" scores were as follows:

5 = All four are prescribed: *scripted program.*

4 = The first three are prescribed; or materials can be chosen within the program, but the other three follow from the choice: *highly structured program.*

3 = Materials can be chosen within the program, but activities and assessments follow from the choice; questions and prompts remain teachers' choice: *structured program.*

2 = Materials (and assessments) are prescribed: *structured content* and *flexible delivery.*

1 = Teacher has a choice in all four areas: *flexible content* and *flexible delivery.*

These data were also aggregated in a database designed using FileMaker Pro in order to easily generate queries comparing schools' programs and their characteristics.

Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire was designed using items from previously conducted student surveys (Consortium on Chicago School Research [CCSR], 2003a; International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement [IEA], 2003; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2000) and newly designed, pilot-tested items. This instrument aims at three purposes. It measures school quality by inquiring into students' sense of school life; it looks at student engagement with the accountability system; and it contains measures of familial support and possession of cultural goods that are more fine-grained than the broad indicators in the state database. It also collects demographic data, curricular track and English as a second language/English language development (ESL/ELD) status, and recent English language arts grades. The final student questionnaire consisted of 50 items capturing the above-mentioned student perceptions. See Appendix D for a list of all variables constructed from this survey.

The questionnaire was designed using TeleForm (2003; www.cardiff-teleform.com), a computer application that electronically scans instruments and aggregates responses in a database, thereby eliminating manual data entry and minimizing human error when tabulating results.

Five scales (academic engagement, academic press, teacher care, peer collaboration, and safety) capture key components of school quality. These are standard variables in school quality research. High-quality schools are seen as those in which students feel engaged and challenged, but at the same time safe and cared for. Collaboration among students is an important civic component of good schools.

It is conceivable that a school's success in the accountability system has less to do with students' cognitive development and is due more to a more intense engagement with the accountability system. Since in California state tests at the middle school level represent high stakes for schools but not for students, making students take the tests seriously is a heightened concern for schools. Some of the pilot schools went to great lengths to generate enthusiasm and shore up student commitment for the tests. Thus, our test engagement items try to home in on different noncognitive test-taking attitudes among schools. These include measures of the importance students place on high scores for both themselves and their whole school; the effort expended on test taking; an awareness of sanctions that result from low test scores; and a general attitude toward sanctions.

Family cultural background items allow us to refine our knowledge of contextual factors that may explain a school's success or failure in the accountability system. When we originally selected the schools, we relied on the coarse student background indicators that the state uses to calculate similar schools rank (ethnicity, Free and Reduced-Price Lunch participation, and English Learner status). But these indicators are not sufficiently fine-grained enough to capture the degree to which parents and family life support students' academic learning. Familial support for student learning and possession of print media and computers, as well as the frequency with which a language other than English is spoken at home, give us a better sense of the family backgrounds represented in a school's population and help us better control for background when we try to explain school success.

Piloting the student questionnaire. Two graduate student researchers piloted the questionnaire in five 8th-grade classrooms at an urban middle school located in southern California. During the summer of 2004, they administered the questionnaire to five separate classes, each composed of approximately 30 students. One of the five classes was a beginning ESL class, in which students had the option of taking the questionnaire in either Spanish or English.

The graduate student researchers administered the survey by introducing themselves, explaining the purpose of the questionnaire, and clarifying its confidential, voluntary nature. The first page of the pilot questionnaire also contained a letter describing the study to students and providing them with directions for completing the questionnaire. At the end of the questionnaire, students filled out a feedback form in which they noted any unclear items and awkward wording, and then recommended changes. After each pilot round, the graduate student researchers held a 10-minute feedback session in which they asked students to verbally share their opinions of the instrument's clarity, vocabulary, and content matter. Almost all students were able to complete the questionnaire within a 15-minute time frame.

Results were analyzed in two ways. First, verbal and written feedback were compiled. Next, principal component factor analysis and a Varimax rotation procedure were used to analyze responses and identify any distinctive factors for constructing scales. Using items with loadings that both were high (usually .5 or more) and loaded on only one factor, we constructed six scales from the pilot analysis: academic engagement, academic press, teacher care, peer collaboration, safety, and familial support. Then, using both the statistical analyses and student feedback, portions of the questionnaire were revised as necessary to increase the reliability and validity of the instrument.

Administering the student questionnaire. Students were sampled using a stratified random sampling technique in which we surveyed 50% of the classes in each curricular track. Typical tracks included regular/mainstream, honors/advanced, remedial, ESL/ELD, and magnet. We adjusted for slight oversampling and undersampling with weights. In total, 4,148 seventh- and eighth-grade students in nine schools were surveyed. The overall response rate was 96%. Table 4 shows the response rate for each school.

Table 4

Student Questionnaire Response Rates, by School (%)

Low				High				
F	D	I	C	H	G	A	E	B
94	96	95	98	95	99	94	96	95

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

Graduate student researchers distributed the questionnaires, along with directions for administering them, to teachers in each selected classroom. After administering the questionnaires, teachers sealed them in envelopes and noted how many students were absent on the day of administration. Researchers collected the sealed envelopes from each teacher.

As in the pilot study, principal component factor analysis and a Varimax rotation procedure were used to construct scales. Table 5 presents a list of the six major scales derived from this analysis. For a complete list of all scales constructed from the student questionnaire, see Appendix E.

Teacher Questionnaire

Teacher questionnaire items and scales come from a variety of sources. Again, work by the Consortium on Chicago School Research (2003b) was instrumental. We also drew from an earlier study by Mintrop, *Schools on Probation* (Mintrop, 2004), as well as items and scales developed collaboratively by SRI International, Policy Studies Associates, and Consortium for Policy Research in Education (2003), the Center for Research on the Context of Teaching (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993), and a study of attitudes towards high-stakes tests by Bomotti, Ginsberg, and Cobb (2002). The instrument contains more than 180 individual response items designed to measure teachers' perceptions of accountability, leadership, organizational strength, motivation, efficacy, and school program and change strategy, as well as teacher background data. Like the student questionnaire, this questionnaire was designed using TeleForm (2003; www.cardiff-teleform.com), a computer application that electronically scans instruments and aggregates responses in a database. See Appendix D for a list of all variables constructed from this questionnaire.

Piloting the teacher questionnaire. We piloted about one third of the items or scales, primarily the ones we developed for this study. Several items and scales were field tested repeatedly until sufficient validity and reliability could be established. Newly designed items were pilot tested in three separate sessions: to two groups of teachers during the summer of 2004, and to one group of teachers during the fall of 2004. The teachers were students enrolled in UCLA's and UC Berkeley's Principal Leadership Institutes (n = 25 to 35).

During the pilot administration, researchers gave a short introduction explaining the purpose of the study, how questionnaires were developed, and the confidential and voluntary nature of the study. In addition, the first page of the pilot

Table 5

Student Questionnaire—6 Major Scales Derived

Scale	Factor loading
Academic engagement	
Most of the topics we are studying are interesting and challenging.	.513
I usually look forward to most of my classes.	.572
I work hard to do my best in most of my classes.	.466
I am usually bored in most of my classes.	.472
Sometimes I get so interested in my work I don't want to stop.	.525
I often count the minutes until class ends.	.396
Most of my classes really make me think.	.480
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .69	
Academic press	
Most of my teachers:	
• expect me to do my best all of the time.	.573
• expect everyone to participate.	.538
• don't allow me to be lazy.	.486
• expect everyone to work hard.	.605
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	
Teacher care	
Students get along well with most teachers.	.482
Most teachers at this school care about students.	.600
Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say.	.663
If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers.	.533
Most of my teachers treat me fairly.	.643
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	
Peer collaboration	
I like to work with other students.	.680
I learn most when I work with other students.	.652
I like to help other people do well in a group.	.567
It is helpful to put together everyone's ideas when working on a project.	.530
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .74	
Safety	
How safe do you feel:	
• around the school?	.711
• in the hallways and bathrooms of the school?	.678
• in your classes?	.614
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .74	

(*Table continues*)

Table 5 (continued)

Scale	Factor loading
Familial support	
How often does a parent or another adult living with you:	
• help you with your homework?	.584
• check to see if you have done your homework?	.599
• tell you they are proud of you for doing well in school?	.624
• push you to take responsibility for the things you've done?	.640
• talk to you about working hard at school?	.695
• push you to go to college?	.577
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	

questionnaire contained a letter that described the study and provided directions for completing the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire, respondents filled out a feedback form in which they noted any unclear items and awkward wording, and then recommended changes. Respondents also indicated which questions were unclear or confusing. After each pilot round, researchers debriefed the respondents by asking them to verbally share their opinions of the instrument's clarity, vocabulary, and content matter.

As with the student questionnaire, results were analyzed in two steps. Both written and verbal feedback were compiled, then principal component factor analysis and a Varimax rotation procedure were used to analyze responses and identify any distinctive factors for constructing scales. Using items with loadings that both were high (usually .5 or more) and loaded on only one factor, we constructed our scales. Next, based on both the statistical analyses and written feedback, portions of the questionnaire were revised as necessary to increase the reliability and validity of particular items.

For most of the other variables, we relied on scales and reliability measures from other studies. In a few cases, we adapted items or scales that were similar, but not identical, to previously used ones. In some instances, we could not include these items on the pilot tests due to time constraints. As a result, we used a few items or scales for which we did not obtain reliability measures prior to the study.

Administering the teacher questionnaire. The teacher questionnaire was administered to all teachers in the nine schools. To reduce response time for teachers, we created two forms with the bulk of the items overlapping between both

forms. In all, 151 teachers responded to form A and 166 teachers to form B, for a total of 317 cases. The overall response rate was 83%. Table 6 summarizes the response rate for each school.

The questionnaire was administered during schoolwide faculty meetings at all schools except Schools F, C, and H. When the questionnaire was taken during meetings, researchers began by introducing themselves and the purpose of the study, explaining the directions for completing the questionnaire, then randomly distributing forms A and B to all teachers. Teachers were asked to not discuss the items with one another in order to minimize response bias. Researchers remained present while teachers filled out the questionnaires, and they collected the questionnaires at the end of each meeting.

At the three schools in which the administration distributed the questionnaires to teachers, researchers prepared packets containing one form of the questionnaire, a set of directions, and a labeled envelope in which to seal the completed questionnaire. Researchers and the administration agreed on procedures for distributing the questionnaires that would maintain confidentiality and maximize response rates. This usually entailed placing the questionnaire packets in teachers' mailboxes, then having a graduate student researcher collect the sealed envelopes by going door-to-door during teachers' prep periods or having a school staff member collect the sealed envelopes.

In order to measure teachers' perceptions of the accountability system, their school's leadership, faculty culture, motivation, efficacy and qualification, change strategies, and background characteristics, we relied on the following lists of scales and items. For a complete list of all teacher questionnaire scales and their psychometric properties, see Appendix F.

Table 6

Teacher Questionnaire Response Rates, by School (%)

Low				High				
F	D	I	C	H	G	A	E	B
74	91	67	91	88	93	69	94	91

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

To inquire about *teacher efficacy and qualifications,* we created the following variables (sample variables and their psychometric properties are shown in Table 7):

Instructional efficacy

Test-related efficacy

Colleagues' skills

Sense of preparedness

Years teaching

Educational attainment

Certification

Table 7

Teacher Efficacy and Qualifications—Sample Variables

Variable	Factor loading
Instructional efficacy	
I have found a way to get through to even my most difficult students.	.647
Sometimes I wonder if I would be more effective teaching a different age group. (Values are reversed.)	.646
In general, my classes are disciplined and well behaved.	.720
Students know that I expect hard work from them and they act accordingly.	.749
My challenge in this school, frankly, is to get through the day. (Values are reversed.)	.609
For the most part, my students are engaged in my lessons.	.730
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	
Test-related efficacy	
I have the skills and knowledge needed for my students to meet the performance expectations of the state.	
I know how to teach so that students will do well on the state tests.	
r = .52	
Colleagues' skills	
Most of my colleagues have the knowledge and skills needed for our school to meet the performance expectations of the state.	.827
The typical teacher at this school ranks near the top of the teaching profession in knowledge and skills.	.855
Many teachers in this school are insufficiently prepared to do their jobs well. (Values are reversed.)	.778
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	

In the domain of *work motivation,* we inquired about:

Involvement

Effort

Commitment to stay

Morale/Improvement expectations

Reasons to stay/leave

Satisfaction

We wanted to know how teachers rate their involvement in improvement activities, intensity of work effort, commitment to stay at the school, and reasons for leaving or staying, as well as their overall satisfaction with their own work (a sample variable and psychometric property is shown in Table 8; teacher questionnaire items are provided in Appendices Q and R). All conditions—a disposition to be involved and expend energy, perhaps feeling challenged by accountability pressures, and having a longer term commitment to stay at one's school—are needed for stable faculties to tackle continuous growth. All variables are measured with items that may or may not amount to a single factor.

Table 8

Teacher Work Motivation:
Sample Variable

Variable
Satisfaction
How often do you feel satisfied: • with your work as a teacher? • with your school overall?
r = .52

In the *accountability* domain, we inquired about problem awareness, motives attached to the accountability system, reinforcement of accountability motives by colleagues and leaders, and perceived curricular effects. We constructed the following variables:

Problem awareness:
- Goal importance
- Urgency

External validation and punitive consequences:
- External validation
- Authoritativeness
- Threat
- Pressure

Meaningfulness:
- Focus
- Diagnostics
- Validity
- Fairness
- Realism
- Raised expectations
- Goal integrity

Schools attach varying degrees of goal importance to the demands of the accountability system. Importance could be more externally or internally motivated. In an external nexus, teachers could calculate extrinsic rewards, such as enhancement of professional prestige or aversion of disadvantages; that is, they would act primarily out of a sense of external validation. They may also accept the state government's normative authority, or authoritativeness, to give teachers directions, in specified areas or more generally. Less benign than the appeal to one's sense of loyalty or desirability of reward is the experience of coercive power. Accountability systems can create pressure and an imminent sense of personal sanctioning and threat.

Contrasting with these primarily external motives to heed accountability demands there could be more internalized motives. Usefulness of the system in providing focus within the uncertain technical culture of teaching and the traditional legitimacy of testing as enhancing diagnostic capacity inhabit the outer layers of internalization. Validity and fairness connote a deeper sense of rightful judgment. Usefulness, rightfulness, and realism of targeted goals are the tripod on which the effectiveness and steering capacity of a performance indicator rests. They are the prime sources of meaningfulness. If accountability systems worked properly, teachers would supposedly have raised expectations for their students' performance and the caliber of their own work. If teachers internalized the system properly, they would experience stronger goal integrity, that is, a better match between system demands, needs of students, and their own values.

All of the accountability variables (with one exception) are based on Mintrop's (2004) previous study of Maryland and Kentucky schools (slightly reworded for the California context) or were newly created and field tested for this study. Responses for almost all of the items are 5-point disagree-agree Likert scales (see Table 9).

Table 9

Accountability Variables

Variable	Factor loading
Goal importance	
It is very important for me personally that the school meet its state and federal performance targets.	.852
It really does not make much difference to me whether this school is (or may be) designated as an underperforming or program improvement school. (Values are reversed.)	.710
A high score on the state tests means a lot to me.	.820
It says nothing about me personally as a teacher whether the school raises the scores on the state tests or not. (Values are reversed.)	.691
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .76	
External validation	
Meeting the expectations of the accountability system is a matter of professional pride for me.	.791
I work towards high test scores for our school because they enhance our standing in the district.	.887
It is important for me to meet our performance targets so that our school's reputation will not be damaged.	.883
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	
Authoritativeness	
Since California state authorities have decided to evaluate schools with the present accountability system, teachers ought to follow it.	.822
Teachers have little choice but to comply with state mandates.	.820
I implement state or district mandates even when they don't make sense to me personally.	.753
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .72	
Threat	
Sanctions:	
• make me more anxious for my career.	.903
• will have negative consequences for me personally.	.897
• put a lot of pressure on me personally.	.924
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .89	

(*Table continues*)

Table 9 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
Focus	
State standards, tests, and performance targets:	
• provide a focus for my teaching.	.857
• tell us what is important for this school to accomplish.	.883
• have made us concentrate our energy on instruction and student learning.	.761
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	
Diagnostics	
Results from state tests give teachers some useful feedback about how well they are teaching in each curricular area.	.840
Results from the state tests can provide valuable diagnostic information.	.893
The state tests provide little useful information for my instruction. (Values are reversed.)	.739
The state tests provide information that helps schools improve.	.875
State test results help identify students who need additional academic help.	.787
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .88	
Validity	
The state assessments assess all of the things I find important for students to learn.	.788
A good teacher has nothing to fear from the state accountability system.	.775
The state assessments reflect just plain good teaching.	.843
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .72	
Fairness	
For the most part, teachers are unfairly judged by the accountability system. (Values are reversed.)	.750
I resent being judged based on school-wide test scores and the performance of other teachers. (Values are reversed.)	.679
All schools in California have a fair chance to succeed within the state accountability system.	.643
The accountability system is stacked against schools located in poor communities. (Values are reversed.)	.719
Our students are not behind because of the teachers they have, but because of the conditions in which they have to grow up. (Values are reversed.)	.760
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	
Realism	
The performance expectations of the state are for the most part unrealistic. (Values are reversed.)	.765
API targets are realistic goals for our school.	.797
AYP targets are realistic goals for our school.	.736

(*Table continues*)

Table 9 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
Realism (continued)	
It is unrealistic to expect schools that serve poor neighborhoods to perform on the same level as schools in wealthy neighborhoods. (Values are reversed.)	.713
The state assessments are unrealistic because too many tasks are too hard for our students. (Values are reversed.)	.688
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	
Raised expectations	
As a result of state standards, assessments, and accountability pressures:	
• I expect more from students.	.870
• I assign more challenging work.	.883
• I expect more from myself as a teacher.	.853
• I assign more complex cognitive tasks.	.831
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .88	
Goal integrity	
How important should these forces be?	
District and state demands	
Student needs	
Teachers' values and goals	
How important are these forces in reality at your school?	
District and state demands	
Student needs	
Teachers' values and goals	
Scores calculated based on differences between like items.	

To capture strength of the *faculty culture,* we constructed four scales (see Table 10) to gauge types of collegial interactions as well as cohesion, professional norms and standards, and attitudes toward learning among the teachers. The scales are:

Collegiality

Pulling together

Norms of performance

Learning orientation

We ascertained the type of *leadership* exerted by the administration through inquiring about the principals' supportive or controlling inclination, their overall managerial skills, and the degree to which openness is encouraged and teachers'

professional judgment is respected. We also asked to what extent the administration sets high standards for teaching and learning and prioritizes students' needs (see Table 10). These scales are:

Urgency	Open communication
Principal support	Autonomy
Principal control	Instructional leadership
School management	Moral leadership

As a school masters or copes with the challenges of accountability, relationships may tighten up and a strong sense of responsibility or internal accountability may arise. Or these elements may already have been established by the time the school faces accountability demands. In schools that create, or already have in place, a learning culture, tightening up would be coupled with openness, inquiry, pulling together, and supportive instructional and moral leadership. In struggling schools, these elements of a faculty culture may be weaker, and such schools may exhibit more clearly signs of control and rigidity. If rigidity is coupled with a low sense of cohesion and morale, signs of fragmentation may be on the horizon.

Sources for the scales' items are the Consortium on Chicago School Research (2003b), the Center for Research on the Context of Teaching (McLaughlin & Talbert, 1993), and a previous study by Mintrop (2004). A number of items and scales were newly developed for this study. Responses for items are 5-point disagree-agree Likert scales unless otherwise noted below.

Table 10

Variables for Faculty Culture and Leadership Scales

Variable	Factor loading
Collegiality	
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.	.763
There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff here.	.875
I can count on colleagues here when I feel down about my teaching or my students.	.805
In this school, the faculty discusses major decisions and sees to it that they are carried out.	.760
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	

(*Table continues*)

Table 10 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
Pulling together	
At this school, when it comes to meeting the challenges of reaching our API or AYP targets, administrators and teachers are on the same side.	.799
Facing the pressures of school accountability has brought the faculty together; almost everyone is making a contribution.	.895
The pressures of meeting API or AYP targets have strengthened the hand of those at the school who are interested in good teaching.	.836
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .80	
Norms of performance	
In your judgment, how many teachers at this school:	
• help maintain discipline in the entire school?	.730
• take responsibility for improving the school?	.875
• set high standards for themselves?	.886
• are eager to try new ideas?	.871
• feel responsible to help each other do their best?	.861
• feel responsible when students in this school fail?	.715
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .90	
Learning orientation	
My job provides me with continuing professional stimulation and growth.	.657
Teachers in this school continually learning and seeking new ideas.	.812
The staff seldom evaluates its programs and activities. (Values are reversed.)	.603
Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who are expert at their craft.	.804
The most expert teachers in their field are given leadership roles at this school.	.739
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .76	
Urgency	
The accountability system makes continuous improvement an urgent task for our school.	.770
Being held accountable by the state has made us aware of what we must accomplish at this school.	.698
The principal uses the pressures of accountability to move our school forward.	.781
The principal has encouraged teachers to see the accountability system as a tool for our school to improve.	.737
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .73	
Principal support	
The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.	.929
The principal usually consults with staff members before s/he makes decisions that affect teachers.	.904
Staff members are recognized for a job well done.	.905
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .90	

(*Table continues*)

Table 10 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
Principal control	
The principal sets priorities, makes plans, and sees that they are carried out.	.738
The principal puts pressure on teachers to get results.	.715
In this school, the principal tells us what the district and state expect of us, and we comply.	.856
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .64	
School management	
This school is well managed.	.938
Overall this school functions well.	.920
Our administrators are good managers who know how to make our school run smoothly.	.932
This school is disorganized. (Values are reversed.)	.832
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .93	
Open communication	
Open discussions about the meaningfulness of the state accountability system and related district policies are encouraged.	.823
Faculty gatherings provide a forum to discuss different perspectives on school improvement.	.880
It is okay to speak up when you disagree with the powers that be.	.862
Teachers are mainly *encouraged* rather than *told* to implement new programs or policies.	.792
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .86	
Autonomy	
Teachers' expertise in the classroom domain is respected here.	.842
In this school, I am encouraged to be creative in my classroom.	.860
In this school, I am given the space to exercise my professional judgment as to what is best for my students.	.851
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	
Instructional leadership	
The administration at this school:	
• makes clear to the staff their expectations for meeting instructional goals.	.759
• sets high standards for teaching.	.860
• understands how children learn.	.831
• sets high standards for student learning.	.841
• broadly shares leadership responsibility with the faculty.	.684
• carefully tracks student academic progress.	.751
• monitors and evaluates the quality of teaching in a way that is meaningful for teachers.	.800
• allocates resources and other supports according to the school's goals and standards.	.746
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .91	

(*Table continues*)

Table 10 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
Moral leadership	
The administration at this school: • places the needs of children ahead of personal and political interests. • models the kind of school they want to create. *r* = .75	

In the *change strategies* domain, we asked respondents to give us information about sources from which the school benefited in its development, professional development activities, and use of data. We also asked them to rate the coherence and deliberateness of the school's strategies as well as the importance of planning and money in the process. Lastly, respondents rated the quality of district requirements and supports and listed their priorities for school improvement. The variables are:

Program coherence
Strategic orientation
Planning
Data usage
Money and hopefulness
Money and impact
District operational system
District instructional system
Indicators of successful teaching
Influences on student discipline
Professional development
Sources of improvement
Priorities

Data from this domain help us understand the mechanics and quality of the school development process. A "quick fixes" approach, for example, would be indicated by low coherence, weak strategic orientation, little use of data, low importance attached to planning, weak perceived effects of professional development, and so forth. A more strategic approach, on the other hand, would be reflected by higher ratings of these same change sources.

Items and scales (see Table 11) were developed from the sources discussed previously. For a complete list of all of these items, see Appendix D.

Table 11

Variables for Change Strategies Scales

Variable	Factor loading
Program coherence	
Once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure it's working.	.784
We have so many different programs in this school that I can't keep track of them all. (Values are reversed.)	.777
Many special programs come and go at this school. (Values are reversed.)	.831
You can see real continuity from one program to another at this school.	.810
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	
Strategic orientation	
A medium or long-term strategy that keeps our school on a path of continuous improvement is clearly in place.	
At this school, we adjust improvement strategies and programs to the varying needs of students or teachers.	
r = .61	
Data usage	
Overall student performance on state or district tests.	.675
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by class.	.674
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by subgroup.	.697
Subtest or item-cluster scores on state or district tests.	.727
Item-by item review of state or district test results.	.505
Student performance on school-level assessments (e.g., common writing prompts, math tasks, or reading assessments).	.572
Surveys of teachers, students, and/or parents.	.689
Information from classroom observations.	.538
Characteristics of students who are retained and/or drop out.	.640
Measures of school safety and discipline.	.671
Attendance rates.	.648
Student mobility rates.	.631
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .87	
District operational system	
Our district:	
• monitors our progress on goals established in our school plans.	.739
• sends consistent messages regarding our school goals and improvement strategies.	.849
• provides adequate assistance for our school's improvement.	.914
• provides useful feedback on our school improvement efforts.	.898
• proposes improvement activities that are in line with our goals.	.905
• has standardized instructional approaches for our school.	.576
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .91	

(*Table continues*)

Table 11 (continued)

Variable	Factor loading
District instructional system	
Our district provides:	
• useful reports of student achievement data.	.687
• clear guidance on what curriculum we should teach.	.786
• clear guidance on how we should deliver our instruction.	.788
• effective professional development that helps our school reach its goals.	.748
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	

Classroom Observation Protocol

Our research required us to construct a classroom observation instrument that helped us describe English language arts instruction for seventh and eighth graders. We wanted to capture content, cognitive complexity, variety in methods, and climate of engagement during the lessons. After an extensive search for classroom observation instruments used by previous studies, we settled on two previously validated instruments that served as points of departure for the construction of our own classroom observation protocol. We relied on the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC; Council of Chief State School Officers, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, and Learning Point Associates, 2003), particularly the form "Instructional Practices for English Language Arts and Reading" and the School Change Observation Scheme from the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (Taylor, 2003). These instruments were substantially altered and their use adapted to our needs.

The protocol eventually evolved into two parts that are used simultaneously. The first part of the protocol aims at classroom context (e.g., type of class, number of students in attendance), instructional methods (i.e., teacher interaction, grouping, materials, form of dialog, differentiated instruction, test preparation), and engagement climate (i.e., time on task, student engagement, teacher tone). The second part classifies English language arts activities and content, as well as the level of cognitive challenge present in each activity.

The SEC are designed for teachers to self-report content and cognitive complexity of their taught curriculum over a year's time. Studies have found them to be rather robust for teachers' self-reports (Blank, Porter, & Smithson, 2001; Porter, 2002). Eventually the SECs enable schools to analyze the degree of alignment of the

school curriculum with state standards. Teachers describe their curriculum based on a thorough classification of content, a well-defined taxonomy of cognitive complexity, and an estimation of time devoted to each topic. Our intent was different. We needed an observation instrument that would enable two raters to record classroom events with a high degree of interrater reliability. Towards this end, we took advantage of the SEC's content classification and cognitive taxonomy schemes. Observers themselves counted instructional time.

In order to encompass the full range of activities that may be present in a middle school classroom in California, we adapted the survey's content classifications in two ways. First, we analyzed both seventh- and eighth-grade California content standards in English language arts and expanded our list of topics in order to align the instrument with the relevant state standards. For example, we added to the SEC's writing applications category the item "Documents related to career development." Second, when we piloted our expanded list, we discovered that the SEC's original categories did not sufficiently differentiate among lower levels of instructional complexity. For example, we realized that the original SEC tool made it difficult for observers to document instances when students spent time reading but such reading was not connected to the flow of the lesson. Sometimes students engaged in silent reading or leafed though magazines for pleasure. We added categories for these incidences of low instructional complexity.

Like the questionnaires, the classroom observation protocol was designed using TeleForm (2003; www.cardiff-teleform.com), a computer application that electronically scans completed instruments and aggregates responses.

Piloting the classroom observation protocol. Our final classroom observation protocol grew out of a number of practice sessions and interrater reliability training that occurred over several months. We began the training by allocating 3 days to watching a number of video clips from middle school English language arts classrooms. These exercises proved extremely useful in helping us learn about the various activities that we might observe in the English language arts content area. We then conducted observations in schools not associated with the study. We spent 3 full days observing classrooms with the use of our instrument. At the end of each day, the group of observers compared ratings and discussed discrepancies.

Throughout the duration of the training, we experienced several challenges to reaching interrater reliability. While we felt it was critical that each of the observers possessed experience as a K–12 classroom teacher, we also found that our previous

experiences as teachers created striking differences in our professional judgments about what constituted a particular activity. These differences diminished as the training continued and we held in-depth discussions. Eventually, we achieved the 75% level of agreement that we deemed necessary for initial interrater reliability.

Utilizing the classroom observation protocol. Classrooms were sampled using a random sampling technique in which two researchers observed 50% of the seventh- and eighth-grade English language arts classes in each curricular track. Prior to the observations, principals announced to all eligible teachers that two observers might visit their classrooms to observe one lesson; principals clarified the dates on which the observations would be conducted, but not the times or specific lessons. In all but one school (School H), only the researchers knew their schedules for visiting classrooms. Teachers were notified that participation in such observations was voluntary, confidential, and non-evaluative, and that anyone who did not wish to be observed could decline to participate when approached by the observers. Out of almost 100 classrooms, only two teachers chose not to be observed.

For each lesson, researchers rated three 5-minute snapshots spaced evenly throughout the observation. They recorded their observations in two ways. First, they completed a full classroom protocol during each snapshot. Second, they took detailed field notes of the entire lesson. The observations were followed by a post-observation interview in which the researchers tried to ascertain how teachers had approached planning and whether the observed lesson was tied to possible strategies of instructional improvement. Afterwards, based on both the field notes and interviews, researchers wrote a descriptive summary of each lesson according to a specified observation guide, using conventional analytical language (Hunter, 1985). Refer to Appendix G for a complete list of all classroom observation measures.

In total, researchers observed 90 English language arts lessons and classified 270 snapshots across the nine schools. Almost all lessons were observed by the two trained observers. An average of 20 decisions or ratings per observation was expected from observers.

Interrater agreement was calculated in two steps. In the first step, we calculated the percent agreement on individual items. We did this by tallying the number of times that raters agreed on an item and the total number of times that they rated that item. Then we divided the number of agreements by the total number of times that they rated that item. This yielded the percent agreement on each individual item. We aimed to reach a level of at least 75% agreement on each item.

Step 1. Percent agreement on individual item:

# of agreements on item / total # of times item was rated = % of agreement on item

Second, in order to identify the percentage of time that this agreement reached at least 75% among all items, we tallied the number of items on which agreement was above 75% and the total number of items rated. Then we divided the number of items on which agreement was at least 75% by the total number of items that were rated. This revealed the overall percentage of items on which agreement reached our desired level of 75%. We aimed to reach a level of at least 75% agreement on at least 90% of the items. Table 12 summarizes the percentage of interrater agreement at each school.

Step 2. Percentage of items on which agreement reached at least 75%:

# of item agreements ≥75% / total # of items rated = % of item agreements above 75%

In addition to these snapshot data, higher inference lesson summary ratings were constructed in order to measure each lesson's overall coherence; clarity of teacher prompts; students' comprehension of tasks; and general prescriptiveness. However, given these ratings' high degree of subjectivity, they were used solely for descriptive purposes. Interrater agreement was not calculated for these items.

Table 12

Interrater Agreement for Classroom Observations (Percentage of Items on Which Agreement ≥ 75%)

Low				High				
F	D	I	C	H	G	A	E	B
92	__[a]	90	91	91	94	77	93	89

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

[a]No interrater agreement exists because only one rater observed classes at this school; yet since school D was the last of the nine schools to be observed, this rater's reliability had already been established from the results of the first eight schools.

Student Writing Samples

In order to capture more finely grained measures of educational quality, we also assessed student work by collecting writing samples from seventh- and eighth-grade English language arts classes. We aimed to measure both the overall proficiency and cognitive complexity of students' writing. After reviewing a range of scoring rubrics from numerous studies, we selected two sets of instruments. First, we adapted the scoring standards from both the Successful School Restructuring study (Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995; Newmann & Wehlage, 1995) and the Chicago Annenberg Research Project (Newmann, Bryk, & Nagaoka, 2001). Second, we relied on the CDE's scoring rubric for the California Standards Test (CDE, 2002). We used the CDE's rubric to align our assessments with California's English-Language Arts Content Standards, since the majority of writing samples represented standards-based assignments. The former instruments were adapted to assess various aspects of students' writing mechanics, style, and cognitive complexity. The final scoring rubrics measured four dimensions of student writing: clarity, consistency, language accuracy, and cognitive complexity. See Appendix H for a copy of these rubrics.

Because students' writing performance is in large part a result of the learning opportunities presented to them, we originally intended to rate not only the quality of student writing, but also that of the teacher prompts used to guide the work. However, collecting teacher prompts proved remarkably challenging, as many teachers either could not articulate particular prompts or simply responded that there were none. Rather than risk drawing tenuous conclusions from a very small sample, we opted to analyze only the work samples and forgo the prompts.

We selected and trained an expert rater, a middle school English language arts teacher, to score the majority of writing samples. Training took place over the course of 4 days using both unusable writing samples[2] collected from the schools and samples chosen from the Internet. The training prompted several discussions that served as catalysts for further modification of the rubrics. Together, one researcher and the expert rater operationally defined terms encountered in the rubrics such as *synthesis, explain,* and *complex information*. They also agreed upon the subtle differences between terms such as *substantial* and *moderate*, as well as *some* and *little to no*. The two discussed the need for a construct that addressed the overall

[2]Unusable writing samples were those samples that lacked the teacher's classification of high, medium, or low quality and, therefore, could not be properly classified.

readability and flow of the writing samples. Besides cognitive complexity, consistency and language accuracy, they added another construct, clarity. The additional construct completed the set of four rubrics, intended to measure mutually exclusive constructs.

The Consistency rubric allowed us to assign a score that represented how clearly and consistently students elaborated on a central idea. The Clarity rubric assessed the degree to which errors interfered with the writing, a characteristic which was originally a part of the Language Accuracy tool. However, we found it problematic to include this criterion in the Language Accuracy rubric because a high number of errors, depending on the type of errors, did not necessarily interfere with the readers' understanding of the writing. By placing this criterion in the Clarity rubric, we separated it from the less subjective quantity of errors and provided an additional characteristic with which to analyze the entire piece of writing. The Cognitive Complexity rubric measured the extent to which students constructed new knowledge through interpretation, synthesis, analysis, or evaluation.

Another 4 days were used for the expert rater and the researcher to achieve sufficient levels of agreement in order to ensure interrater reliability. Interrater agreement was calculated for each of the four rubrics and an overall score. In each instance, we computed a Pearson correlation coefficient (r) to signify the degree to which the two raters agreed with one another. We defined an acceptable level of agreement as a coefficient above .75 for each subcategory and the overall score. Table 13 summarizes the interrater agreement across each category.

As with the student questionnaire, we sampled student work according to a stratified random sampling technique in which we selected 50% of the English language arts classes in each curricular track. Within each class, we requested three pieces of writing: one high-quality, one medium-quality, and one low-quality exemplar from teachers' most recent major writing assignment. In all, we collected 390 pieces of writing from 130 classes. As with the student questionnaire data, we adjusted for slight oversampling or undersampling with weights.

Table 13

Interrater Agreement for Scoring Student Writing Samples (r)

Clarity	Consistency	Language accuracy	Cognitive complexity	Overall
.83	.79	.79	.90	.90

Collecting writing samples from the teachers proved more challenging than anticipated. Administrators at each participating school allowed researchers to approach the teachers individually, first through a letter and then with follow-up visits to classrooms during prep periods. Researchers returned to most schools an average of seven times to collect samples. Due to the intense nature of their work, teachers reported that it was quite challenging to take the time to select three writing samples and recall their prompt (very few teachers had documented directions and guidelines for writing assignments). Many teachers also found it difficult to locate low-, medium-, and high-quality work, as some had no "high-quality" papers and others had no "low-quality" papers. Moreover, some teachers told us that they simply did not have their students engage in *major* writing because they believed their students were not ready for such demanding work; in a few cases, teachers submitted dictation, explaining that this was the most authentic writing that their students produced. Finally, though only a few teachers explicitly refused to submit their students' writing, others agreed to participate, but after repeated requests, never furnished the samples.

It is worth noting that this collection of writing samples is in many ways not representative of the typical, daily work produced in classrooms. In asking teachers to provide examples of their last *major* writing task, teachers may have selected projects or essays that were indicative of culminating tasks rather than everyday, usual work. For example, many teachers submitted essays produced for district writing assessments, stating that these represented the only instances of major writing in their classrooms. Further, while we asked teachers for the *last* major writing task, we received samples that were anywhere from a few days to a few months old.

Once the writing samples were collected, all identifying information was blacked out and they were organized by school, curricular track and quality level (low, medium or high). Prior to scoring, the samples were photocopied so that the originals could remain intact and be referred to later if necessary. Each piece of student work was then assigned a random number that the raters could refer to during the scoring process, but that was in no way connected to participating schools, teachers or students.

Eventually, each writing sample was rated across the four rubrics, yielding four subscores and one overall score. Scoring sheets aligned with the rubrics were used to record each sample's ratings. Again, writing sample scoring sheets were designed

using TeleForm (2003; www.cardiff-teleform.com), a computer application that electronically scans instruments and aggregates responses. Twenty percent of the sample was rated by both the expert rater and the researcher, neither of whom had any knowledge of each sample's respective school identity or performance status. The two achieved an interrater agreement of 90% on the samples scored between them. Table 14 summarizes the data collected at each participating school.

Data Analysis

Student Questionnaire Data

Student questionnaire data were analyzed in multiple steps. First, we weighted the data to account for our stratified sampling design and to adjust for slight oversampling or undersampling. Next, we conducted basic descriptive analyses in order to inspect each variable's properties, identify any irregularities, and compare patterns among the schools. Then we conducted factor analyses to construct questionnaire scales. We also performed descriptive analyses on these scales. Finally, we tested the significant differences between our original "high" and "low" performance groups, as well as our recent 2-year high-growth and low-growth groups.

Weighting. We employed a stratified random sampling technique in which we surveyed 50% of the classes in each curricular track. In order to account for this stratified design, and to adjust for oversampling or undersampling particular tracks, we applied weights to the student questionnaire data. Specifically, we applied a

Table 14

Data Collection Participants at Each School

Data collection method	Valid *N*									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total
Both teacher questionnaire items	44	31	39	42	29	26	28	49	29	317
Form A teacher questionnaire items	21	15	19	20	15	12	13	21	15	151
Form B teacher questionnaire items	23	16	20	22	14	14	15	28	14	166
Student questionnaire	748	323	436	440	243	341	687	560	370	4,148
Lesson snapshots (units)	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30	270
Lessons	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10	90
Writing samples (units)	58	37	42	54	36	31	39	70	23	390
Interviews	18	17	21	15	13	17	17	17	22	157

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

probability weight, or p-weight, to each school's curricular track, or strata, as well as to each overall track. P-weights indicate the inverse of the probability that each observation was included due to the sampling design. P-weights were computed in the following steps:

1. Calculate sampling fractions for each school's curricular tracks, that is, the proportion of the population being sampled in each track. For instance, if School A has 600 mainstream students and we sampled 300 of them, then our sampling fraction for School A's mainstream track would be 300/600, or 1/2.

2. Calculate each track's p-weight. For example, if the sampling fraction for School A is 1/2, then the p-weight is 2/1, or 2. Thus, each case in School A's mainstream track represents 2 students.

3. An analogous procedure was used to calculate overall p-weights for each overall track.

Consult Appendix I for a summary of all p-weights applied to the student questionnaire data.

Descriptive analyses. General descriptive analyses were conducted for each student questionnaire item, as well as for the broader student perception scales derived from the factor analyses. For more information on these scales, refer to our previous discussion on scale construction in the Instrumentation portion of this report. For continuous variables, we examined estimated means and standard errors. For categorical items, we inspected percentage distributions. See Appendix J for these descriptive statistics.

Significance tests. The purpose of statistical significance tests in our study was not to arrive at generalizable findings, but to make ourselves more independent of subjective rater judgments. Student questionnaire data were analyzed using Intercooled Stata, Version 8.2 (1984-2005; www.statacorp.com). After weighting the data, we conducted significance tests for all student perception scales to identify differences between our two original performance groups (high and low). Because the data were weighted, we could not conduct a traditional independent samples *t* test. In its place, we performed weighted survey regression analyses, interpreting the *t* statistic and its *p* value in each test. We used each student perception variable as the dependent variable, and dummy coded a "performance group" variable (*high* = 1, *low* = 0) to use as the independent variable. We also conducted these same analyses to test the differences between our two other high- and low-performance

groups, defined as those schools that experienced high or low growth within the last 2 years. Refer to Appendix K for the results of all of these regression analyses.

Classroom Observation Data

We collected two types of classroom observation data: snapshot data and lesson summary data. As to the classroom observation data, we conducted basic descriptive analyses in order to inspect each variable's properties, identify any irregularities, and compare patterns across schools. We also tested the significance between both original high- and low-performance groups and the recent 2-year high-growth and low-growth groups. For lesson summary data, we conducted the same basic descriptive analyses.

Descriptive analyses. We performed general descriptive analyses for each classroom observation snapshot item. Most items were categorical in nature. For these, we created percentage distributions. With respect to the remaining lesson summary items, we examined both percentage distributions and means. See Appendix L for these descriptive statistics.

Significance tests. To test the significance between our high- and low-performance groups, we conducted Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney tests, which are the nonparametric version of the independent samples *t* test. Mann-Whitney tests can be used when the dependent variable is not a normally distributed interval variable, and instead is only ordinal. They are also often used when each group is composed of a small number of cases. These tests revealed whether there were statistically significant differences between the classroom observation measures in the original high- and low-performance groups and the recent 2-year growth groups. We interpreted the *z* statistic and its *p* value to determine significant differences between groups. See Appendix M for the results of these significance tests.

Qualitative data analysis. Qualitative narratives of each lesson were used as material to illustrate patterns identified through quantitative analyses. The narratives were read holistically and prototypes were selected. In addition, we rated lessons on the following criteria: lesson coherence, clarity of teacher explanations or prompts, student comprehension of task, and overall prescriptiveness.

Writing Samples

Student writing sample data were analyzed in multiple steps. First, we weighted the data to account for our stratified sampling design and to adjust for

slight oversampling or undersampling. Next, we ran basic descriptive analyses in order to inspect each variable's properties, identify any irregularities, and compare patterns among the schools. Third, we tested the significance between our original high- and low-performance groups and the recent 2-year performance groups.

Weighting. As with the student questionnaire data, we employed a stratified random sampling technique in which we collected three samples of student work (high, medium, and low) from 50% of the classes in each curricular track. In order to account for this stratified design, and to adjust for oversampling or undersampling of different tracks, we applied weights to our student writing data. Specifically, we applied a probability weight, or p-weight, to each school's curricular track, or strata, as well to each overall track. P-weights indicate the inverse of the probability that each observation was included due to the sampling design. P-weights were computed in the following steps:

1. Calculate sampling fractions for each school's curricular tracks, that is, the proportion of the population being sampled in each track. For instance, if School A has 600 mainstream students and we sampled 60 of them, then our sampling fraction for School A's mainstream track would be 60/600, or 1/10.

2. Calculate each track's p-weight. For example, if the sampling fraction for School A is 1/10, then the p-weight is 10/1, or 10. Thus, each writing sample case in School A's mainstream track represents 10 cases.

3. An analogous procedure was used to calculate overall p-weights for each overall track.

Consult Appendix N for a summary of all p-weights applied to the student writing sample data.

Descriptive analyses. In order to identify cross-school patterns and possible irregularities, we compared each school's estimated means for three student writing sample scores—Clarity and Consistency, Cognitive Complexity, and Language Accuracy—as well as the Overall Writing Score. See Appendix O for these descriptive statistics.

Significance tests. We used Intercooled Stata, Version 8.2 (1984-2005; www.statacorp.com), to test the significant differences between the writing scores for our original performance groups (high and low) and our recent 2-year performance groups. Again, we conducted survey regression analyses, as these data were also weighted, which precluded the use of an independent samples *t* test. As

with the student questionnaire data, we interpreted the *t* statistic and *p* value in each test. Each writing score served as the dependent variable, and we dummy coded a "performance group" variable (*high* = 1, *low* = 0) to use as the independent variable. Refer to Appendix P for the results of these analyses.

Teacher Questionnaire Data

Teacher questionnaire data were analyzed in multiple steps. First, we conducted basic descriptive analyses in order to inspect each variable's properties, spot any irregularities, and identify patterns among schools. Then we conducted factor analyses to construct teacher questionnaire scales. We also performed descriptive analyses on these scales. Finally, we tested the significant differences between our original high- and low-performance groups and the recent 2-year performance groups.

Descriptive analyses. General descriptive analyses were conducted for each teacher questionnaire item, as well as for the broader student perception scales derived from the factor analyses. For more information on these scales, refer to the previous discussion on scale construction in the Instrumentation portion of this report. For continuous variables, we examined each school's means and standard deviations. For categorical variables, we inspected percentage distributions. See Appendices Q and R for these descriptive statistics.

Significance tests. Before testing the significant differences between our performance groups, we adjusted for differences in school size in order to ensure that each school received equal weight in its respective performance group. This prevented schools with larger faculties from weighing more heavily on a group's mean, and those with smaller faculties from being underrepresented in their group's mean.

To do this, we applied weights to the teacher questionnaire data. Specifically, we applied a probability weight, or p-weight, to each school in order to grant its teacher questionnaire cases equal weight in their respective performance group. P-weights were computed in the following steps:

1. Calculate sampling fractions for each school, that is, the proportion of each performance group comprised by each school. For instance, if the high-performance group has 200 total cases and 40 of them are from School A, then our sampling fraction for School A would be 40/200, or 1/5.

2. Calculate each school's p-weight. For example, if the sampling fraction for School A is 1/5, then the p-weight is 5/1, or 5. Thus, each of School A's cases in the high-performance group represents 5 teachers.

Refer to Appendix S for a summary of all p-weights applied to the teacher questionnaire data.

After applying weights to adjust for differences in school size, we conducted significance tests for the teacher questionnaire data using Intercooled Stata, Version 8.2 (1984-2005; www.statacorp.com). Specifically, we tested the significant differences between all teacher questionnaire scales (plus a few individual items) for our two original performance groups (high and low) and the recent 2-year high- and low-growth groups. We also tested a number of other configurations of schools, based on various growth patterns and time frames, though these analyses yielded little or no significant differences in terms of organizational characteristics or accountability responses. As before, because the data were weighted we could not conduct a traditional independent samples *t* test. In its place, we performed weighted survey regression analyses, interpreting the *t* statistic and its *p* value. We used each teacher questionnaire variable as the dependent variable, and dummy coded a "performance group" variable (*high* = 1, *low* = 0) to use as the independent variable. Refer to Appendix T for the results of all of these regression analyses.

School Background Data

School background data were analyzed in two steps. First, descriptive analyses were conducted by generating queries across schools, using the FileMaker Pro database in which all data were aggregated. These queries allowed us to identify similarities and differences among schools with respect to student demographics, curricular and instructional programs, learning conditions; personnel, and state and federal performance history. Consult Table 3 for a list of all background data.

Significance tests. In addition, significance tests were performed in order to assess the comparability of our original high- and low-performance groups. Again, Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney tests, the nonparametric version of independent samples *t* test, were used to judge whether each group differed significantly in terms of various 2005 (the primary year of data collection) background data. Tested variables included API growth score, student enrollment, percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced-Price Lunch, average parent education level, mobility rate, and percentage of English Learners. Refer to Appendix U for the results of these significance tests.

Interview Data

Interview transcripts were coded using Atlas.ti, Version 5.2 (1993-2007; http://www.atlasti.com). Transcripts were initially analyzed by using previously generated descriptive constructs as coding categories. After assigning these basic codes, interview data were analyzed for patterns and contradictions both within and across schools. The primary purpose of this coding was to piece together a coherent account of each school's organizational dynamics and responses to accountability pressures. See Appendix V for a list of these codes.

Queries were generated from these codes, including reports on each school's change history; change strategies, including inquiry and the use of data, professional development, and teacher leadership; teachers' instructional philosophy; instructional and curricular programs; instructional time; interactions among teachers and administration; and personnel issues.

Cross-School Analysis

Various cross-school analyses for specific research questions were conducted. These are documented in the findings section for each subtopic.

References

Blank, R., Porter, A., & Smithson, J. (2001). *New tools for analyzing teaching, curriculum, and standards in mathematics and science: Results from the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum project*. Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Bomotti, S., Ginsberg, R., & Cobb, B. (2002, April). *Different teachers, different stakes? Determinants of attitudes toward high-stakes testing.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

California Department of Education. (2002). *California Standards Test: Teacher guide for the California Writing Standards Test at grades 4 and 7.* Sacramento, CA: Author

California Department of Education. (2005). *California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS).* Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved 14 May 2007 from http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/

Consortium on Chicago School Research. (2003a). *Survey of Chicago public school students, spring 2003, elementary student edition*. Chicago: Author.

Consortium on Chicago School Research (2003b). *Survey of Chicago public school teachers, spring 2003, elementary teacher edition.* Chicago: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, & Learning Point Associates. (2003). *Surveys of Enacted Curriculum*. Washington DC: Author.

Hunter, M. (1985). *Mastery teaching*. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. (2003). *TIMSS 2003 main survey, student questionnaire, grade 4*. Amsterdam: Author.

Linn, R., & Haug, C. (2002). Stability of school building accountability scores and gains. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24,* 29-36.

McLaughlin, M., & Talbert, J. (1993). *Contexts that matter for teaching and learning: Strategic opportunities for meeting the nation's educational goals*. Stanford, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching.

Mintrop, H. (2004). *Schools on probation: How accountability works (and doesn't work).* New York: Teachers College Press.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007a). *Accountability urgency, organizational learning, and educational outcomes: A comparative analysis of California middle schools.* Unpublished manuscript. Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007b). *The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools* (CSE Rep. No. 713).

Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Newmann, F., Bryk, A., & Nagaoka, S. (2001). *Authentic intellectual work and standardized tests: Conflict or coexistence?* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Newmann, F., Secada, W., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards, and scoring*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

Newmann, F., & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring: A report to the public and educators*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2000). *PISA 2000 technical report*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Porter, A. (2002). Measuring the content of instruction: Uses in research and practice. AERA Presidential Address. *Educational Researcher, 31*(7), 3-14.

SRI International, Policy Studies Associates, & Consortium for Policy Research in Education. (2003). *Evaluation of Title I accountability systems and school improvement efforts (TASSIE), Findings from 2002-03*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service.

Taylor, B. (2003). *School change classroom observation manual*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Trujillo, T., & Mintrop, H. (2007). *Centralized instructional management: District control, organizational culture, and school performance*. Unpublished manuscript. Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.

Appendix A
Initial Interview Protocol

Background

Can you please give us some brief information about your professional background?

Curriculum and Improvement Strategies

How is the school doing at the present time? (accomplishments, challenges)

How do you explain the growth in API and test scores in recent years?

How does the school organize its curriculum in English and Math? (learning groups such as houses or instructional teams, tracking, course assignments, etc.)

What basic materials are used for English and Math? (textbooks, reading series, remedial programs, etc.)

What particular programs or strategies did the school employ to effect improvements? (programs, strategies)

Are there particular milestones that you think mark the school's progress? (Discuss some of them in detail.)

Social Characteristics and School Capacity

How would you describe your role in the school? (involvement in school improvement activities)

How would you describe your role and leadership in the school? (for principal)

What personal successes and challenges did you encounter in your efforts to help with the improvement of the school? (both at the school level and in your classroom)

How would you describe the principal's or the administration's leadership?

How would you describe the faculty at this school? (skill; interactions with each other; getting along; conflicts)

Who are the primary movers? Who gets involved? Who plays leadership roles?

How are parents and students included?

What role does the district play?

Have there been external consultants who have played an important role? How?

What resources could the school draw from?

How did / does the community support the school's efforts?

Oral History of School Development [For those at the school for a longer time (4 years)]

Was the school different four years ago?

Describe what the school looked like back then?
What changed over time?
How did these changes come about?

Role of Accountability System

What role have state standards and assessments played for the development of the school?

What role have accountability pressures, such as meeting API or AYP, played for the development of the school?

Appendix B
Follow-Up Interview Protocol

Skill Development and Expertise

Content

What professional development has taken place in the last year? Was there a focus?

How much on subject matter? What kind?
How much training on program material? What kind?
How much on testing? What kind?

Can you detect an overall purpose or strategy behind all these offerings? Is so, what is it?

Format

Who conducted it?

How much of it was single workshops; what was on-going?

What was accompanied by follow-up visits, coaching?

What generated discussions with colleagues?

Quality

How rigorous was the professional development?

How appropriate was it for your learning needs? For your level of experience?

How useful was it for instruction?

How much enjoyment or curiosity did it generate for you?

Describe some notable changes you made or insights you gained for your teaching in the last year? [It's okay if nothing comes to mind.]

Embedded Professional Development

How much do you learn from common planning time with other teachers/department/grade level meetings/faculty meetings/or other places where you work with other teachers?

How important is this work for you?

What would happen if it fell into disuse?
Would it change much?

Are there other areas where you and other teachers in your department have the opportunity to learn new things about teaching?

Monitoring

Who in the school knows what goes on in your classroom?

Do they observe? How?

What do you learn from these occasions?

Do you feel pressure to teach in a particular way?

Are there benchmarks?

Are they aligned with the curriculum you teach?
Does anybody take notice of the results?
What happens when benchmark results are low? (pressure/discussions/nothing)

Are there instructional or pacing guides?

Are they closely followed/monitored?
When somebody falls behind, is there pressure/discussion/a search for solutions?

Commitment

Do you agree in your department on what is good student work?

Do you sense much enthusiasm for instructional changes in the school? How about for yourself?

If not, what gets in the way? If so, how is it generated?

Professional Judgment

Is your professional judgment valued in this school? In what areas?

What makes or would make your work truly professional work?

How do teachers in this school hold themselves accountable for the quality of their instruction?

Appendix C
First Impressions Sheet

OBSERVATIONS	NO	YES	DID NOT OBSERVE
Are the parking lots, landscaped areas, etc. clean?	○	○	○
Are there signs of vandalism on or around the school grounds?	○	○	○
Is the treatment friendly for visitors?	○	○	○
Is student work displayed beyond the entry hall?	○	○	○
Are hallways and courtyards clean and pleasant?	○	○	○
Are the students polite to visitors?	○	○	○
Is there undue noise (e.g., loud machine sounds)?	○	○	○
When observing behavior in the courtyard, is the atmosphere relaxed?	○	○	○

COMMENTS:

Appendix D
Teacher and Student Questionnaire Variables

Name	Definition
Student educational experience	
Academic Engagement	Students find classes interesting and challenging
Academic Press	Teachers have high expectations of students
Teacher Care	Teachers care for and listen to students
Peer Collaboration	Students like to work cooperatively
Safety	Students feel safe around the school campus
Accountability	
Goal Importance	Personal importance of accountability system and goals
External Validation	System supplies professional prestige
Authoritativeness	Teachers should comply with state or district mandates no matter what
Threat	Personal anxiety due to sanctions
Pressure	Accountability imposes pressure on school
Focus	System provides a focus for instruction
Diagnostics	System provides useful information to drive instruction
Validity	System is a valid gauge of teachers' performance
Fairness	System is a fair gauge of teachers' performance
Realism	System targets are realistic
Raised Expectations	Teachers expect and assign more challenging work
Goal Integrity	System goals and demands are balanced with teachers' values and student needs
Test Importance – personal	Students feel high state test scores are personally important
Test Importance – whole school	Students feel high state test scores important for the whole school
Sanction Awareness	Students are aware of consequences for low school performance
Test Effort	Students push themselves when taking state tests
Leadership	
Urgency	Pressure for continuous improvement, reinforced by principal
Principal Support	Administration encourages and recognizes staff members for a well done job
Principal Control	Administration sets school priorities, makes and enforces plans
School Management	School is organized and functions well
Open Communication	Open discussions are encouraged and it is okay to disagree
Autonomy	Teachers' professional judgment and creativity are respected
Instructional Leadership	Administration sets high teaching standards and understands how children learn
Moral Leadership	Administration models how to put the needs of children first
Faculty culture	
Collegiality	Cooperative effort and support among staff
Pulling Together	Cooperative effort and support among staff driven by accountability demands
Norms of Performance	Teachers set and hold each other to high standards
Learning Orientation	Teachers continually learn and respect professional expertise
Motivation	
Involvement	Teachers' present level of involvement in improvement activities
Effort – 1	Work hours increased due to school improvement efforts
Effort – 2	Willingness to put in a great deal of effort beyond expectations
Hard Work	Teachers work beyond contractual hours
Commitment	Teachers have commitment to stay at the school
Morale	Teachers believe school is on continuous improvement path
Satisfaction	Teachers feel satisfied with their work and the school

Name	Definition
Efficacy and qualifications	
Instructional Efficacy	Teachers can effectively reach even the most difficult students
Test-related Efficacy	Teachers have knowledge and skills of how to do well on state tests
Colleagues' Skills	Colleagues are well prepared to meet performance expectations
Preparedness	Teachers feel prepared for this year's teaching assignment
Years Teaching	Total years teachers have taught
Years at School	Total years teachers have taught at this school
Years in District	Total years teachers have taught in this district
Degree	Highest degree held by teachers
Full Certification	Teachers are fully certified to teach this year's assignment
Special Certification	Teachers are certified in specialized areas
Change strategies	
Program Coherence	Continuity exists among programs
Strategic Orientation	School continually adjusts medium- or long-term improvement strategies
Money & Hopefulness	Low-performing schools funding has made me hopeful
Money & Impact	Low-performing schools funding has had some impact
Planning	School improvement plan provides a focus for school to carry out
Data Usage	Various sources of data are important for teachers' work
District Operational System	District provides consistent messages and aligns activities
District Instructional System	District provides useful instructional and curricular guidance
Background	
Familial Support	Parent or another adult helps and encourages students
Parent Support	Parents are involved in school activities
Possession of Cultural Goods	Students' families have newspapers, magazines, and a computer
Books at Home	Estimated number of books in student's home
Home Language	Frequency with which family speaks a language other than English at home
Recent Grades	Students' last English Language Arts report card grades
Time at School	Years students have attended the school
ELD Attendance	Students' ELD/ESL status
Ethnicity/Race	Students' ethnic/racial identity
Student Grade Level	Students' grade level
Teacher Grade Level	Teachers' present grade level assignment
Teacher Subject Area	Teachers' present teaching assignment

Appendix E
Student Questionnaire Scales

Student Educational Experience

Academic Engagement[a]	*Factor Loading*
Most of the topics we are studying are interesting and challenging.	.513
I usually look forward to most of my classes.	.572
I work hard to do my best in most of my classes.	.466
I am usually bored in most of my classes.	.472
Sometimes I get so interested in my work I don't want to stop.	.525
I often count the minutes until class ends.	.396
Most of my classes really make me think.	.480
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .69	

Academic Press[a]	*Factor Loading*
Most of my teachers:	
• expect me to do my best all of the time.	.573
• expect everyone to participate.	.538
• don't allow me to be lazy.	.486
• expect everyone to work hard.	.605
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	

Teacher Care[b]	*Factor Loading*
Students get along well with most teachers.	.482
Most teachers at this school care about students.	.600
Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say.	.663
If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers.	.533
Most of my teachers treat me fairly.	.643
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	

Peer Collaboration[b]	*Factor Loading*
I like to work with other students.	.680
I learn most when I work with other students.	.652
I like to help other people do well in a group.	.567
It is helpful to put together everyone's ideas when working on a project.	.530
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .74	

Safety[a]	*Factor Loading*
How safe do you feel:	
• around the school?	.711
• in the hallways and bathrooms of the school?	.678
• in your classes?	.614
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .74	

Accountability

Sanction Awareness
Some students will transfer to other schools.
Teachers at our school will be transferred.
Our principal will be transferred.
The state or district will take control of our school.
Our school will be closed.
Scores calculated as the sum of the items.

Background

Familial Support[a]	*Factor Loading*
How often does a parent or another adult living with you:	
• help you with your homework?	.584
• check to see if you have done your homework?	.599
• tell you they are proud of you for doing well in school?	.624
• push you to take responsibility for the things you've done?	.640
• talk to you about working hard at school?	.695
• push you to go to college?	.577
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	

Possession of Cultural Goods
Does your family:
• get a newspaper at least four times a week?
• get any magazines regularly?
• have a computer at home that you use?
Scores calculated as the sum of the items.

[a]Adapted from Consortium on Chicago School Research (2003a).

[b]Adapted from Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2000).

Appendix F
Teacher Questionnaire Scales

Accountability

Goal Importance[a]	*Factor Loading*
It is very important for me personally that the school meet its state and federal performance targets.	.852
It really does not make much difference to me whether this school is (or may be) designated as an underperforming or program improvement school. (Values are reversed.)	.710
A high score on the state tests means a lot to me.	.820
It says nothing about me personally as a teacher whether the school raises the scores on the state tests or not. (Values are reversed.)	.691
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .76	

External Validation	*Factor Loading*
Meeting the expectations of the accountability system is a matter of professional pride for me.	.791
I work towards high test scores for our school because they enhance our standing in the district.	.887
It is important for me to meet our performance targets so that our school's reputation will not be damaged.	.883
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	

Authoritativeness	*Factor Loading*
Since California state authorities have decided to evaluate schools with the present accountability system, teachers ought to follow it.	.822
Teachers have little choice but to comply with state mandates.	.820
I implement state or district mandates even when they don't make sense to me personally.	.753
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .72	

Threat	*Factor Loading*
Sanctions:	
• make me more anxious for my career.	.903
• will have negative consequences for me personally.	.897
• put a lot of pressure on me personally.	.924
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .89	

Focus[a]	*Factor Loading*
State standards, tests, and performance targets:	
• provide a focus for my teaching.	.857
• tell us what is important for this school to accomplish.	.883
• have made us concentrate our energy on instruction and student learning.	.761
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	

Diagnostics[b]	*Factor Loading*
Results from state tests give teachers some useful feedback about how well they are teaching in each curricular area.	.840
Results from the state tests can provide valuable diagnostic information.	.893

The state tests provide little useful information for my instruction. (Values are reversed.)	.739
The state tests provide information that helps schools improve.	.875
State test results help identify students who need additional academic help.	.787
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .88	

Validity	*Factor Loading*
The state assessments assess all of the things I find important for students to learn.	.788
A good teacher has nothing to fear from the state accountability system.	.775
The state assessments reflect just plain good teaching.	.843
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .72	

Fairness[a]	*Factor Loading*
For the most part, teachers are unfairly judged by the accountability system. (Values are reversed.)	.750
I resent being judged based on school-wide test scores and the performance of other teachers. (Values are reversed.)	.679
All schools in California have a fair chance to succeed within the state accountability system.	.643
The accountability system is stacked against schools located in poor communities. (Values are reversed.)	.719
Our students are not behind because of the teachers they have, but because of the conditions in which they have to grow up. (Values are reversed.)	.760
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	

Realism[a]	*Factor Loading*
The performance expectations of the state are for the most part unrealistic. (Values are reversed.)	.765
API targets are realistic goals for our school.	.797
AYP targets are realistic goals for our school.	.736
It is unrealistic to expect schools that serve poor neighborhoods to perform on the same level as schools in wealthy neighborhoods. (Values are reversed.)	.713
The state assessments are unrealistic because too many tasks are too hard for our students. (Values are reversed.)	.688
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .79	

Raised Expectations	*Factor Loading*
As a result of state standards, assessments, and accountability pressures:	
• I expect more from students.	.870
• I assign more challenging work.	.883
• I expect more from myself as a teacher.	.853
• I assign more complex cognitive tasks.	.831
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .88	

Goal Integrity
How important should these forces be?
District and state demands
Student needs
Teachers' values and goals
How important are these forces in reality at your school?
District and state demands
Student needs
Teachers' values and goals
Scores calculated based on differences between like items.

Leadership

Urgency	*Factor Loading*
The accountability system makes continuous improvement an urgent task for our school.	.770
Being held accountable by the state has made us aware of what we must accomplish at this school.	.698
The principal uses the pressures of accountability to move our school forward.	.781
The principal has encouraged teachers to see the accountability system as a tool for our school to improve.	.737
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .73	

Principal Support[a]	*Factor Loading*
The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.	.929
The principal usually consults with staff members before s/he makes decisions that affect teachers.	.904
Staff members are recognized for a job well done.	.905
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .90	

Principal Control[a]	*Factor Loading*
The principal sets priorities, makes plans, and sees that they are carried out.	.738
The principal puts pressure on teachers to get results.	.715
In this school, the principal tells us what the district and state expect of us, and we comply.	.856
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .64	

School Management	*Factor Loading*
This school is well managed.	.938
Overall this school functions well.	.920
Our administrators are good managers who know how to make our school run smoothly.	.932
This school is disorganized. (Values are reversed.)	.832
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .93	

Open Communication	*Factor Loading*
Open discussions about the meaningfulness of the state accountability system and related district policies are encouraged.	.823
Faculty gatherings provide a forum to discuss different perspectives on school improvement.	.880
It is okay to speak up when you disagree with the powers that be.	.862
Teachers are mainly ***encouraged*** rather than ***told*** to implement new programs or policies.	.792
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .86	

Autonomy	*Factor Loading*
Teachers' expertise in the classroom domain is respected here.	.842
In this school, I am encouraged to be creative in my classroom.	.860
In this school, I am given the space to exercise my professional judgment as to what is best for my students.	.851
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	

Moral Leadership

The administration at this school:

- places the needs of children ahead of personal and political interests.
- models the kind of school they want to create.

r = .75

Instructional Leadership[c]	*Factor Loading*
The administration at this school:	
• makes clear to the staff their expectations for meeting instructional goals.	.759
• sets high standards for teaching.	.860
• understands how children learn.	.831
• sets high standards for student learning.	.841
• broadly shares leadership responsibility with the faculty.	.684
• carefully tracks student academic progress.	.751
• monitors and evaluates the quality of teaching in a way that is meaningful for teachers.	.800
• allocates resources and other supports according to the school's goals and standards.	.746
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .91	

Faculty Culture

Collegiality[d]	*Factor Loading*
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.	.763
There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff here.	.875
I can count on colleagues here when I feel down about my teaching or my students.	.805
In this school, the faculty discusses major decisions and sees to it that they are carried out.	.760
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	

Pulling Together	*Factor Loading*
At this school, when it comes to meeting the challenges of reaching our API or AYP targets, administrators and teachers are on the same side.	.799
Facing the pressures of school accountability has brought the faculty together; almost everyone is making a contribution.	.895
The pressures of meeting API or AYP targets have strengthened the hand of those at the school who are interested in good teaching.	.836
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .80	

Norms of Performance	*Factor Loading*
In your judgment, how many teachers at this school:	
• help maintain discipline in the entire school?	.730
• take responsibility for improving the school?	.875
• set high standards for themselves?	.886
• are eager to try new ideas?	.871
• feel responsible to help each other do their best?	.861
• feel responsible when students in this school fail?	.715
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .90	

Learning Orientation[d]	*Factor Loading*
My job provides me with continuing professional stimulation and growth.	.657
Teachers in this school continually learning and seeking new ideas.	.812
The staff seldom evaluates its programs and activities. (Values are reversed.)	.603
Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who are expert at their craft.	.804
The most expert teachers in their field are given leadership roles at this school.	.739
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .76	

Motivation

Satisfaction

How often do you feel satisfied:
- with your work as a teacher?
- with your school overall?

$r = .52$

Efficacy and Qualifications

Instructional Efficacy	*Factor Loading*
I have found a way to get through to even my most difficult students.	.647
Sometimes I wonder if I would be more effective teaching a different age group. (Values are reversed.)	.646
In general, my classes are disciplined and well behaved.	.720
Students know that I expect hard work from them and they act accordingly.	.749
My challenge in this school, frankly, is to get through the day. (Values are reversed.)	.609
For the most part, my students are engaged in my lessons.	.730
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	

Test-related Efficacy

I have the skills and knowledge needed for my students to meet the performance expectations of the state.
I know how to teach so that students will do well on the state tests.
$r = .52$

Colleagues' Skills[a]	*Factor Loading*
Most of my colleagues have the knowledge and skills needed for our school to meet the performance expectations of the state.	.827
The typical teacher at this school ranks near the top of the teaching profession in knowledge and skills.	.855
Many teachers in this school are insufficiently prepared to do their jobs well. (Values are reversed.)	.778
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .75	

Change Strategies

Program Coherence[c]	*Factor Loading*
Once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure it's working.	.784
We have so many different programs in this school that I can't keep track of them all. (Values are reversed.)	.777
Many special programs come and go at this school. (Values are reversed.)	.831
You can see real continuity from one program to another at this school.	.810
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .81	

Strategic Orientation

A medium or long-term strategy that keeps our school on a path of continuous improvement is clearly in place.
At this school, we adjust improvement strategies and programs to the varying needs of students or teachers.
$r = .61$

Data Usage	*Factor Loading*
Overall student performance on state or district tests.	.675
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by class.	.674
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by subgroup.	.697
Subtest or item-cluster scores on state or district tests.	.727
Item-by item review of state or district test results.	.505
Student performance on school-level assessments (e.g., common writing prompts, math tasks, or reading assessments).	.572
Surveys of teachers, students, and/or parents.	.689
Information from classroom observations.	.538
Characteristics of students who are retained and/or drop out.	.640
Measures of school safety and discipline.	.671
Attendance rates.	.648
Student mobility rates.	.631
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .87	

District Operational System[e]	*Factor Loading*
Our district:	
• monitors our progress on goals established in our school plans.	.739
• sends consistent messages regarding our school goals and improvement strategies.	.849
• provides adequate assistance for our school's improvement.	.914
• provides useful feedback on our school improvement efforts.	.898
• proposes improvement activities that are in line with our goals.	.905
• has standardized instructional approaches for our school.	.576
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .91	

District Instructional System	*Factor Loading*
Our district provides:	
• useful reports of student achievement data.	.687
• clear guidance on what curriculum we should teach.	.786
• clear guidance on how we should deliver our instruction.	.788
• effective professional development that helps our school reach its goals.	.748
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .77	

Background

Parental Support[c]	*Factor Loading*
At this school, how many of your students' parents:	
• attend parent-teacher conferences when you request them?	.713
• return your phone calls promptly?	.770
• attend a sports event on campus?	.505
• attend a student performance on campus?	.670
• attend Back-to-School Night?	.696
• support your teaching efforts?	.787
• do their best to help their children learn?	.748
Reliability (Cronbach alpha) = .83	

[a]Adapted from Mintrop (2004).

[b]Adapted from Bomotti, Ginsberg, and Cobb (2002, April).

[c]Adapted from Consortium on Chicago School Research (2003b).

[d]Adapted from McLaughlin and Talbert (1993).

[e]Adapted from SRI International, Policy Studies Associates, and the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (2003).

Appendix G
Classroom Observation Measures

Name	Definition
Date	Date of observation
Segment time	Beginning and end time of snapshot
Grade	7^{th} or 8^{th} grade
Type of class	Curricular track (e.g., regular, ELD, honors, remedial, etc.)
Total number of students	Total number of students present
Grouping	Configuration of students (e.g., individual, pairs, small group, whole class)
Who	Person in charge of class (e.g., teacher, aide, specialist, substitute)
Major focus/Domain	Primary language arts [area?] (e.g., reading, writing, language study, oral communication)
Materials	Physical resources used to support activity (e.g., textbook, worksheet, periodical , novel, board/chart, student writing)
Dialogue complexity	Number of instances in which students engaged in conversation that built upon each other's responses or questions
Differentiated instruction	The students engaged in separate activities based on ability levels.
Test preparation	The students engaged in activities explicitly intended to prepare for state testing.
Non-instructional time	The classroom activity was not related to student learning.
Time on task	At least ¾ of students were on-task.
Student engagement	The students appeared highly engaged in the lesson.
Positive teacher tone	The teacher communicated with students using a positive, engaging tone (e.g., warm, task-oriented, inspired).
Proactive instruction	The teacher employed active instructional techniques (e.g., modeling, coaching, recitation, discussion, assessment).
Cognitive complexity	The students engaged in cognitively demanding activities (e.g., demonstrate/explain; analyze/investigate; evaluate; generate/create).
Lesson prescriptiveness	Components of lesson were structured by a program rather than by the teacher (e.g., materials; teacher questions or prompts; student activities)

Appendix H

7th- and 8th-Grade English Language Arts Student Writing Scoring Rubric

4	3	2	1
Clarity and Consistency			
• Demonstrates a *clear* understanding of audience • Maintains a *consistent* point of view, focus and organizational structure • Includes facts, details, and/or explanations *only relevant* to purpose	• Demonstrates a *general* understanding of audience • Maintains a *mostly consistent* point of view, focus and organizational structure • Includes facts, details, and/or explanations *mostly relevant* to purpose	• Demonstrates *some* understanding of audience • Maintains an *inconsistent* point of view, focus, and/or organizational structure • Includes facts, details and/or explanations *moderately related* to purpose	• Demonstrates *little to no* understanding of audience • *Lacks* a point of view, focus and organizational structure • Most of the facts, details and/or explanations are *unrelated* to purpose
• Maintains a clearly presented central idea • Errors do not interfere with the reader's understanding of the writing	• Presents a central idea with some elaboration • Errors rarely interfere with the reader's understanding of the writing	• Presents a central idea with little or no elaboration • Errors moderately interfere with the reader's understanding of the writing	• Lacks or merely suggests a central idea • Errors consistently interfere with the reader's understanding of the writing
Cognitive Complexity			
• *Substantial* evidence of construction of knowledge- *almost all* of the student's work shows interpretation, analysis, synthesis or evaluation	• *Moderate* evidence of construction of knowledge- a *moderate portion* of the student's work shows interpretation, analysis, synthesis or evaluation	• *Some* evidence of construction of knowledge- a *small portion* of the student's work shows interpretation, analysis, synthesis or evaluation	• *Little to no* evidence of construction of knowledge—*no portion* of the student's work shows interpretation, analysis, synthesis or evaluation; OR virtually all construction of knowledge is in error
Language Accuracy			
• Contains *few to no* errors in the conventions of the English language (grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc) • Includes a *wide variety* of sentence types (syntax, length, transitional and prepositional phrases, etc.)	• Contains *some* errors in the conventions of the English language (grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.) • Includes *some variety* of sentence types (syntax, length, transitional and prepositional phrases, etc.)	• Contains *several* errors in the conventions of the English language (grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.) • Includes *little variety* in sentence types (syntax, length, transitional and prepositional phrases, etc.)	• Contains *numerous* errors in the conventions of the English language (grammar, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.) • Includes the *ineffective or awkward use of sentence variety* or none at all

Note. Writing samples that were not original student writing, i.e., were copied from another source, scored a 0 in each category.

Appendix I
P-Weights Applied to Stratified Student Questionnaire Data

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total
Regular/Mainstream/Mixed	1.518	2.000	6.021	3.734	3.965	2.374	0.936	1.675	2.115	2.515
ESL/ELD	3.235	2.000	2.893	2.143	2.652	1.804	1.000	18.324	23.529	3.807
GATE/Honors/Magnet	1.571	2.018	1.681	3.441	1.017	—	—	3.368	0.439	1.489
Remedial	1.500	2.000	1.170	2.030	—	2.291	—	—	0.278	2.842

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc. — Indicates that a school did not place students in a particular track.

Appendix J
Student Questionnaire Items and Scales: Descriptive Statistics
(Note: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.)

Means and Standard Errors of Academic Engagement Items[a]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
Most of the topics we are studying are interesting and challenging.	2.71	2.60	2.69	2.64	2.73	2.73	2.63	2.81	2.77	2.70
	0.028	0.057	0.043	0.075	0.022	0.034	0.023	0.082	0.036	0.044
I usually look forward to most of my classes.	2.71	2.60	2.90	2.64	2.62	2.68	2.64	2.86	2.59	2.69
	0.021	0.033	0.255	0.062	0.041	0.062	0.063	0.144	0.054	0.082
I work hard to do my best in most of my classes.	3.25	3.01	3.40	3.18	3.03	3.23	3.09	3.30	3.23	3.19
	0.048	0.053	0.226	0.036	0.028	0.031	0.046	0.062	0.035	0.063
I am usually bored in most of my classes.	2.38	2.31	2.65	2.28	2.35	2.38	2.32	2.50	2.27	2.38
	0.027	0.067	0.295	0.023	0.008	0.023	0.014	0.109	0.050	0.068
Sometimes I get so interested in my work I don't want to stop.	2.50	2.36	2.86	2.49	2.64	2.52	2.46	2.60	2.46	2.54
	0.022	0.086	0.245	0.110	0.027	0.045	0.044	0.177	0.097	0.095
I often count the minutes until class ends.	2.27	2.22	2.40	1.98	2.17	2.11	2.08	2.28	2.14	2.18
	0.058	0.048	0.262	0.067	0.047	0.039	0.057	0.148	0.097	0.091
Most of my classes really make me think.	2.92	2.80	2.65	2.76	2.81	2.89	2.82	2.99	2.84	2.83
	0.043	0.035	0.079	0.072	0.049	0.003	0.039	0.056	0.027	0.045
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	426-434	332-340	359-367	405-411	236-239	628-635	550-555	670-681	317-321	3923-3983

[a]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly agree*.

Means and Standard Errors of Academic Press Items[b]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
Most of my teachers expect me to do my best all of the time.	3.38	3.15	3.42	3.35	3.38	3.37	3.32	3.38	3.37	3.35
	0.057	0.012	0.098	0.030	0.073	0.016	0.059	0.013	0.023	0.042
Most of my teachers expect everyone to participate.	3.26	3.09	3.31	3.25	3.29	3.28	3.20	3.28	3.25	3.25
	0.070	0.014	0.095	0.028	0.057	0.030	0.057	0.020	0.027	0.044
Most of my teachers don't let me get away with being lazy.	3.22	2.92	2.99	3.04	3.21	3.16	3.20	3.19	3.19	3.12
	0.061	0.039	0.014	0.063	0.015	0.001	0.062	0.010	0.019	0.032
Most of my teachers expect everyone to work hard.	3.39	3.15	3.45	3.33	3.42	3.36	3.31	3.44	3.40	3.36
	0.075	0.020	0.098	0.032	0.042	0.016	0.025	0.013	0.033	0.039
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	434-436	334-337	366-368	408-411	238-240	631-633	555-556	674-682	320-322	3964-3982

[b]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly agree*.

Means and Standard Errors of Teacher Care Items[c]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
Students get along well with most teachers.	2.47	2.38	2.54	2.40	2.44	2.47	2.45	2.63	2.47	2.47
	0.093	0.058	0.261	0.129	0.124	0.091	0.022	0.065	0.049	0.099
Most teachers at this school care about students.	3.12	2.83	3.05	2.90	2.98	3.05	2.93	3.14	3.00	3.00
	0.049	0.044	0.176	0.073	0.148	0.020	0.018	0.073	0.046	0.072
Most of my teachers really listen to what I have to say.	2.87	2.58	2.82	2.66	2.76	2.80	2.67	2.94	2.75	2.76
	0.050	0.041	0.208	0.071	0.151	0.010	0.032	0.037	0.061	0.073
If I need extra help, I will receive it from my teachers.	3.06	2.97	3.26	2.94	3.01	3.06	3.06	3.16	3.09	3.07
	0.024	0.038	0.200	0.076	0.106	0.035	0.027	0.029	0.058	0.066
Most of my teachers treat me fairly.	2.99	2.72	2.91	2.82	2.88	2.87	2.86	2.94	2.77	2.86
	0.055	0.041	0.152	0.070	0.139	0.038	0.046	0.020	0.028	0.065
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	434-438	335-339	364-367	441-414	241-242	628-637	555-560	678-683	312-320	3975-3997

[c]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 4 = *strongly agree*.

Means and Standard Errors of Peer Collaboration Items[d]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
I like to work with other students.	3.30	3.12	3.27	3.10	3.18	3.17	3.10	3.24	3.34	3.20
	0.044	0.035	0.195	0.039	0.049	0.014	0.061	0.055	0.026	0.058
I learn most when I work with other students.	2.97	2.96	3.04	2.90	3.01	2.98	2.91	2.89	3.07	2.97
	0.033	0.003	0.114	0.032	0.007	0.021	0.041	0.071	0.049	0.041
I like to help other people do well in a group.	3.07	2.77	3.05	2.84	3.08	2.99	2.87	3.09	3.02	2.98
	0.041	0.045	0.174	0.049	0.057	0.053	0.054	0.101	0.059	0.070
It is helpful to put together everyone's ideas when working on a project.	3.37	3.21	3.40	3.24	3.34	3.35	3.27	3.44	3.36	3.33
	0.077	0.034	0.191	0.025	0.006	0.052	0.030	0.051	0.022	0.054
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	434-437	338-340	363-368	410-414	238-241	629-636	553-559	673-679	318-322	3962-3995

[d]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 4 = *strongly agree*.

Means and Standard Errors of Safety Items[e]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
How safe do you feel around the school?	2.81	2.84	2.85	2.70	2.78	3.00	2.78	2.94	2.74	2.83
	0.046	0.035	0.198	0.031	0.081	0.050	0.057	0.009	0.042	0.061
How safe do you feel traveling between home and school?	2.85	2.75	2.55	2.95	2.81	2.76	2.76	2.94	2.91	2.81
	0.051	0.030	0.085	0.020	0.055	0.012	0.092	0.046	0.072	0.051
How safe do you feel in the hallways and bathrooms of the school?	2.94	2.82	2.41	2.75	2.99	3.11	2.95	2.90	2.95	2.87
	0.053	0.052	0.374	0.062	0.046	0.053	0.070	0.060	0.041	0.090
How safe do you feel In your classes?	3.56	3.35	3.45	3.22	3.42	3.55	3.21	3.54	3.37	3.41
	0.039	0.029	0.046	0.098	0.049	0.008	0.120	0.027	0.043	0.051
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	344-400	280-317	304-327	355-377	200-218	528-581	464-509	580-627	257-281	3312-3637

[e]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *not safe at all,* 4 = *very safe*; *I don't know* = coded as missing.

Means and Standard Errors of Familial Support Items[f]

How often does a parent or another adult living with you:	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
Help you with your homework?	2.51	2.17	2.16	2.42	2.44	2.28	2.28	2.40	2.24	2.32
	0.017	0.071	0.058	0.039	0.051	0.053	0.056	0.037	0.047	0.048
Check to see if you have done your homework?	2.91	2.64	2.63	2.79	2.75	2.76	2.64	2.86	2.44	2.71
	0.015	0.070	0.007	0.052	0.057	0.008	0.040	0.090	0.086	0.047
Tell you they are proud of you for doing well in school?	3.14	2.86	2.88	2.99	2.88	2.84	2.73	2.91	2.90	2.90
	0.057	0.059	0.135	0.011	0.067	0.003	0.062	0.043	0.027	0.052
Push you to take responsibility for the things you've done?	3.28	3.09	3.09	3.13	3.26	3.16	3.13	3.12	3.10	3.15
	0.065	0.036	0.047	0.029	0.048	0.014	0.018	0.019	0.053	0.037
Talk to you about working hard at school?	3.22	3.04	2.99	3.18	3.26	3.21	3.10	3.22	3.19	3.16
	0.042	0.022	0.097	0.055	0.050	0.019	0.064	0.055	0.029	0.048
Push you to go to college?	3.18	3.03	3.21	3.13	3.34	3.03	3.10	3.09	3.09	3.13
	0.060	0.046	0.305	0.022	0.024	0.009	0.079	0.089	0.107	0.082
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)	429-434	336-339	363-368	407-410	236-239	618-631	542-551	672-678	316-319	3931-3963

[f]Scale: 1-4, 1 = *never*, 2 = *once on a while*, 3 = *most of the time*, 4 = *all of the time*.

Means and Standard Errors of Recent English Language Arts Grades[g]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	MEAN
What was the last grade that you received in your English Language Arts class?	3.56	3.86	3.58	3.68	2.90	3.12	3.29	3.54	3.77	3.48
	0.140	0.051	0.344	0.117	0.099	0.092	0.166	0.085	0.225	0.147
Total *N*	426	331	366	406	235	622	546	659	308	3899

[g]Scale: 1-5, 1 = F; 2 = D+, D or D–; 3 = C+, C or C–, 4 = B+, B or B–, 5 = A+, A or A–.

Percentage Distribution of Test Importance Items

Question: How much do you care that:		D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
You get high scores on the state test?	Not at all	4%	5%	3%	5%	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	4%
	A little	17	23	13	18	13	14	15	13	14	16
	A lot	73	62	74	64	76	75	72	75	77	71
	I don't know	6	10	10	13	8	7	8	9	6	9
Your school gets high scores on the state test?	Not at all	12%	12%	12%	17%	5%	11%	14%	12%	14%	13%
	A little	29	26	22	26	29	25	24	25	28	26
	A lot	36	33	51	30	41	41	43	41	32	39
	I don't know	24	28	16	27	25	24	20	21	25	23
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)		437-438	339-340	368	414	239-240	634	551-554	680-681	320-321	3984-3988

Percentage Distribution of Test Effort Responses

When I have taken the state tests in the past:	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
I didn't push myself that much because I knew that the tests didn't count towards my grades.	4%	7%	3%	6%	4%	6%	6%	7%	4%	5%
I pushed myself sometimes, and sometimes I just wrote an answer without much thinking.	43	47	44	48	44	39	51	40	39	45
I pushed myself really hard.	53	46	52	46	52	55	44	53	57	50
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	420	332	363	399	237	616	548	663	304	3882

Percentage Distribution of Students Reporting That They Have Been Informed About Sanctions

Did your teachers or principal talk about what will happen to your school if students do poorly on the state tests?	**D**	**F**	**I**	**C**	**E**	**G**	**H**	**A**	**B**	TOTAL
No	31%	23%	49%	40%	26%	25%	28%	34%	45%	34%
Yes	34	50	25	26	34	49	36	24	21	32
I don't know	35	27	27	34	40	26	36	42	34	34
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	422	327	360	401	236	614	542	665	315	3882

Percentage Distribution of Student Awareness of Sanctions

What will happen if the students in your school do poorly on the state tests?		**D**	**F**	**I**	**C**	**E**	**G**	**H**	**A**	**B**	TOTAL
Some students will transfer to other schools.	No	27%	28%	24%	23%	29%	33%	26%	30%	23%	27%
	Yes	24	35	15	24	21	23	27	21	22	24
	I don't know	49	37	61	53	50	44	47	49	55	50
Teachers at our school will be transferred.	No	40%	29%	33%	30%	35%	45%	35%	42%	30%	36%
	Yes	10	31	13	14	15	14	13	10	17	14
	I don't know	50	40	54	55	50	41	52	48	54	50
Our principal will be transferred.	No	42%	35%	45%	33%	43%	45%	35%	44%	29%	39%
	Yes	7	26	8	9	10	13	14	9	16	12
	I don't know	51	39	47	57	47	42	51	47	55	50
I will be embarrassed to attend a school with low test scores.	No	52%	48%	35%	40%	35%	44%	43%	44%	43%	43%
	Yes	25	36	36	33	37	36	35	35	34	34
	I don't know	23	16	29	27	28	20	21	22	23	23
The state or district will take over our school.	No	21%	15%	25%	21%	22%	25%	23%	24%	16%	22%
	Yes	23	36	21	22	19	27	24	17	26	23
	I don't know	56%	49%	54%	57%	59%	48%	52%	59%	58%	55%
Our school will be closed.	No	48%	36%	50%	39%	42%	51%	46%	48%	29%	44%
	Yes	9	27	11	13	9	11	8	11	22	12
	I don't know	43	37	39	49	49	38	46	42	49	44
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)		427-434	333-337	362-365	407-411	238-240	620-624	546-548	669-675	311-317	3921-3947

Percentage Distribution of Reported Literacy Resources at Home

Does your family:		D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
Get a **newspaper** at least four times a week?	No	41%	44%	56%	43%	53%	50%	55%	51%	52%	49%
	Yes	36	34	23	33	25	32	28	28	27	30
	I don't know	23	22	21	24	22	18	17	21	21	21
Get any **magazines** regularly?	No	44%	49%	52%	44%	41%	39%	42%	41%	34%	44%
	Yes	42	30	34	39	42	47	44	41	44	40
	I don't know	14	21	13	16	17	14	14	18	21	16
Have a **computer** at home that you use?	No	70%	57%	60%	70%	76%	78%	74%	75%	79%	71%
	Yes	27	39	39	27	22	21	23	24	19	27
	I don't know	4	3	1	3	2	2	4	1	2	3
Total *N* (Range for Each Item)		428-431	334-336	365-366	408-409	234-238	620-621	549-552	676-677	319	3937-3948

Percentage Distribution of Reported Books at Home

*About how many **books** are there in your home?*	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
Few (0-3)	22%	32%	31%	27%	15%	20%	29%	26%	32%	26%
Enough to fill one shelf (11-25)	34	35	39	31	32	29	25	31	26	31
Enough to fill one bookcase (26-100)	32	22	23	26	41	36	30	31	30	30
Enough to fill several bookcases (100+)	12	11	7	16	12	15	16	12	12	13
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	421	329	365	409	238	615	545	673	318	3913

Percentage Distribution of Students' Reported Home Language Experiences

How often do people in your home talk to each other in a language other than English?	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
Never	21%	16%	30%	17%	16%	10%	7%	10%	5%	15%
Once in a while	27	17	15	18	14	15	15	16	15	17
Often	19	24	13	21	25	25	20	22	16	20
Almost always	33	44	42	44	45	50	58	52	64	47
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	424	331	366	409	236	616	548	675	319	3924

Percentage Distribution of Students' Reported Race/Ethnicity

Which best describes you?	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2%	4%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	1	20	17	5	6	3	9	4	8
Black/African American	6	4	6	11	6	3	2	5	3	5
Hispanic/Latino	63	72	63	52	75	68	79	68	77	68
White	7	5	3	5	3	3	1	3	2	3
Other	21	14	8	15	10	19	1	14	13	14
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	421	334	366	406	235	619	548	649	315	3893

Percentage Distribution of Students' Reported ESL/ELD Class Attendance

Do you attend and ESL or ELD class?	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	TOTAL
No	86%	70%	52%	71%	79%	79%	69%	62%	78%	71%
Yes	14	30	48	29	21	21	31	38	22	29
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	415	328	358	401	227	619	539	656	310	3853

Percentage Distribution of Students' Reported Length of Enrollment

How many years have you attended this school?	**D**	**F**	**I**	**C**	**E**	**G**	**H**	**A**	**B**	TOTAL
This is my first year.	47%	35%	53%	65%	12%	54%	10%	19%	40%	36%
This is my second year.	50	42	45	32	46	42	11	48	49	38
This is my third year.	1	21	1	1	40	1	50	30	10	19
I have been here longer than three years.	2	2	2	3	2	3	29	2	0	7
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	429	335	365	409	233	622	551	665	319	3928

Percentage Distribution of Students' Reported Grades

What grade are you in?	**D**	**F**	**I**	**C**	**E**	**G**	**H**	**A**	**B**	TOTAL
6th	0%	1%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	7%	1%	2%
7th	45	49	42	61	48	51	34	47	51	47
8th	55	49	55	36	52	48	66	46	48	51
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total *N*	430	338	367	408	235	624	552	671	320	3945

Means and Standard Errors of Academic Engagement[h]

	D	**F**	**I**	**C**	**E**	**G**	**H**	**A**	**B**	**Mean**
Academic Engagement (α=.6890)	18.7	17.9	19.7	18.0	18.3	18.5	18.0	19.4	18.3	18.5
	0.098	0.294	1.317	0.428	0.017	0.133	0.182	0.795	0.301	0.396
Total *N*	410	325	349	392	228	608	527	634	306	3779

[h]Scale: 7-28; seven 4-point items; 1 = *strongly disagree,* 4 = *strongly agree.*

Means and Standard Errors of Academic Press[i]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Academic Press (α=.7739)	13.3	12.3	13.2	13.0	13.3	13.2	13.0	13.3	13.2	13.1
	0.249	0.021	0.345	0.143	0.177	0.033	0.177	0.017	0.084	0.138
Total *N*	432	334	366	407	237	630	555	672	315	3948

[i]Scale: 4-16; four 4-point items; 1 = *strongly disagree,* 4 = *strongly agree.*

Means and Standard Errors of Teacher Care[j]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Teacher Care (α=.7936)	14.5	13.5	14.7	13.8	14.1	14.3	14.0	14.8	14.1	14.2
	0.208	0.243	1.066	0.419	0.668	0.185	0.107	0.213	0.136	0.361
Total *N*	429	329	358	403	241	621	552	669	309	3911

[j]Scale: 5-20; five 4-point items; 1 = *strongly disagree,* 4 = *strongly agree.*

Means and Standard Errors of Peer Collaboration[k]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Peer Collaboration (α=.7423)	12.7	12.1	12.8	12.1	12.7	12.5	12.2	12.7	12.8	12.5
	0.181	0.114	0.682	0.133	0.037	0.140	0.156	0.268	0.137	0.205
Total *N*	431	334	357	408	237	627	549	664	314	3921

[k]Scale: 4-16; four 4-point items; 1 = *strongly disagree,* 4 = *strongly agree.*

Means and Standard Errors of Safety[l]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Safety (α=.7375)	9.4	9.1	8.8	8.7	9.3	9.7	9.1	9.5	9.1	9.2
	0.143	0.121	0.199	0.221	0.041	0.082	0.197	0.054	0.073	0.125
Total *N*	306	249	251	308	180	473	397	500	216	2880

[l]Scale: 3-12; three 4-point items; 1 = *not safe at all,* 4 = *very safe; I don't know* = coded as missing.

Means and Standard Errors of Familial Support[m]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Familial Support (α=.7924)	18.2	16.8	16.9	17.7	17.9	17.3	16.9	17.7	17.0	17.4
	0.255	0.098	0.275	0.050	0.065	0.056	0.214	0.301	0.131	0.161
Total *N*	417	329	352	404	233	611	533	662	309	3850

[m]Scale: 6-24; six 4-point items; 1 = *never*, 2 = *once on a while*, 3 = *most of the time*, 4 = *all of the time*.

Means and Standard Errors of Sanction Awareness[n]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Sanction Awareness (α=.6536)	0.7	1.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.7	1.0	0.9
	0.101	0.043	0.093	0.072	0.020	0.042	0.098	0.125	0.080	0.075
Total *N*	424	329	361	406	237	615	537	664	310	3883

[n]Scale: 0-5, sum of "yes" responses.

Means and Standard Errors of Possession of Cultural Goods[o]

	D	F	I	C	E	G	H	A	B	Mean
Possession of Cultural Goods (α=.3179)	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1
	0.023	0.033	0.047	0.038	0.026	0.011	0.018	0.056	0.034	0.032
Total *N*	300	215	267	277	161	462	427	480	215	2804

[o]0-3, sum of "yes" responses.

Appendix K
Student Perception Scales: Survey Regression Results

Survey Regression Results Between Original "High-Growth" and "Low-Growth" Groups

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Educational experience				
Academic engagement	7-28	18.6	18.5	–0.08
Academic press	4-16	13.0	13.2	1.03
Teacher care	5-20	14.1	14.3	0.32
Peer collaboration	4-16	12.4	12.5	0.32
Safety	3-12	9.0	9.3	1.76
Accountability				
Test importance – personal	1-3	2.7	2.8	1.71
Test importance – whole school	1-3	2.3	2.4	0.98
Test effort	1-3	2.4	2.4	0.02
Sanction awareness	0-5	0.9	0.8	–0.63

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Survey Regression Results Between Recent 2-Year High- and Low-Growth Groups

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Educational experience				
Academic engagement	7-28	18.7	18.6	–0.09
Academic press	4-16	13.1	13.1	–0.07
Teacher care	5-20	14.3	14.1	–0.47
Peer collaboration	4-16	12.6	12.5	–0.34
Safety	3-12	9.4	8.8	–3.39**
Accountability				
Test importance – personal	7-28	2.7	2.7	–0.24
Test importance – whole school	4-16	2.4	2.3	–0.78
Test effort	5-20	2.5	2.5	–0.31
Sanction awareness	4-16	0.9	0.8	–0.51

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Appendix L
Classroom Observation Data: Descriptive Statistics
(Note: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.)

Table L1. GRADES OBSERVED

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Seventh	44%	50%	56%	50%	50%	55%	58%	50%	50%
Eighth	56	50	44	42	50	45	42	50	50
Mixed				8					
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L2. CLASS TYPE

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Regular/Mixed	56%	30%	44%	42%	38%	36%	55%	60%	80%
ELD/ESL	0	10	22	25	25	9	36	30	10
GATE/Honors/Magnet	32	0	22	17	25	0	0	10	10
Remedial	12	60	11	17	13	55	9	0	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L3. MATERIALS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Textbook	18%	18%	14%	38%	16%	27%	8%	33%	8%
Worksheet	10	21	34	23	10	31	24	10	15
Periodical	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Novel	21	3	24	8	13	7	30	5	8
Board/Chart	13	18	7	17	16	24	5	20	21
Student writing	0	13	0	6	13	0	3	0	8
Other	38	21	21	8	32	11	30	33	41
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L4. INSTRUCTOR

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Teacher	100%	100%	96%	100%	88%	73%	82%	97%	100%
Aide	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	0
Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Substitute	0	0	0	0	13	27	18	0	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L5. NUMBER OF STUDENTS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
1 to 10	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
11 to 20	24	20	11	25	13	9	12	0	10
21 to 30	68	50	56	42	38	55	70	20	50
31 or more	8	30	33	33	50	36	18	80	40
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L6. GROUPING

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Individual	28%	23%	33%	33%	46%	26%	21%	20%	17%
Pairs	0	10	0	6	4	0	0	3	0
Small group	0	16	0	6	0	13	0	3	7
Whole group	72	52	67	56	50	61	79	73	77
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L7. DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Yes		0%	0%	11%	6%	0%	0%	0%	7%	0%
	N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L8. TEST PREPARATION

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Yes		0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	18%	12%	13%	7%
	N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L9. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Low		16%	20%	11%	14%	17%	18%	0%	17%	20%
Medium		80	60	85	78	75	76	91	77	63
High		4	20	4	8	8	6	9	7	17
TOTAL		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L10. TIME ON TASK

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Almost none		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
About 1/4		0	0	0	0	0	6	0	10	7
About 1/2		0	7	4	11	8	6	0	10	7
About 3/4		12	23	15	31	17	24	0	0	20
Almost all		88	70	81	58	75	58	100	80	67
TOTAL		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L11. TEACHER INTERACTION									
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
Telling	31%	47%	56%	24%	42%	53%	35%	48%	34%
Modeling	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Recitation	31	37	11	41	0	24	22	26	19
Coaching	10	13	0	14	13	3	0	10	16
Listening/Watching	7	3	22	16	25	21	38	13	19
Reading aloud	7	0	7	0	4	0	3	0	0
Assessment	0	0	4	5	13	0	3	0	9
Discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	7	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Note: No table for dialog complexity exists because we never observed an instance of it.

Table L12. TEACHER TONE									
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
Harried	0%	3%	15%	2%	7%	0%	3%	16%	5%
Inspirational	0	9	0	5	10	3	0	0	8
Neutral	36	18	19	15	17	35	31	3	28
Reserved	4	0	7	0	0	6	0	0	0
Stern	11	0	0	0	7	9	9	0	8
Task oriented	43	53	48	59	30	32	57	65	33
Warm	7	18	11	20	30	15	0	16	18
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table L13. COGNITIVE COMPLEXITY

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Recall	61%	47%	67%	49%	70%	80%	88%	71%	56%
Demonstrate/Explain	24	26	26	47	24	10	3	21	29
Analyze/Investigate	16	17	0	2	5	3	10	8	9
Evaluate	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
Generate/Create	0	4	7	0	0	8	0	0	0
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L14. INSTRUCTIONAL AREA

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
R: Basic activities	0%	9%	22%	14%	19%	13%	25%	16%	12%
R: Vocabulary	3	11	15	7	3	10	3	3	15
R: Awareness of Text/Print	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
R: Fluency	8	0	0	5	3	0	0	0	0
R: Comprehension	29	15	11	26	8	15	43	39	15
R: Critical reading	8	0	0	5	0	3	0	0	0
R: Author's craft	0	0	0	7	8	20	0	11	0
W: Writing process	13	38	0	2	14	0	5	3	18
W: Writing components	0	0	0	0	19	0	5	5	0
W: Writing applications	16	15	26	12	16	13	13	5	18
LS: Language study	18	9	11	19	11	15	8	8	12
OC: Listening/Viewing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OC: Speaking/Presentation	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
Non-instructional	0	4	15	2	0	13	0	11	6
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Table L15. MAJOR DOMAIN										
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
Reading		69%	45%	52%	58%	50%	62%	70%	60%	39%
Writing		15	32	22	17	33	8	15	17	42
Language study		15	16	11	19	17	16	15	10	13
Oral communication		0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Non-instructional		0	6	15	3	0	14	0	13	6
TOTAL		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	27	30	27	36	24	33	33	30	30

Lesson Summary Ratings

Table L16. Lesson Coherence										
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
Wholly incoherent		6%	0%	11%	0%	6%	0%	0%	13%	20%
More than one break		6	0	17	0	19	45	10	13	20
One break		17	30	28	33	38	18	20	33	40
Logical flow		72	70	44	67	38	36	70	40	20
TOTAL		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10

Table L17. Clarity of Teacher Explanations or Prompts										
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
High		11%	35%	0%	33%	25%	9%	5%	7%	25%
	N	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10

Table L18. Student Comprehension of Content or Task										
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**
High		22%	30%	0%	33%	25%	14%	0%	0%	10%
	N	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10

Table L19. Overall Prescriptiveness

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Not at all	56%	50%	44%	33%	63%	27%	45%	50%	70%
One part	0	0	22	0	13	18	9	20	10
Two parts	11	20	33	25	0	45	18	0	10
Wholly prescriptive	33	30	0	42	25	9	27	30	10
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10
Mean	2.38	2.3	1.75	1.75	1.88	2.36	2.27	2.1	1.6

Table L20. Areas of Prescriptiveness

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Materials	36%	38%	63%	38%	43%	53%	43%	45%	50%
Student Activities	27	31	38	33	29	40	36	27	33
Teacher Prompts	36	31	0	29	29	7	21	27	17
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	9	10	9	12	8	11	11	10	10

Appendix M
Classroom Observation Data: Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney Test Results

Test Results Between Original "High-Performance" and "Low-Performance" Groups

	z	*p-value*
Non-instructional time	1.63	0.104
Time on task	–0.98	0.325
Student engagement	–0.25	0.805
Positive teacher tone	–0.12	0.902
Proactive instruction	0.00	1.000
Cognitive complexity	0.49	0.623

Test Results Between Recent 2-Year High- and Low-Performance Groups

	z	*p-value*
Non-instructional time	–1.69	0.091
Time on task	0.15	0.881
Student engagement	–0.91	0.365
Positive teacher tone	–0.75	0.451
Proactive instruction	0.15	0.882
Cognitive complexity	–1.34	0.180

Appendix N

P-Weights Applied to Stratified Student Writing Sample Data

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Total
Regular/Mainstream/Mixed	20.400	11.467	79.909	29.607	22.800	29.083	13.630	21.771	28.947	25.391
ESL/ELD	48.250	13.333	36.000	15.000	13.071	13.833	20.917	61.636	200.000	33.556
GATE/Honors/Magnet	14.667	0.000	11.875	24.000	30.000	—	—	9.160	12.500	14.905
Remedial	10.000	16.842	9.167	16.750	—	26.077	—	—	0.000	18.091

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc. — indicates that a school did not place students in a particular track.

Appendix O
English Language Arts Writing Samples:
Descriptive Statistics—Estimated Mean Scores and Standard Errors

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	Mean
Clarity and consistency (range 0-8)	3.7	4.6	2.3	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.5	4.7	4.1	4.0
Cognitive complexity (range 0-4)	1.2	1.2	0.7	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.2
Language accuracy (range 0-4)	1.6	1.9	0.9	1.7	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.1	1.7	1.7
Overall writing score (range 0-16)	6.4	7.6	3.9	7.2	7.5	7.3	8.0	7.9	7.0	7.0

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

Appendix P
Student Writing Sample Scores: Survey Regression Results

Test Results Between Original "High-Performance" and "Low-Performance" Groups

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Clarity and consistency	0-8	3.54	4.31	1.42
Cognitive complexity	0-4	1.09	1.22	0.83
Language accuracy	0-4	1.46	1.89	1.61
Overall writing score	0-16	6.09	7.41	1.42

$^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Test Results Between Recent 2-Year High- and Low-Performance Groups

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Clarity and consistency	0-8	4.05	3.32	–1.12
Cognitive complexity	0-4	1.29	0.97	–2.05
Language accuracy	0-4	1.78	1.31	–1.58
Overall writing score	0-16	7.12	5.59	–1.39

$^{*}p < .05$. $^{**}p < .01$. $^{***}p < .001$.

Appendix Q
Individual Teacher Questionnaire Items: Descriptive Statistics

Items are listed in the order in which they appear on the questionnaire.

Items Shared in Both Forms

		Total years teaching				
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mode	N
Blind School ID	A	12.63	11.37	6	4	44
	B	11.53	12.21	5	4	31
	C	15.10	9.40	13	10	39
	D	9.17	8.10	7	5	42
	E	11.14	8.65	10	3	29
	F	10.13	9.19	8	8	26
	G	9.27	8.39	7	4	28
	H	13.41	11.28	8	5	49
	I	17.07	10.96	15	15	29

		Years teaching in school				
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mode	N
Blind School ID	A	7.99	7.39	5	5	44
	B	7.60	8.89	4	2	31
	C	6.54	6.74	3	1	39
	D	6.14	6.18	5	5	42
	E	7.34	6.66	5	11	29
	F	6.40	4.69	5	1	26
	G	5.89	5.27	4	4	28
	H	7.43	7.52	5	2	49
	I	10.38	8.91	8	1	29

		Years teaching in district				
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Median	Mode	N
Blind School ID	A	10.63	9.58	6	5	44
	B	10.73	12.91	4	2	31
	C	12.08	7.72	10	10	39
	D	7.50	6.97	5	5	42
	E	8.90	8.60	6	2	29
	F	7.12	4.91	7	1	26
	G	7.75	7.62	4	4	28
	H	10.07	10.30	5	2	49
	I	15.62	11.33	11	1	29

		Highest degree attained							
		Less than a B.A.		B.A.		M.A.		Ph.D. or Ed.D.	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Blind School ID	A	0	0%	30	68%	12	27%	2	5%
	B	0	0%	23	74%	7	23%	1	3%
	C	0	0%	26	67%	13	33%	0	0%
	D	0	0%	25	60%	17	40%	0	0%
	E	0	0%	10	34%	19	66%	0	0%
	F	0	0%	18	72%	7	28%	0	0%
	G	0	0%	15	54%	13	46%	0	0%
	H	0	0%	24	51%	23	49%	0	0%
	I	0	0%	23	79%	6	21%	0	0%

Grades taught	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
6th	20	6	2	0	14	10	1	18	0
7th	27	16	28	31	14	18	22	15	20
8th	24	15	26	27	13	14	20	17	20
Other	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	1

Subjects taught	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Art	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0
P.E.	2	3	3	1	4	5	4	11	3
ELD/ESL	5	5	2	4	3	4	2	13	4
Science	10	11	7	7	11	6	6	20	2
English	19	13	10	13	10	9	6	23	11
Social Studies	13	7	6	7	11	6	5	23	7
Math	10	14	10	8	9	8	5	21	6
Special Education	5	3	4	5	4	5	2	5	1
Music	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	1
Other	7	0	6	9	7	2	4	8	10

Full certification	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
No	10	5	4	2	2	1	2	5	3
Yes	34	26	35	40	27	24	26	42	25

Special certifications	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
National Board Certification	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2
Administrative Credential	7	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	3
BCLAD	3	8	7	13	4	10	4	10	2
Other credential	9	8	15	11	7	6	15	12	15

Feelings of preparedness	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not as prepared as I need to be	3	7%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%
Not as prepared as I wish to be	5	11%	4	13%	1	3%	11	26%	5	18%	0	0%	4	15%	7	15%	1	3%
Adequately prepared	13	30%	15	48%	14	37%	15	36%	11	39%	3	12%	7	27%	14	30%	10	34%
Very well prepared	23	52%	11	35%	23	61%	16	38%	12	43%	22	88%	15	58%	26	55%	16	55%

Level of involvement in school improvement activities	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low	10	23%	4	13%	3	8%	4	10%	3	11%	4	16%	3	11%	4	9%	2	7%
Medium	15	35%	10	32%	15	39%	19	45%	14	50%	7	28%	8	29%	22	49%	12	41%
High	8	19%	7	23%	15	39%	11	26%	6	21%	8	32%	11	39%	14	31%	11	38%
Very High	10	23%	10	32%	5	13%	8	19%	5	18%	6	24%	6	21%	5	11%	4	14%

Leadership activities in which teachers are involved	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Administrative duties	7	3	3	3	2	2	2	5	1
Parent-school coordinator	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	0
Chair of committee	5	5	12	6	5	5	6	6	5
PD presenter	20	9	2	6	5	3	3	11	4
Chair of grade level	6	5	2	1	7	4	1	8	6
Resource teacher with special assignment	1	1	2	3	3	0	1	1	0
Department head	12	9	15	8	3	6	8	7	11
Subject matter specialist	3	3	4	5	4	1	0	4	0
Instructional coach	3	5	4	5	3	3	1	6	2
Test coordinator/Data analyst	6	3	0	11	3	2	0	1	7
Master/mentor teacher	16	4	9	10	7	4	5	16	7
Writer of grant proposals	8	0	2	2	4	2	0	1	0
Member of the school improvement team	8	4	8	11	7	7	4	7	4
Writer of the school improvement plan	4	1	5	5	8	4	2	11	0
Member of the school leadership team	8	11	10	11	7	5	13	11	8
Union representative	2	4	2	6	4	1	2	7	2
School improvement/reform coordinator	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Other leadership activities	11	5	7	13	10	9	4	19	6

Work done within contractual hours?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	38	86%	28	93%	27	73%	38	90%	27	93%	20	80%	24	86%	43	88%	20	69%
Yes	6	14%	2	7%	10	27%	4	10%	2	7%	5	20%	4	14%	6	12%	9	31%

Hours worked in a typical week	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-2 Hours	3	8%	1	3%	5	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	0	0%
3-4 Hours	10	26%	3	10%	5	17%	8	21%	2	7%	3	15%	4	17%	12	28%	3	14%
5-6 Hours	11	28%	8	26%	3	10%	11	28%	4	15%	6	30%	3	13%	11	26%	8	38%
7-8 Hours	9	23%	6	19%	3	10%	7	18%	8	30%	8	40%	6	25%	10	23%	2	10%
9 or More Hours	6	15%	13	42%	13	45%	13	33%	13	48%	3	15%	11	46%	7	16%	8	38%

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Work hours have increased due to school improvement efforts	3.86	.95	4.16	.73	3.71	1.01	4.14	.87	3.82	1.19	4.20	1.12	4.18	.94	3.92	1.16	4.07	.83
Willing to put in effort beyond what is usually expected of teachers	3.89	.95	3.97	.91	3.97	.90	3.98	.95	4.07	.98	4.33	.92	3.96	.92	4.04	1.04	4.14	.80
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree.

Plans for leaving or staying	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I intend to leave this school at the end of the year.	7	17%	5	17%	6	16%	5	12%	6	22%	3	13%	7	25%	3	7%	3	11%
I have thought about leaving, but I decided to give it another year.	8	19%	6	20%	3	8%	12	29%	4	15%	9	38%	6	21%	7	16%	7	25%
At present, I don't think about leaving. This school is my place.	27	64%	19	63%	28	76%	25	60%	17	63%	12	50%	15	54%	35	78%	18	64%

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
I've found a way to get through to even my most difficult students.	3.66	1.06	3.32	1.08	3.47	1.08	3.52	.99	3.66	1.20	3.19	1.13	3.57	1.32	3.54	1.11	3.34	1.04
(R) Sometimes I wonder if I would be more effective teaching a different age group.	3.72	1.14	3.39	1.33	3.68	1.14	3.19	1.35	3.79	1.08	3.27	1.22	3.71	1.12	3.52	1.27	3.34	1.04
In general, my classes are disciplined and well behaved.	4.40	.73	4.03	.98	3.89	1.11	3.86	1.00	4.00	.96	3.50	1.10	4.21	.69	4.33	.72	3.79	.90
Students know that I expect hard work from them and they act accordingly.	4.18	.81	3.74	.96	4.03	.71	4.00	.73	3.83	.66	3.77	1.07	3.89	1.07	3.85	.97	3.79	.98
(R) My challenge in this school, frankly, is to get through the day.	4.19	.88	4.26	.68	4.15	.87	4.24	.82	4.03	.91	3.81	1.13	3.96	1.00	4.02	.96	3.83	1.00
For the most part, my students are engaged in my lessons.	4.14	.52	4.10	.47	4.08	.48	3.88	.71	4.00	.60	3.81	.75	3.96	.69	4.06	.60	4.00	.46
For the most part, my students are interested in the material I teach them.	3.98	.74	3.74	.73	3.87	.70	3.52	.86	3.83	.71	3.27	1.04	3.57	1.03	3.81	.70	3.59	.68
I have the skills and knowledge needed to meet the performance expectations of the state.	4.40	.66	4.39	.50	4.49	.60	4.40	.59	4.28	.70	4.42	.86	4.21	.69	4.42	.61	4.39	.57
I know how to teach so that students will do well on state tests.	3.88	.88	3.97	.75	3.95	.83	3.69	.75	3.90	.77	4.12	.83	3.89	.83	3.92	.79	3.97	.68
Many of the students I teach are not capable of learning the material I should be teaching them.	2.56	1.12	2.55	1.06	2.69	1.17	2.98	1.30	2.93	1.39	3.88	.88	2.71	1.41	2.74	1.41	2.97	1.12
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree.

How often do you feel satisfied:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
…with your work as a teacher?	3.16	.71	3.19	.65	3.05	.69	2.98	.72	2.83	.71	3.15	.88	3.18	.94	3.13	.73	2.93	.75
…with your school overall?	2.84	.75	2.97	.66	3.26	.75	2.62	.73	2.14	.69	2.85	.78	2.56	1.01	2.58	.74	2.90	.77
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-4, 1 = almost never, 4 = almost always.

Top indicators of successful teaching	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Affection from students	9	2	9	16	10	7	4	12	5
Answers from individual students	26	16	22	31	20	18	24	31	21
API or AYP	7	11	7	11	3	6	4	7	9
High scores on teacher-made test	21	19	18	27	14	13	20	27	13
I just know it in my heart	10	3	7	10	6	4	9	6	4
Lively participation	31	20	25	37	24	19	24	36	25
Positive parent comments	12	4	15	23	9	6	8	20	7
Colleagues' praise	7	7	8	15	7	5	9	12	6
Principal's praise	6	8	9	6	7	10	4	10	4
State test scores	14	15	11	16	11	8	7	13	15
Student completion of tasks	33	19	31	37	22	19	22	32	24

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
It is very important for me personally that the school meet its state and federal performance targets.	3.53	.98	4.19	.75	4.08	.71	3.40	1.06	3.52	.99	4.32	.85	3.61	1.23	3.78	1.03	3.97	.82
(R) It really does not make much difference to me whether this school is (or may be) designated as an underperforming or program improvement school.	3.86	1.04	4.42	.81	4.05	.96	3.64	.98	3.90	.94	4.44	.65	3.32	1.42	4.22	.82	3.76	1.33
A high score on the state tests means a lot to me.	3.47	.85	3.87	.88	3.71	.80	2.98	1.18	3.52	.83	3.88	1.01	3.43	1.29	3.45	1.08	3.72	.84
(R) It says nothing about me personally as a teacher whether the school raises the scores on the state tests or not.	3.14	.99	3.45	1.06	3.55	.98	2.83	1.21	3.10	1.08	2.72	1.17	2.86	1.46	3.00	1.26	3.59	1.09
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
The state assessments assess all of the things I find important for students to learn.	2.44	.91	2.65	.91	2.31	.92	2.05	.97	2.14	.83	1.88	.91	2.07	.98	2.69	1.09	2.38	1.12
A good teacher has nothing to fear from the state accountability system.	2.98	1.20	3.10	.91	2.77	1.01	2.12	1.05	2.72	1.19	1.73	.87	2.71	1.41	2.90	1.40	3.28	1.13
The state assessments reflect just plain good teaching.	2.42	.96	2.71	1.10	2.51	1.05	1.88	1.03	2.17	.93	1.69	.79	2.00	1.02	1.94	.91	2.79	1.11
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(R) For the most part, teachers are unfairly judged by the accountability system.	2.81	1.33	2.68	.99	2.59	1.05	2.00	.88	2.13	.83	1.56	.63	2.53	1.19	2.08	1.06	2.73	1.28
(R) I resent being judged based on school-wide test scores and the performance of other teachers.	1.67	.73	2.88	.83	2.41	.84	2.32	.95	1.87	.74	1.40	.51	1.67	.82	2.08	1.20	2.67	1.35
All schools in California have a fair chance to succeed within the accountability system.	3.07	1.44	2.52	1.08	2.44	1.05	1.95	1.03	1.40	.51	1.81	1.17	2.33	.98	2.23	1.31	2.00	1.13
(R) The accountability system is stacked against schools located in poor communities.	2.19	1.02	2.44	.92	1.74	.53	1.85	.81	2.07	1.28	1.44	.63	2.27	.88	2.27	1.28	2.13	1.13
(R) I feel that I am working to my best ability and effort regardless of the test scores the school may receive.	1.56	.64	1.32	.56	1.78	1.12	1.50	.61	1.47	.52	1.25	.45	1.53	.74	1.50	.91	1.93	.96
(R) If somebody from the state or district thinks they can do a better job than teachers here, let them take over.	2.26	1.48	2.68	1.25	2.67	1.07	2.95	1.43	2.60	1.45	2.00	1.26	2.33	1.40	2.50	1.27	2.20	.94
(R) Our students are not behind because of the teachers they have, but because of the conditions in which they have to grow up.	2.41	1.19	2.46	1.18	1.74	.59	1.95	.94	1.80	.77	1.63	.62	1.87	.74	2.16	1.18	2.33	.82
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(R) The performance expectations of the state are for the most part unrealistic.	2.37	1.18	2.60	1.08	2.07	.87	2.35	.88	2.53	.92	1.56	.63	2.20	.77	2.00	.89	2.43	1.09
API targets are realistic goals for our school.	3.19	1.20	3.08	1.00	2.48	1.22	2.55	1.00	2.67	1.11	2.25	1.24	2.53	1.13	2.58	1.10	2.87	.99
AYP targets realistic goals for our school.	2.96	1.16	3.25	.85	2.59	1.19	2.35	.99	2.47	1.30	1.63	.81	2.53	1.13	2.23	.95	2.33	.98
(R) It is unrealistic to expect schools that serve poor neighborhoods to perform on the same level as schools in wealthy neighborhoods.	1.83	1.15	2.58	.93	1.78	.97	2.45	1.15	2.00	1.00	1.94	1.12	2.07	1.33	2.28	1.21	2.33	1.29
(R) The state assessments are unrealistic because too many tasks are too hard for our students.	2.20	1.01	3.24	.66	2.26	.94	3.05	1.15	3.00	1.07	2.50	1.10	2.60	.99	2.56	1.19	2.93	1.03
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Provision of focus for teaching	3.48	1.05	4.00	.91	3.82	.73	3.48	1.06	3.72	.70	3.04	1.34	3.18	1.12	3.36	1.17	3.86	.74
Tell what is important for school to accomplish	3.48	1.00	3.97	.71	3.61	.75	3.21	1.05	3.21	.82	2.96	1.22	3.29	1.24	3.27	1.07	3.69	.71
Concentrate energy on instruction and student learning	3.41	1.04	3.87	1.02	3.66	.97	2.69	1.14	3.00	.93	2.88	1.37	3.21	1.40	3.02	1.21	3.52	1.06
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Expect more of students	3.37	.87	4.00	.77	3.51	.91	3.02	1.19	2.86	.95	3.50	1.10	3.11	1.26	3.24	1.13	3.59	.95
Assign more challenging work	3.16	.90	3.97	.75	3.33	.93	2.95	1.12	2.93	1.00	3.31	1.16	3.07	1.25	2.78	1.09	3.31	.85
Narrowed curriculum	3.40	1.12	3.58	.99	3.69	.95	3.41	1.00	3.00	1.10	3.92	1.13	3.07	1.30	3.57	1.08	3.57	1.03
Simplified curriculum	2.84	1.17	2.81	1.11	2.71	1.01	3.03	1.14	2.59	.98	3.23	1.14	2.68	1.25	2.94	1.14	2.97	1.02
Spend more time on test-taking skills	3.63	.95	3.61	.62	3.13	.86	3.84	.82	3.55	.95	3.68	1.11	3.14	1.11	3.31	1.10	3.10	1.01
Expect more from myself as teacher	3.12	.96	4.00	.77	3.31	.92	2.84	1.17	3.24	1.18	3.04	1.22	2.89	1.29	3.06	1.34	3.62	.94
Assign more complex cognitive tasks	2.95	1.00	3.70	.65	3.38	.91	2.74	1.16	3.14	.95	3.23	.95	2.71	1.08	3.10	1.16	3.48	.83
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree.*

Sanctions:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
… make me more anxious for my career.	2.95	1.29	3.26	1.09	3.13	1.22	3.41	1.14	3.14	1.27	4.31	.74	3.07	1.36	3.29	1.25	2.86	1.04
… while have negative consequences for me personally.	2.65	1.09	2.58	.92	2.74	.99	3.10	1.26	2.93	1.13	4.19	.80	2.75	1.27	2.77	1.28	2.79	1.08
… put a lot of pressure on me personally.	2.93	1.18	3.33	1.06	3.10	.97	3.39	1.16	3.14	1.19	4.31	.79	3.11	1.40	3.04	1.29	2.97	1.18
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

How do you rate the pressure your school experiences as a result of accountability targets, such as API or AYP?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Amount of pressure	3.91	.71	4.13	.90	3.68	.85	4.20	.71	4.17	.85	4.73	.53	4.30	.67	4.06	.92	3.59	.78

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *very low*, 5 = *very high*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Most of my colleagues share my beliefs and values about what the central mission of the school should be.	3.72	.83	3.97	.71	3.87	.77	3.45	.97	3.14	.99	3.81	.75	3.86	.89	3.60	1.06	3.52	.74
There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff here.	4.05	.83	4.39	.56	4.31	.61	4.07	.95	3.07	1.22	4.12	.86	3.96	.51	3.54	1.17	3.52	1.09
I can count on colleagues here when I feel down about my teaching or my students.	4.10	.88	4.19	.87	4.18	.72	3.98	1.00	3.52	1.35	4.15	1.01	3.82	.98	3.77	1.04	3.69	1.07
In this school, the faculty discusses major decisions and sees to it that they are carried out.	3.50	.92	3.81	.79	3.97	.74	3.26	1.13	2.24	.99	3.62	1.13	3.00	1.28	2.90	1.21	3.45	1.02
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Most of my colleagues have the knowledge and skills needed for our school to meet the performance expectations of the state.	4.08	.81	4.32	.65	4.23	.48	4.12	.63	3.72	1.10	4.08	.69	3.89	1.03	3.81	1.08	4.07	.75
The typical teacher at this school ranks near the top of the teaching profession in knowledge and skills.	3.69	.89	4.00	.77	3.74	.75	3.40	.94	3.14	.99	3.81	.85	3.64	.73	3.49	1.04	3.69	.47
(R) Many teachers in this school are insufficiently prepared to do their jobs well.	3.59	1.02	4.23	.72	4.05	.79	3.71	1.04	3.41	.95	3.85	.83	3.89	1.03	3.71	1.01	3.79	.77
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
My job provides me with continuing professional stimulation and growth.	3.74	.99	4.29	.74	3.97	.74	3.71	.94	3.69	1.00	3.65	1.02	3.71	1.18	3.79	.99	3.83	.89
Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas.	4.00	.76	4.32	.60	4.05	.56	3.98	.68	3.52	.83	3.96	.72	3.96	.79	3.71	1.05	3.83	.71
(R) The staff seldom evaluates its programs and activities.	3.79	.95	4.00	1.03	4.26	.72	3.57	1.09	3.14	1.06	4.08	1.02	3.68	1.06	3.40	1.09	3.55	1.06
Teachers at this school respect those colleagues who are expert at their craft.	4.05	.76	4.19	.79	3.90	.79	4.07	.75	3.48	.95	3.92	1.09	3.96	.79	3.46	1.17	3.79	.68
The most expert teachers in their field are given leadership roles at this school.	3.49	.88	3.65	.91	3.44	1.07	3.74	.99	2.90	1.18	3.46	1.10	3.36	1.31	3.13	1.18	3.18	.94
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

In your judgment, how many teachers at this school:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
… help maintain discipline in the entire school?	3.59	1.20	4.48	.93	4.21	1.00	3.56	1.05	3.45	1.12	3.54	1.36	4.14	1.11	3.47	1.41	3.48	1.24
… take responsibility for improving the school?	3.44	1.03	4.42	.92	4.16	.96	3.44	1.00	2.97	1.15	3.96	1.02	4.04	1.07	3.49	1.35	3.59	.98
… set high standards for themselves?	3.78	1.06	4.52	.81	4.34	.67	3.71	.84	3.45	1.09	4.04	1.02	4.18	1.06	3.78	1.15	4.03	.94
… are eager to try new ideas?	3.24	.97	4.39	.72	4.00	.87	3.22	.94	3.00	1.07	3.50	1.14	3.64	1.10	3.48	1.03	3.45	1.06
… feel responsible to help each other do their best?	3.40	.98	4.45	.77	4.13	.84	3.22	1.11	2.72	.96	3.54	1.33	3.75	1.21	3.20	1.27	3.66	1.08
… feel responsible when students in this school fail?	3.05	1.14	4.03	1.16	3.84	.97	2.90	1.02	2.17	.89	3.19	1.44	3.07	1.49	2.77	1.31	2.93	1.07
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *very few,* 2 = *about one quarter,* 3 = *about half,* 4 = *about three quarters,* 5 = *nearly all.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.	3.24	1.36	3.81	.87	4.41	.68	4.12	.81	2.45	1.21	4.00	.85	3.50	1.07	3.40	1.03	3.62	.94
The principal usually consults with staff members before s/he makes decisions that affect teachers.	2.44	1.10	3.48	.89	4.33	.66	4.00	1.07	2.41	1.18	3.42	1.39	2.86	1.35	3.17	1.14	3.72	1.10
Staff members are recognized for a job well done.	3.39	1.16	3.74	.86	4.62	.63	3.49	.93	2.55	1.24	3.58	1.10	3.57	1.00	3.33	1.08	3.86	.99
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
The principal sets priorities, makes plans, and sees that they are carried out.	3.56	.90	4.32	.54	4.54	.55	3.39	.95	2.66	1.17	4.12	.86	3.79	.99	3.48	1.01	3.83	1.04
The principal puts pressure on teachers to get results.	3.88	.81	3.81	1.14	3.85	.78	3.17	.83	3.83	1.07	4.27	.67	4.14	.85	3.25	.89	3.38	.82
In this school, the principal tells us what the district and state expect of us, and we comply.	3.85	.76	3.97	.84	4.13	.61	3.66	.82	3.48	.78	4.42	.58	4.11	.83	3.65	.84	3.66	.97
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

The administration at this school:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
… makes clear to the staff their expectations for meeting instructional goals.	3.88	.78	4.29	.69	4.49	.56	3.53	.93	3.31	1.00	4.42	.64	4.39	.63	3.74	.82	3.72	.84
… sets high standards for teaching.	3.98	.76	4.52	.51	4.44	.55	3.60	.81	3.28	1.10	4.54	.51	4.29	.98	3.72	.90	3.79	.77
… understands how children learn.	3.44	1.14	3.97	.71	4.31	.69	3.78	.83	2.83	1.23	4.04	.92	3.64	1.03	3.10	1.10	3.45	.99
… sets high standards for student learning.	3.98	.79	4.45	.51	4.41	.59	3.65	.77	3.21	1.18	4.31	1.01	4.07	1.09	3.52	1.05	3.66	.94
… broadly shares leadership responsibility with the faculty.	3.14	1.22	3.74	1.00	4.08	.67	3.61	.97	2.79	1.11	3.38	.98	2.79	1.37	2.94	1.02	3.21	1.15
… carefully tracks student academic progress.	3.78	.82	4.23	.67	4.32	.62	3.46	.90	2.86	1.09	4.12	.71	4.11	.88	3.13	.98	3.45	1.06
… monitors and evaluates the quality of teaching in a way that is meaningful for teachers.	2.95	.97	3.61	.95	3.89	.80	3.00	.87	2.17	1.14	4.08	.84	3.39	1.10	2.81	1.02	3.17	.85
… allocates resources and other supports according to school's goals and standards.	3.83	.80	3.94	.77	4.32	.90	3.37	.77	3.10	1.05	4.19	.63	3.96	1.00	3.60	.89	3.62	.82
… places the needs of children ahead of personal and political interests.	3.22	1.13	4.10	.65	4.24	.97	3.68	.93	2.52	1.15	4.04	.87	3.57	1.23	2.83	.97	3.41	.95
… models the kind of school they want to create.	3.32	1.06	4.23	.67	4.37	.79	3.46	.84	2.48	1.24	4.08	.80	3.85	.86	3.26	.82	3.21	.98
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

Do you think the school is on a path of continuous improvement?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I am very doubtful.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	2	11%	3	13%	2	9%	2	6%	0	0%
I am somewhat doubtful.	2	5%	1	4%	1	3%	8	24%	4	22%	2	8%	3	14%	7	20%	3	12%
I am somewhat certain.	19	50%	12	43%	18	47%	15	45%	9	50%	11	46%	8	36%	21	60%	14	56%
I am fairly certain.	17	45%	15	54%	19	50%	9	27%	3	17%	8	33%	9	41%	5	14%	8	32%

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
When it comes to meeting the challenges of reaching API or AYP targets, administration and teachers are on the same side.	3.60	1.11	4.13	.62	4.15	.71	3.51	1.08	3.03	1.12	3.85	.73	3.21	1.23	3.50	.95	3.69	.71
Facing the pressures of school accountability has brought the faculty together; almost everyone is making a contribution.	3.48	.97	4.10	.75	4.10	.60	3.17	.83	2.41	1.05	3.27	1.34	3.04	1.23	2.98	1.06	3.45	.95
The pressures of meeting API or AYP targets have strengthened the hand of those at the school who are interested in good teaching.	3.31	.92	3.87	.67	3.85	.84	2.80	1.01	2.52	1.09	3.15	1.01	2.86	1.18	2.90	1.10	3.38	1.01
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

How important should these forces be?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
District and state demands	3.00	1.00	3.30	1.09	3.21	.92	2.62	1.10	3.18	.98	3.12	1.24	3.11	1.34	2.79	1.09	2.97	1.12
Student needs	4.91	.37	5.00	.00	4.74	.50	4.88	.40	4.82	.39	4.81	.57	4.89	.31	4.85	.42	4.79	.49
Teachers' values and goals	3.98	.89	3.81	1.01	4.03	.67	3.93	.68	3.96	.79	3.96	.77	4.46	.58	4.02	.92	3.48	.91
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = least important, 5 = most important.

How important are these forces in reality at your school?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
District and state demands	4.53	.83	4.55	.68	4.23	.84	4.40	.86	4.29	.94	4.62	.70	4.50	.79	4.50	.74	4.48	.74
Student needs	3.56	.96	4.23	.80	4.05	.89	3.07	1.16	2.57	.92	3.38	1.27	3.46	1.45	3.04	1.27	3.17	1.17
Teachers' values and goals	2.74	1.16	3.35	1.05	3.36	1.14	2.69	1.07	2.46	.88	2.62	1.27	3.00	1.49	2.73	1.11	2.83	1.14
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *least important*, 5 = *most important*.

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Once we start a new program, we follow up to make sure it's working.	3.62	.73	3.77	.67	4.13	.86	2.69	1.07	2.29	.94	3.50	.99	3.39	1.07	3.02	.96	3.34	.81
(R) We have so many different programs in this school that I can't keep track of them all.	2.81	1.11	3.32	1.01	3.62	1.16	2.36	.98	2.43	1.07	2.58	1.06	3.32	1.06	2.73	1.01	3.10	1.08
(R) Many special programs come and go at this school.	2.86	1.05	3.32	.98	3.62	1.09	2.17	.76	2.36	.78	2.92	1.09	2.71	.94	2.75	.93	2.97	1.21
You can see real continuity from one program to another at this school.	3.12	.94	3.35	.66	3.90	.85	2.50	.89	2.36	.78	3.38	.94	2.68	.98	2.77	.81	3.07	.84
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A medium or long-term strategy that keeps our school on a path of continuous improvement is clearly in place.	3.29	.83	4.00	.68	4.21	.61	2.83	.96	2.61	.96	3.73	.78	3.29	1.08	3.09	.90	3.52	.74
At this school, we adjust improvement strategies and programs to the varying needs of students or teachers.	3.74	.66	3.81	.79	3.92	.84	3.29	.94	2.79	1.03	3.50	.95	3.21	1.13	2.98	1.03	3.24	.99
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

Professional development topic		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Curriculum alignment	Not addressed	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	2	7%	3	13%	4	14%	3	7%	4	14%
	Weak focus	10	27%	2	7%	3	9%	14	34%	8	29%	1	4%	5	18%	10	22%	2	7%
	Strong focus	23	62%	26	93%	32	91%	25	61%	18	64%	20	83%	19	70%	32	71%	22	79%
	Overall effective?	16		21		25		13		11		9		15		21		14	
Training in new instructional methods	Not addressed	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	5	12%	4	14%	0	0%	2	7%	4	9%	3	10%
	Weak focus	13	34%	6	21%	6	17%	20	48%	13	45%	9	41%	5	18%	9	21%	5	17%
	Strong focus	25	65%	22	76%	28	80%	17	41%	12	41%	13	59%	21	75%	31	71%	21	72%
	Overall effective?	19		16		19		8		7		8		12		22		10	
Training in the usage of new materials	Not addressed	11	29%	3	10%	9	26%	10	24%	10	39%	4	17%	4	14%	8	18%	8	29%
	Weak focus	13	34%	7	24%	6	17%	17	41%	10	39%	9	39%	7	25%	14	31%	8	29%
	Strong focus	14	37%	19	66%	20	57%	15	36%	6	23%	10	44%	17	61%	23	51%	12	43%
	Overall effective?	9		12		13		8		2		4		9		13		8	
In-depth study of a specific area in your subject matter	Not addressed	15	40%	7	26%	17	47%	19	45%	14	52%	7	30%	10	36%	15	33%	15	52%
	Weak focus	16	42%	8	30%	11	31%	12	29%	9	33%	6	26%	11	39%	18	40%	6	21%
	Strong focus	7	18%	12	44%	8	22%	11	26%	4	15%	10	44%	7	25%	12	27%	8	28%
	Overall effective?	6		9		3		8		1		5		4		5		5	
Study of how children learn particular topics	Not addressed	11	29%	11	41%	4	11%	22	52%	17	61%	7	29%	10	36%	17	36%	11	38%
	Weak focus	15	40%	10	37%	8	22%	12	29%	8	29%	7	29%	9	32%	21	45%	6	21%
	Strong focus	12	32%	6	22%	24	67%	8	19%	3	11%	10	42%	9	32%	9	19%	12	41%
	Overall effective?	7		7		9		4		2		3		5		5		6	
Individual differences in student learning	Not addressed	5	13%	8	29%	2	6%	12	29%	10	36%	2	8%	10	37%	20	44%	8	28%
	Weak focus	15	39%	12	43%	17	49%	19	45%	13	46%	12	50%	8	30%	13	28%	9	31%
	Strong focus	19	49%	8	29%	16	46%	11	26%	5	18%	10	42%	9	33%	13	28%	12	41%
	Overall effective?	11		6		8		5		1		4		5		5		7	
Meeting the learning needs of special populations	Not addressed	1	3%	9	31%	5	14%	7	17%	11	38%	3	13%	8	29%	16	35%	11	38%
	Weak focus	17	43%	9	31%	15	43%	19	45%	12	41%	4	17%	11	39%	14	30%	9	31%
	Strong focus	22	55%	11	38%	15	43%	16	38%	6	21%	16	70%	9	32%	16	35%	9	31%
	Overall effective?	11		6		10		10		3		8		6		10		5	

Professional development topic		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Classroom assessment	Not addressed	7	18%	2	8%	3	9%	13	31%	9	33%	1	4%	5	18%	11	24%	9	31%
	Weak focus	14	37%	3	12%	12	34%	20	48%	7	26%	5	22%	11	39%	18	39%	7	24%
	Strong focus	17	45%	21	81%	20	57%	9	21%	11	41%	17	74%	12	43%	17	37%	13	45%
	Overall effective?	8		15		12		3		4		6		5		8		11	
Technology to support student learning	Not addressed	1	3%	7	24%	8	23%	12	29%	1	3%	7	29%	2	7%	4	9%	15	52%
	Weak focus	8	21%	11	38%	14	40%	21	51%	10	35%	9	38%	4	15%	16	36%	10	35%
	Strong focus	30	77%	11	38%	13	37%	8	20%	18	62%	8	33%	21	78%	24	55%	4	14%
	Overall effective?	19		4		6		6		12		1		16		16		2	
Classroom management/ Discipline	Not addressed	4	10%	3	10%	6	17%	16	39%	11	39%	10	40%	7	25%	11	24%	15	52%
	Weak focus	25	64%	4	14%	17	47%	15	37%	12	43%	9	36%	13	46%	24	53%	6	21%
	Strong focus	10	26%	22	76%	13	36%	10	24%	5	18%	6	24%	8	29%	10	22%	8	28%
	Overall effective?	10		15		9		7		0		3		8		7		4	
Lesson planning	Not addressed	11	29%	7	25%	3	9%	21	51%	12	46%	5	21%	5	18%	16	36%	14	48%
	Weak focus	19	50%	11	39%	12	34%	7	17%	10	39%	6	25%	12	43%	18	40%	7	24%
	Strong focus	8	21%	10	36%	20	57%	13	32%	4	15%	13	54%	11	39%	11	24%	8	28%
	Overall effective?	6		6		13		6		3		2		6		6		4	
New instructional programs	Not addressed	14	38%	7	25%	8	23%	10	24%	12	43%	5	22%	4	14%	9	20%	15	52%
	Weak focus	11	30%	8	29%	10	29%	19	46%	8	29%	8	35%	12	43%	18	40%	6	21%
	Strong focus	12	32%	13	46%	17	49%	12	29%	8	29%	10	44%	12	43%	18	40%	8	28%
	Overall effective?	5		8		10		6		1		3		6		9		3	
New curriculum or scope and sequence in your subject	Not addressed	15	39%	8	29%	11	34%	18	44%	16	57%	6	27%	9	32%	13	28%	13	45%
	Weak focus	14	36%	9	32%	7	22%	15	37%	8	29%	8	36%	12	43%	22	48%	4	14%
	Strong focus	10	26%	11	39%	14	44%	8	20%	4	14%	8	36%	7	25%	11	24%	12	41%
	Overall effective?	4		4		10		7		0		3		2		3		6	
New procedures (for example, testing)	Not addressed	8	21%	7	25%	4	13%	16	39%	14	52%	3	13%	7	25%	7	16%	11	39%
	Weak focus	18	47%	7	25%	15	48%	14	34%	7	26%	10	44%	12	43%	19	43%	6	21%
	Strong focus	12	32%	14	50%	12	39%	11	27%	6	22%	10	44%	9	32%	18	41%	11	39%
	Overall effective?	8		11		7		2		2		0		4		5		3	

Professional development topic		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Communication or inquiry among colleagues about various topics	Not addressed	14	40%	3	10%	3	9%	8	20%	10	37%	3	14%	8	29%	10	22%	7	24%
	Weak focus	12	34%	8	28%	11	33%	20	49%	11	41%	10	48%	10	36%	21	47%	12	41%
	Strong focus	9	26%	18	62%	19	58%	13	32%	6	22%	8	38%	10	36%	14	31%	10	35%
	Overall effective?	10		11		14		9		4		3		6		6		8	
Grading or looking at student work	Not addressed	12	30%	1	3%	4	12%	14	34%	9	31%	5	22%	5	18%	15	33%	2	7%
	Weak focus	16	40%	12	41%	15	46%	17	42%	14	48%	8	35%	15	54%	19	42%	12	42%
	Strong focus	12	30%	16	55%	14	42%	10	24%	6	21%	10	44%	8	29%	11	24%	15	52%
	Overall effective?	6		8		10		6		6		3		5		5		6	
Understanding test score data	Not addressed	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	5	12%	1	3%	0	0%	2	7%	5	11%	6	21%
	Weak focus	7	18%	3	11%	7	21%	18	44%	10	35%	10	44%	4	14%	8	18%	7	24%
	Strong focus	32	82%	23	85%	27	79%	18	44%	18	62%	13	57%	22	79%	32	71%	16	55%
	Overall effective?	15		16		16		3		5		5		10		10		7	
Other	Not addressed	5	63%	1	33%	0	0%	6	50%	2	40%	2	33%	3	43%	4	40%	3	75%
	Weak focus	2	25%	0	0%	2	33%	2	17%	0	0%	2	33%	2	29%	5	50%	0	0%
	Strong focus	1	13%	2	67%	4	67%	4	33%	3	60%	2	33%	2	29%	1	10%	1	25%
	Overall effective?	0		1		4		1		1		1		1		1		0	

Items in Form A

Reasons for staying		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The school is close to my home.	Not important at all	2	11%	2	14%	9	56%	5	28%	1	8%	6	55%	3	27%	4	20%	5	36%
	Somewhat important	9	47%	7	50%	6	38%	11	61%	6	50%	3	27%	7	64%	8	40%	7	50%
	Very important	8	42%	5	36%	1	6%	2	11%	5	42%	2	18%	1	9%	8	40%	2	14%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	20	100%	14	100%
I like the administration.	Not important at all	2	11%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	1	9%	2	10%	1	7%
	Somewhat important	8	42%	5	38%	2	13%	5	28%	2	17%	2	18%	3	27%	7	33%	8	57%
	Very important	9	47%	6	46%	14	88%	13	72%	8	67%	9	82%	7	64%	12	57%	5	36%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	21	100%	14	100%
I play an important role for this community.	Not important at all	5	26%	3	23%	1	6%	5	28%	1	8%	2	18%	2	20%	4	19%	1	7%
	Somewhat important	7	37%	5	38%	10	63%	6	33%	5	42%	4	36%	2	20%	10	48%	8	57%
	Very important	7	37%	5	38%	5	31%	7	39%	6	50%	5	45%	6	60%	7	33%	5	36%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	10	100%	21	100%	14	100%
I like my colleagues.	Not important at all	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	1	9%	1	5%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	6	32%	6	46%	5	31%	5	28%	7	58%	3	27%	3	27%	9	43%	6	43%
	Very important	13	68%	7	54%	11	69%	12	67%	4	33%	8	73%	7	64%	11	52%	8	57%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	21	100%	14	100%
I have friends here.	Not important at all	1	5%	3	23%	2	13%	5	28%	2	17%	1	9%	1	9%	1	5%	3	21%
	Somewhat important	6	32%	6	46%	9	56%	8	44%	6	50%	2	18%	5	45%	8	40%	5	36%
	Very important	12	63%	4	31%	5	31%	5	28%	4	33%	8	73%	5	45%	11	55%	6	43%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	20	100%	14	100%

Reasons for staying		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
We are a high performing school.	Not important at all	6	32%	2	15%	6	40%	9	53%	4	33%	7	64%	4	36%	5	26%	4	29%
	Somewhat important	11	58%	8	62%	9	60%	7	41%	7	58%	2	18%	4	36%	9	47%	7	50%
	Very important	2	11%	3	23%	0	0%	1	6%	1	8%	2	18%	3	27%	5	26%	3	21%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	15	100%	17	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	19	100%	14	100%
We will prove to the public that we are a high performing school.	Not important at all	3	16%	3	23%	4	27%	4	24%	1	8%	0	0%	5	50%	4	21%	2	14%
	Somewhat important	10	53%	6	46%	8	53%	11	65%	7	58%	8	73%	4	40%	7	37%	7	50%
	Very important	6	32%	4	31%	3	20%	2	12%	4	33%	3	27%	1	10%	8	42%	5	36%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	15	100%	17	100%	12	100%	11	100%	10	100%	19	100%	14	100%
I like the students.	Not important at all	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	6	32%	4	31%	6	38%	6	33%	1	8%	3	27%	4	36%	8	40%	10	71%
	Very important	13	68%	9	69%	9	56%	12	67%	11	92%	8	73%	6	55%	12	60%	4	29%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	20	100%	14	100%
I have great hope for the school.	Not important at all	2	11%	0	0%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	2	18%	1	5%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	7	37%	3	23%	4	25%	7	39%	2	17%	2	18%	3	27%	6	30%	6	43%
	Very important	10	53%	10	77%	11	69%	10	56%	10	83%	9	82%	6	55%	13	65%	8	57%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	16	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	20	100%	14	100%
Accountability challenges have greatly energized this school.	Not important at all	3	16%	0	0%	3	21%	8	44%	3	25%	1	9%	5	45%	6	30%	2	14%
	Somewhat important	12	63%	6	46%	7	50%	9	50%	6	50%	8	73%	3	27%	9	45%	9	64%
	Very important	4	21%	7	54%	4	29%	1	6%	3	25%	2	18%	3	27%	5	25%	3	21%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	14	100%	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	20	100%	14	100%

Reasons for staying		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I have no other option at this point.	Not important at all	16	84%	9	75%	13	100%	13	72%	9	75%	9	90%	7	70%	15	79%	12	86%
	Somewhat important	2	11%	2	17%	0	0%	4	22%	2	17%	1	10%	2	20%	3	16%	2	14%
	Very important	1	5%	1	8%	0	0%	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	1	10%	1	5%	0	0%
	Total	19	100%	12	100%	13	100%	18	100%	12	100%	10	100%	10	100%	19	100%	14	100%
I am too close to retirement to change schools.	Not important at all	15	79%	11	92%	14	93%	12	67%	12	100%	9	90%	10	91%	13	68%	11	79%
	Somewhat important	3	16%	0	0%	1	7%	5	28%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	4	21%	1	7%
	Very important	1	5%	1	8%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	2	11%	2	14%
	Total	19	100%	12	100%	15	100%	18	100%	12	100%	10	100%	11	100%	19	100%	14	100%
Other	Not important at all	3	60%	2	67%	2	67%	6	67%	2	100%	4	80%	2	50%	6	75%	2	100%
	Somewhat important	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%
	Very important	0	0%	1	33%	1	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	5	100%	3	100%	3	100%	9	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	8	100%	2	100%

Reasons for leaving		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The students here wear me down.	Not important at all	0	0%	1	50%	2	33%	2	50%	1	100%	1	50%	1	33%	2	50%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	3	100%	0	0%	4	67%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	50%	1	50%
	Very important	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%	1	33%	0	0%	1	50%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	6	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
My work is unappreciated by the community.	Not important at all	1	33%	1	50%	3	50%	3	75%	1	100%	0	0%	1	33%	1	25%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	2	67%	1	50%	3	50%	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	50%	2	100%
	Very important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	25%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	6	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
I do not like the administration.	Not important at all	0	0%	1	33%	4	80%	4	100%	0	0%	2	100%	2	67%	1	25%	1	50%
	Somewhat important	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
	Very important	0	0%	2	67%	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	1	33%	1	25%	1	50%
	Total	3	100%	3	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
You cannot count on teachers here.	Not important at all	1	33%	0	0%	6	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	1	33%	0	0%	2	100%
	Somewhat important	1	33%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	4	100%	0	0%
	Very important	1	33%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	6	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
The school feels like a sinking ship.	Not important at all	2	67%	1	50%	4	80%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	50%	1	50%
	Somewhat important	1	33%	1	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	1	25%	1	50%
	Very important	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	2	67%	1	25%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%

Reasons for leaving		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
I am tired of the additional pressure of the accountability system.	Not important at all	1	33%	0	0%	1	20%	3	75%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	1	33%	1	50%	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	50%
	Very important	1	33%	1	50%	1	20%	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%	3	100%	1	25%	1	50%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
This district is a place where a teacher cannot be successful.	Not important at all	1	33%	1	50%	3	60%	3	75%	1	100%	1	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	1	33%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	2	50%	2	100%
	Very important	1	33%	1	50%	1	20%	1	25%	0	0%	1	50%	1	33%	1	25%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
I have better career options elsewhere.	Not important at all	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	2	67%	0	0%	4	80%	2	50%	1	100%	0	0%	1	33%	2	50%	1	50%
	Very important	1	33%	1	50%	1	20%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	25%	1	50%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
I can get higher pay elsewhere.	Not important at all	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	2	50%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	50%	1	50%
	Somewhat important	3	100%	2	100%	2	40%	2	50%	1	100%	0	0%	3	100%	1	25%	1	50%
	Very important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	3	100%	4	100%	2	100%
I will retire this year.	Not important at all	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	1	33%	1	50%	3	100%	2	67%	2	100%
	Somewhat important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%
	Very important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	3	100%	2	100%	5	100%	4	100%	3	100%	2	100%	3	100%	3	100%	2	100%
Other	Not important at all	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	1	25%	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%	1	50%	0	0%
	Somewhat important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%
	Very important	1	100%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	1	100%	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	2	100%	0	0%

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Since California state authorities have decided to evaluate schools with the present accountability system, teachers ought to follow it.	3.47	1.07	4.13	.64	3.89	.74	3.58	.96	3.40	.99	3.50	.90	2.69	1.55	3.60	.94	3.73	.96
Teachers have little choice but to comply with state mandates.	3.55	1.00	4.00	.53	3.89	.81	3.89	1.05	3.87	.35	3.83	1.34	3.46	1.39	4.05	1.00	3.93	.59
I implement state or district mandates even when they don't make sense to me personally.	3.70	.98	3.67	.82	3.89	.74	3.42	.84	3.40	.74	3.92	.79	2.77	1.48	3.70	1.03	3.47	.99
Meeting the expectations of the accountability system is a matter of professional pride for me.	3.38	1.07	3.87	.64	3.58	.90	2.89	1.15	3.13	1.13	3.33	1.07	2.31	1.25	3.40	1.10	4.00	1.00
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
I work towards high test scores for our school because they enhance our standing in the district.	3.50	1.00	3.80	.77	3.68	.75	2.95	1.35	3.20	1.08	3.58	1.16	2.77	1.54	3.45	.94	3.27	1.22
It is important for me to meet our performance targets so that our school's reputation will not be damaged.	3.55	1.00	3.60	.63	3.84	.50	3.26	1.24	3.47	.74	3.67	1.23	2.69	1.32	3.32	.89	3.53	1.25
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Results from state tests give teachers some useful feedback about how well they are teaching in each curricular area.	3.29	1.19	3.60	.83	3.11	1.18	3.10	1.02	3.27	.88	2.42	1.38	2.00	1.00	2.85	1.27	3.20	1.08
Results from state tests can provide valuable diagnostic information.	3.29	1.01	3.93	.59	3.74	.81	3.42	1.26	3.60	.74	2.83	1.27	2.62	1.39	3.05	.97	3.60	.83
(R) The state tests provide little useful information for my instruction.	3.10	1.18	3.47	.83	3.32	1.16	3.05	1.08	3.07	.88	2.42	.90	2.00	1.15	3.10	1.12	3.73	1.03
The state tests provide information that helps schools improve.	3.38	.86	3.87	.74	3.47	.84	3.26	1.05	3.47	.74	2.64	1.03	2.54	1.27	2.75	1.07	3.47	.92
State test results identify students who need additional academic help.	3.57	.98	3.73	.80	3.37	.96	3.47	1.12	3.67	.90	3.00	1.35	2.62	1.33	3.10	1.14	3.71	.83
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
The accountability system makes continuous improvement an urgent task for our school.	3.85	.75	4.00	.65	4.00	.58	3.90	.79	3.80	.77	4.08	1.08	3.92	1.04	3.60	.99	3.73	.70
Our school does not pay attention to accountability targets, such as the API or AYP.	1.40	.50	1.47	1.06	1.53	.61	1.90	.85	2.07	1.03	1.25	.45	1.54	.88	1.55	.60	1.73	.59
Being held accountable by the state has made us aware of what we must accomplish at this school.	3.53	.90	4.07	.96	3.95	.52	3.65	.93	3.40	.99	4.25	.62	3.38	1.26	3.85	.93	4.00	.53
The principal has made it clear that we must concentrate our effort on state standards and assessments.	4.00	.88	4.20	.68	4.42	.51	4.15	.59	4.20	.86	4.58	.51	4.62	.65	4.40	.50	3.87	.64
The principal uses the pressures of accountability to move our school forward.	3.63	1.01	4.13	.64	3.95	.71	3.25	.85	3.27	1.39	4.50	.80	3.85	.90	3.89	.94	3.67	.90
The administration pays little attention to performance targets.	1.63	.68	1.33	.49	1.63	.96	2.00	.86	1.87	.92	1.08	.29	1.15	.38	1.55	.69	1.93	.96
The principal has communicated to the faculty that not all aspects of the state accountability system are valid for our school.	2.32	.95	2.20	.77	2.11	.88	3.05	.89	2.60	1.06	2.42	1.08	2.23	1.36	2.55	1.10	2.27	1.03
The principal has encouraged teachers to see the accountability system as a tool for our school to improve.	3.74	.93	4.33	.62	4.11	.74	3.70	.73	3.27	1.10	4.58	.51	3.85	1.14	4.10	.64	3.93	.46
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Teachers' expertise in the classroom domain is respected here.	3.32	1.16	3.67	1.18	4.00	.88	4.05	.76	2.73	1.10	4.00	.74	3.15	1.21	3.70	1.08	3.40	.99
In this school, I am encouraged to be creative in my classroom.	3.53	.96	4.13	.83	3.89	.81	3.90	1.07	3.00	1.20	3.67	.98	3.15	1.34	3.25	1.07	3.67	.72
The instructional programs we've adopted in this school have curtailed my creativity.	3.11	1.20	2.40	.83	2.67	1.24	3.00	1.08	3.13	.83	3.50	1.09	3.15	1.21	2.85	.88	3.07	1.10
In this school, I am given the space to exercise my professional judgment as to what is best for my students.	3.58	1.02	3.93	.59	3.83	.79	3.70	.98	3.00	1.13	3.50	1.00	3.23	1.30	3.65	.93	3.73	.80
District requirements have standardized instructional approaches for our school.	3.68	1.06	2.67	1.05	3.63	.68	3.85	1.04	3.20	.68	3.33	1.44	3.69	1.18	3.63	.76	3.67	1.18
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree,* 5 = *strongly agree.*

Priorities for school improvement	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
Child psychology	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	2
Cleanliness of building	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Communication among faculty	2	2	3	0	3	2	2	2	1
Culturally relevant instruction	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	0
Enforcement of homework	2	3	5	3	4	1	3	8	2
Faculty turnover	0	4	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
New instructional materials	1	2	3	0	0	2	0	0	0
New instructional methods	3	0	2	5	1	4	2	1	0
New pedagogical theory	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
New textbooks	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	1	0
Respect for teachers	6	2	6	1	6	2	4	6	5
Spirit of the school	3	3	4	6	5	1	2	6	1
Student achievement	11	9	11	13	6	6	7	14	7
Student discipline	4	7	5	10	7	6	7	7	11
Student health & nutrition	6	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Student referral system	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2
Teacher motivation	6	2	2	1	3	1	0	4	2
Teacher-parent relationships	4	2	2	7	1	3	0	1	5
Teacher-student relationships	3	1	3	2	0	0	1	2	3
Work place environment	3	2	2	1	6	0	0	2	2
Other	0	0	1	4	0	1	2	1	0

Items in Form B

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
This school is well managed.	3.50	.91	4.25	.77	4.58	.61	3.36	.90	2.29	1.07	3.64	1.01	3.67	1.11	3.68	.82	3.43	.94
Overall this school functions well.	3.77	.75	4.38	.62	4.47	.77	3.73	.98	2.50	1.29	3.71	.83	4.00	.85	3.82	.67	3.50	.94
Our administrators are good managers who know how to make our school run smoothly.	3.59	1.10	4.00	.89	4.53	.77	3.50	.96	2.43	1.16	3.93	.92	3.67	.98	3.64	.68	3.57	.85
(R) This school is disorganized.	4.05	1.05	4.38	.72	4.58	.84	3.82	.91	2.71	1.27	4.00	1.11	4.13	.74	4.04	.96	4.07	.92
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

At this school, how many of your students' parents:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
… attend parent-teacher conferences when you request them?	3.22	1.20	3.63	1.09	3.25	1.12	2.41	1.14	4.14	1.41	2.15	.99	3.40	1.35	3.11	1.52	3.43	1.34
… return your phone calls promptly?	3.09	1.23	3.38	1.41	3.16	1.42	2.50	1.19	4.07	1.14	2.38	1.19	3.40	1.24	2.88	1.40	3.14	1.17
… attend a sports events on campus?	1.68	.89	1.70	1.34	1.72	.89	1.55	.89	1.36	.63	1.38	.65	2.17	.94	1.54	.88	1.57	.85
… attend a student performance on campus?	2.20	.89	2.29	1.07	1.94	1.03	2.00	.98	1.86	1.03	1.77	1.01	2.67	1.23	2.69	1.05	2.07	.92
… attend Back-to-School Night?	2.87	.87	3.38	1.20	2.65	.88	2.23	.81	1.64	.74	2.00	.91	3.20	1.08	3.00	1.31	1.71	.61
… support your teaching efforts?	3.24	1.18	3.56	1.46	3.00	1.38	3.27	1.20	3.36	1.39	2.15	1.14	2.92	1.32	3.04	1.43	3.14	1.23
… do their best to help their children learn?	2.73	.94	2.94	1.29	2.60	1.05	2.77	1.19	2.14	1.03	2.00	1.08	2.69	1.18	2.61	1.31	2.79	1.25
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *very few,* 2 = *about one quarter,* 3 = *about half,* 4 = *about three quarters,* 5 = *nearly all.*

Powerful and positive influences on your school's improvement	Blind School ID								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	Count
District policies or mandates	5	0	5	1	0	4	2	1	1
District assessments	10	2	1	3	5	1	4	10	2
District assistance	6	2	4	2	0	2	2	2	1
District instructional or pacing guides	9	13	4	6	8	6	6	11	5
External consultants	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	2	0
Faculty collaboration in various forms	4	10	12	6	0	1	2	3	4
In-school reform facilitators or coaches	2	0	4	1	0	4	2	2	4
New instructional programs	7	5	7	8	1	3	2	4	5
New textbooks and materials	0	4	13	3	2	0	1	3	6
Professional development	8	3	10	7	3	5	2	6	5
School administrators	14	11	11	17	7	7	7	13	10
School leadership team(s)	4	12	9	1	1	4	2	7	5
Shared decision-making	2	5	2	2	0	0	2	3	2
State standards	7	3	4	0	0	3	1	8	3
State tests	0	6	4	1	0	1	1	5	1
State accountability targets	5	1	2	1	1	4	2	3	3
Other	2	0	2	3	1	0	1	1	1
Nothing in particular stands out	1	0	0	1	3	1	2	6	2

Source of discipline		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Counselors	None	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3	15%	6	43%	6	50%	5	42%	3	13%	2	15%
	A little	5	26%	10	67%	8	47%	12	60%	8	57%	4	33%	5	42%	15	63%	5	38%
	A lot	13	68%	5	33%	9	53%	5	25%	0	0%	2	17%	2	17%	6	25%	6	46%
	Total	19	100%	15	100%	17	100%	20	100%	14	100%	12	100%	12	100%	24	100%	13	100%
Deans	None	1	5%	7	64%	7	70%	14	82%	9	82%	7	70%	6	75%	12	67%	10	83%
	A little	7	37%	1	9%	2	20%	1	6%	1	9%	2	20%	2	25%	6	33%	2	17%
	A lot	11	58%	3	27%	1	10%	2	12%	1	9%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	19	100%	11	100%	10	100%	17	100%	11	100%	10	100%	8	100%	18	100%	12	100%
Colleagues in the same grade	None	2	11%	5	36%	0	0%	2	10%	3	23%	2	18%	1	9%	3	13%	1	8%
	A little	6	32%	3	21%	6	46%	9	45%	5	38%	4	36%	2	18%	10	43%	6	46%
	A lot	11	58%	6	43%	7	54%	9	45%	5	38%	5	45%	8	73%	10	43%	6	46%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	13	100%	20	100%	13	100%	11	100%	11	100%	23	100%	13	100%
The whole faculty	None	6	32%	4	29%	1	6%	5	25%	3	25%	4	36%	1	9%	6	27%	2	15%
	A little	5	26%	5	36%	7	44%	10	50%	7	58%	3	27%	3	27%	9	41%	9	69%
	A lot	8	42%	5	36%	8	50%	5	25%	2	17%	4	36%	7	64%	7	32%	2	15%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	16	100%	20	100%	12	100%	11	100%	11	100%	22	100%	13	100%
Teachers adjacent to my room	None	5	28%	3	21%	1	7%	8	40%	3	23%	5	42%	1	9%	2	8%	2	15%
	A little	6	33%	7	50%	8	53%	5	25%	6	46%	2	17%	2	18%	12	50%	8	62%
	A lot	7	39%	4	29%	6	40%	7	35%	4	31%	5	42%	8	73%	10	42%	3	23%
	Total	18	100%	14	100%	15	100%	20	100%	13	100%	12	100%	11	100%	24	100%	13	100%
Principal or assistant principals	None	8	42%	3	21%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	1	9%	1	8%	6	26%	0	0%
	A little	8	42%	5	36%	7	41%	11	55%	12	92%	5	45%	5	38%	11	48%	8	62%
	A lot	3	16%	6	43%	10	59%	7	35%	1	8%	5	45%	7	54%	6	26%	5	38%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	17	100%	20	100%	13	100%	11	100%	13	100%	23	100%	13	100%
Security guards	None	7	37%	7	54%	1	6%	2	10%	5	45%	1	10%	1	9%	3	13%	1	8%
	A little	10	53%	5	38%	7	41%	10	50%	5	45%	5	50%	2	18%	14	61%	7	54%
	A lot	2	11%	1	8%	9	53%	8	40%	1	9%	4	40%	8	73%	6	26%	5	38%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	17	100%	20	100%	11	100%	10	100%	11	100%	23	100%	13	100%
Student hall monitors	None	17	89%	6	50%	6	40%	15	88%	10	91%	8	80%	5	56%	14	82%	9	75%
	A little	1	5%	5	42%	6	40%	0	0%	1	9%	1	10%	4	44%	3	18%	2	17%
	A lot	1	5%	1	8%	3	20%	2	12%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%
	Total	19	100%	12	100%	15	100%	17	100%	11	100%	10	100%	9	100%	17	100%	12	100%

Source of discipline		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Parents	None	7	37%	2	14%	2	12%	6	30%	4	31%	6	55%	3	27%	7	29%	2	15%
	A little	7	37%	10	71%	12	71%	13	65%	7	54%	4	36%	6	55%	15	63%	9	69%
	A lot	5	26%	2	14%	3	18%	1	5%	2	15%	1	9%	2	18%	2	8%	2	15%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	17	100%	20	100%	13	100%	11	100%	11	100%	24	100%	13	100%
Detention hall	None	9	47%	3	25%	1	7%	11	58%	4	31%	6	55%	5	56%	6	29%	2	15%
	A little	9	47%	8	67%	11	73%	8	42%	9	69%	5	45%	3	33%	10	48%	10	77%
	A lot	1	5%	1	8%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	5	24%	1	8%
	Total	19	100%	12	100%	15	100%	19	100%	13	100%	11	100%	9	100%	21	100%	13	100%
The constant enforcement of our discipline policies and standards	None	5	26%	1	7%	0	0%	2	10%	1	8%	3	27%	2	17%	4	18%	2	17%
	A little	8	42%	4	27%	5	36%	11	55%	6	46%	7	64%	2	17%	10	45%	7	58%
	A lot	6	32%	10	67%	9	64%	7	35%	6	46%	1	9%	8	67%	8	36%	3	25%
	Total	19	100%	15	100%	14	100%	20	100%	13	100%	11	100%	12	100%	22	100%	12	100%
Unspoken norms that the students have internalized	None	5	26%	4	27%	4	29%	6	30%	1	8%	4	40%	3	33%	7	35%	4	31%
	A little	10	53%	3	20%	7	50%	12	60%	5	42%	5	50%	3	33%	9	45%	8	62%
	A lot	4	21%	8	53%	3	21%	2	10%	6	50%	1	10%	3	33%	4	20%	1	8%
	Total	19	100%	15	100%	14	100%	20	100%	12	100%	10	100%	9	100%	20	100%	13	100%
Instructional aides	None	6	32%	6	46%	6	46%	6	30%	4	33%	7	64%	4	40%	11	61%	9	69%
	A little	10	53%	4	31%	4	31%	8	40%	5	42%	2	18%	3	30%	5	28%	3	23%
	A lot	3	16%	3	23%	3	23%	6	30%	3	25%	2	18%	3	30%	2	11%	1	8%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	13	100%	20	100%	12	100%	11	100%	10	100%	18	100%	13	100%
Colleagues who are effective disciplinarians	None	0	0%	3	21%	2	14%	6	30%	1	8%	2	20%	0	0%	6	27%	3	23%
	A little	12	63%	6	43%	4	29%	4	20%	5	38%	5	50%	3	27%	6	27%	7	54%
	A lot	7	37%	5	36%	8	57%	10	50%	7	54%	3	30%	8	73%	10	45%	3	23%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	14	100%	20	100%	13	100%	10	100%	11	100%	22	100%	13	100%
Other support staff	None	7	39%	6	46%	3	21%	8	40%	4	31%	4	40%	1	10%	6	30%	6	46%
	A little	8	44%	4	31%	9	64%	7	35%	8	62%	4	40%	4	40%	10	50%	4	31%
	A lot	3	17%	3	23%	2	14%	5	25%	1	8%	2	20%	5	50%	4	20%	3	23%
	Total	18	100%	13	100%	14	100%	20	100%	13	100%	10	100%	10	100%	20	100%	13	100%
Team clusters, houses, families, or small learning communities	None	10	56%	9	75%	6	55%	8	42%	5	42%	7	70%	2	20%	10	59%	9	69%
	A little	4	22%	1	8%	4	36%	4	21%	4	33%	2	20%	4	40%	5	29%	2	15%
	A lot	4	22%	2	17%	1	9%	7	37%	3	25%	1	10%	4	40%	2	12%	2	15%
	Total	18	100%	12	100%	11	100%	19	100%	12	100%	10	100%	10	100%	17	100%	13	100%

Source of discipline		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The referral process	None	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	4	20%	1	8%	4	40%	3	27%	7	30%	1	8%
	A little	14	74%	11	79%	9	60%	8	40%	12	92%	5	50%	5	45%	14	61%	11	85%
	A lot	3	16%	3	21%	6	40%	8	40%	0	0%	1	10%	3	27%	2	9%	1	8%
	Total	19	100%	14	100%	15	100%	20	100%	13	100%	10	100%	11	100%	23	100%	13	100%
District administrators	None	14	74%	8	62%	6	40%	16	80%	7	64%	8	80%	6	60%	13	65%	10	77%
	A little	4	21%	5	38%	6	40%	3	15%	4	36%	2	20%	4	40%	6	30%	3	23%
	A lot	1	5%	0	0%	3	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%
	Total	19	100%	13	100%	15	100%	20	100%	11	100%	10	100%	10	100%	20	100%	13	100%
I'm pretty much on my own in maintaining discipline.	Total	4	100%	1	100%	2	100%	2	100%	1	100%	1	100%	2	100%	4	100%	1	100%

What role does the school improvement/action plan play in your school?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
We don't have a plan according to my knowledge.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%
We have a plan, but to my knowledge it is rarely used.	1	5%	1	6%	1	5%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%
The plan is mainly used by the administration to require implementation of particular strategies.	10	45%	12	75%	8	40%	6	29%	1	8%	1	7%	3	20%	7	25%	5	38%
The plan provides a focus for our school that gets everybody on the same page.	7	32%	3	19%	8	40%	8	38%	8	62%	4	29%	11	73%	11	39%	6	46%
The plan is a summary of strategies that the faculty is truly committed to and intends to carry out.	4	18%	0	0%	3	15%	2	10%	4	31%	9	64%	1	7%	7	25%	2	15%
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Source of data		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Overall student performance on state or district tests	Not important at all	3	13%	2	13%	1	5%	1	5%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	3	11%	2	14%
	Somewhat important	16	70%	4	25%	9	47%	17	77%	10	71%	4	29%	9	60%	16	57%	6	43%
	Very important	4	17%	10	63%	9	47%	4	18%	2	14%	9	64%	6	40%	9	32%	6	43%
	Total	23	100%	16	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	14	100%	15	100%	28	100%	14	100%
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by class	Not important at all	2	10%	2	13%	1	5%	6	27%	4	29%	2	15%	2	13%	4	14%	1	7%
	Somewhat important	12	60%	5	33%	11	58%	13	59%	5	36%	4	31%	8	53%	14	50%	7	50%
	Very important	6	30%	8	53%	7	37%	3	14%	5	36%	7	54%	5	33%	10	36%	6	43%
	Total	20	100%	15	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	13	100%	15	100%	28	100%	14	100%
Student performance on state or district tests, disaggregated by subgroup	Not important at all	2	10%	3	21%	1	5%	4	18%	4	29%	1	8%	2	14%	6	22%	2	14%
	Somewhat important	13	65%	3	21%	12	63%	14	64%	5	36%	7	54%	6	43%	12	44%	7	50%
	Very important	5	25%	8	57%	6	32%	4	18%	5	36%	5	38%	6	43%	9	33%	5	36%
	Total	20	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	13	100%	14	100%	27	100%	14	100%
Subtest or item-cluster scores on state or district tests	Not important at all	6	30%	4	29%	1	5%	7	32%	4	29%	1	8%	2	14%	6	22%	1	7%
	Somewhat important	10	50%	4	29%	13	68%	13	59%	6	43%	7	54%	7	50%	12	44%	9	64%
	Very important	4	20%	6	43%	5	26%	2	9%	4	29%	5	38%	5	36%	9	33%	4	29%
	Total	20	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	13	100%	14	100%	27	100%	14	100%
Item-by-item review of state or district test results	Not important at all	7	35%	3	21%	4	20%	9	41%	5	36%	0	0%	5	36%	4	15%	4	29%
	Somewhat important	10	50%	7	50%	12	60%	9	41%	6	43%	7	54%	4	29%	14	52%	7	50%
	Very important	3	15%	4	29%	4	20%	4	18%	3	21%	6	46%	5	36%	9	33%	3	21%
	Total	20	100%	14	100%	20	100%	22	100%	14	100%	13	100%	14	100%	27	100%	14	100%

Source of data		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student performance on school-level assessments (e.g. common writing prompts, math tasks, or reading assignments)	Not important at all	2	10%	2	14%	2	11%	3	14%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	2	7%	1	7%
	Somewhat important	11	52%	3	21%	9	47%	12	55%	6	43%	7	54%	8	57%	11	41%	3	21%
	Very important	8	38%	9	64%	8	42%	7	32%	6	43%	6	46%	6	43%	14	52%	10	71%
	Total	21	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	13	100%	14	100%	27	100%	14	100%
Surveys of teachers, students, and/or parents	Not important at all	7	33%	4	29%	2	11%	8	36%	7	50%	3	25%	3	21%	8	32%	3	21%
	Somewhat important	11	52%	9	64%	12	63%	13	59%	6	43%	5	42%	6	43%	12	48%	11	79%
	Very important	3	14%	1	7%	5	26%	1	5%	1	7%	4	33%	5	36%	5	20%	0	0%
	Total	21	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	14	100%	12	100%	14	100%	25	100%	14	100%
Information from classroom observations	Not important at all	2	10%	1	8%	1	5%	5	23%	1	8%	1	8%	1	7%	6	24%	3	21%
	Somewhat important	14	67%	10	77%	9	47%	10	45%	6	46%	7	54%	7	47%	10	40%	10	71%
	Very important	5	24%	2	15%	9	47%	7	32%	6	46%	5	38%	7	47%	9	36%	1	7%
	Total	21	100%	13	100%	19	100%	22	100%	13	100%	13	100%	15	100%	25	100%	14	100%
Characteristics of students who retained and/or drop out	Not important at all	10	50%	5	36%	3	16%	8	36%	5	38%	4	33%	4	29%	8	31%	5	36%
	Somewhat important	8	40%	6	43%	11	58%	11	50%	7	54%	5	42%	6	43%	11	42%	8	57%
	Very important	2	10%	3	21%	5	26%	3	14%	1	8%	3	25%	4	29%	7	27%	1	7%
	Total	20	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	13	100%	12	100%	14	100%	26	100%	14	100%
Measures of school safety and discipline	Not important at all	5	24%	4	29%	1	5%	7	32%	6	46%	4	33%	2	14%	7	27%	4	29%
	Somewhat important	10	48%	4	29%	7	37%	10	45%	4	31%	3	25%	6	43%	11	42%	7	50%
	Very important	6	29%	6	43%	11	58%	5	23%	3	23%	5	42%	6	43%	8	31%	3	21%
	Total	21	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	13	100%	12	100%	14	100%	26	100%	14	100%

Source of data		Blind School ID																	
		A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Attendance rates	Not important at all	5	23%	3	21%	0	0%	4	18%	5	38%	3	21%	1	7%	6	23%	2	14%
	Somewhat important	8	36%	6	43%	10	53%	12	55%	3	23%	3	21%	7	47%	4	15%	6	43%
	Very important	9	41%	5	36%	9	47%	6	27%	5	38%	8	57%	7	47%	16	62%	6	43%
	Total	22	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	13	100%	14	100%	15	100%	26	100%	14	100%
Student mobility rates	Not important at all	6	27%	4	29%	0	0%	6	27%	4	31%	3	25%	1	7%	6	24%	3	21%
	Somewhat important	11	50%	8	57%	10	53%	11	50%	8	62%	5	42%	7	50%	7	28%	7	50%
	Very important	5	23%	2	14%	9	47%	5	23%	1	8%	4	33%	6	43%	12	48%	4	29%
	Total	22	100%	14	100%	19	100%	22	100%	13	100%	12	100%	14	100%	25	100%	14	100%
Other	Not important at all	3	43%	1	33%	0	0%	2	20%	2	50%	3	75%	1	20%	3	27%	3	50%
	Somewhat important	4	57%	2	67%	3	100%	5	50%	2	50%	1	25%	1	20%	7	64%	2	33%
	Very important	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	3	60%	1	9%	1	17%
	Total	7	100%	3	100%	3	100%	10	100%	4	100%	4	100%	5	100%	11	100%	6	100%

Has your school received money and support from the state as a result of its performance status?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	1	4%	1	6%	1	5%	1	5%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%
Yes	7	30%	10	63%	9	45%	14	64%	2	14%	9	64%	9	60%	12	44%	8	57%
I don't know.	15	65%	5	31%	10	50%	7	32%	11	79%	5	36%	5	33%	15	56%	5	36%

The money and support we received from the state or district:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
... (has) made me hopeful that our school will improve.	7	70%	10	91%	10	91%	6	40%	1	33%	4	50%	8	80%	10	63%	8	89%
... (has) had little impact on the way that I feel about the school's chances to succeed.	1	10%	0	0%	1	9%	6	40%	1	33%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%
I don't know.	2	20%	1	9%	0	0%	3	20%	1	33%	0	0%	2	20%	6	38%	0	0%

The money and support we received from the state or district:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
... (has) had little impact on our school's performance.	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	13%	1	33%	4	44%	1	10%	1	6%	1	11%
... (has) had some impact on our school's performance.	7	78%	8	73%	9	82%	12	80%	1	33%	5	56%	7	70%	8	50%	8	89%
I don't know.	2	22%	3	27%	2	18%	1	7%	1	33%	0	0%	2	20%	7	44%	0	0%

Have you personally had opportunities to decide how this money will be spent?	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	8	89%	4	50%	3	33%	3	25%	3	100%	3	50%	4	40%	10	71%	3	38%
Yes	1	11%	4	50%	6	67%	9	75%	0	0%	3	50%	6	60%	4	29%	5	63%

Our district:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
… provides useful reports of student achievement data.	3.17	1.07	3.07	.96	3.79	.63	2.77	1.02	3.62	.77	3.64	.74	4.27	.46	3.61	1.03	3.79	.80
… provides clear guidance on what curriculum we should teach.	3.74	.86	2.73	1.39	3.79	.54	3.05	1.17	2.92	1.04	3.93	.47	4.07	.70	3.32	1.12	4.00	.88
… provides clear guidance on how we should deliver our instruction.	3.14	1.13	2.21	1.05	3.11	.99	2.64	.90	2.77	1.17	3.29	.91	3.80	.94	2.61	.96	3.07	1.07
… monitors our progress on goals established in our school plans.	3.50	.95	2.29	1.27	3.65	1.09	3.05	.84	2.57	.94	3.79	.97	3.87	.92	3.00	.94	3.46	.78
… sends consistent messages regarding our school goals and improvement strategies.	3.43	.95	2.29	1.07	3.06	1.26	2.68	.99	2.31	1.03	3.46	.66	3.53	.83	3.31	.84	3.00	.91
… provides adequate assistance for our school's improvement.	3.09	1.02	2.07	1.07	2.94	1.30	2.41	1.05	2.23	.73	3.38	.96	3.43	1.02	3.15	1.08	2.69	1.18
… provides useful feedback on our school improvement efforts.	3.23	.87	2.14	1.17	3.16	1.26	2.09	.75	2.38	.87	3.36	.93	3.64	.93	3.00	1.02	2.77	1.01
… proposes improvement activities that are in line with our goals.	3.27	.88	2.29	1.14	3.11	1.23	2.32	.89	2.42	.90	3.36	.93	3.50	1.09	3.20	1.00	2.85	.90

Our district:	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
(R) … mandates programs and improvement activities with little knowledge of their suitability for our school.	2.24	.77	2.54	1.13	2.94	1.21	1.76	1.00	2.92	.95	2.92	.95	2.07	.92	2.35	1.09	2.92	.95
… has standardized instructional approaches for our school.	3.76	.83	2.36	1.15	3.42	.96	3.86	.96	2.33	.78	3.15	.69	3.77	.93	3.58	.97	3.23	.83
… provides effective professional development that helps reach its goals.	2.91	1.28	2.40	1.35	2.84	1.30	2.59	1.10	2.92	.86	3.43	.65	3.73	1.10	3.39	1.17	3.15	.69
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Scale: 1-5, 1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*.

Appendix R
Teacher Questionnaire Scales: Descriptive Statistics
(*Note.* A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.)

Accountability

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Goal Importance	14.00	3.07	15.94	2.45	15.39	2.28	12.86	3.22	14.03	3.06	15.36	2.60	13.21	4.61	14.45	3.32	15.03	3.04
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
External Validation	10.40	2.89	11.27	1.62	11.11	1.76	9.11	3.16	9.80	2.51	10.58	3.12	7.77	3.49	10.00	2.00	10.80	2.98
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Authoritativeness	10.68	2.60	11.80	1.15	11.68	1.45	10.89	2.33	10.67	1.45	11.25	2.53	8.92	3.64	11.35	2.46	11.13	2.20
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Threat	8.53	3.28	9.23	2.36	8.97	2.89	9.90	3.14	9.21	3.38	12.81	2.17	8.93	3.65	9.06	3.46	8.46	2.90
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Focus	10.36	2.59	11.80	1.99	11.08	2.11	9.38	2.70	9.93	1.87	8.88	3.22	9.68	3.16	9.62	2.86	11.07	2.07
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Diagnostics	16.62	4.52	18.60	2.64	16.89	3.82	16.37	4.57	17.07	3.15	12.91	5.17	11.77	5.10	14.79	4.42	17.64	3.69
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Validity	7.84	2.31	8.45	2.32	7.59	2.44	6.05	2.49	7.03	2.58	5.31	2.38	6.79	2.71	7.52	2.37	8.45	2.76
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Fairness	12.36	4.22	12.92	3.15	10.93	2.72	10.16	2.67	9.27	2.66	7.73	2.12	10.67	3.04	10.84	5.07	11.87	4.49
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Realism	11.56	4.05	14.96	2.93	11.19	3.81	12.75	3.40	12.67	4.32	9.88	3.32	11.93	4.51	11.44	4.01	12.79	3.45
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Raised Expectations	12.60	3.06	15.57	2.45	13.54	3.05	11.47	4.20	12.17	3.44	13.08	3.76	11.79	4.50	12.15	3.98	14.00	2.82
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Goal Integrity Score	8.79	2.30	10.10	2.26	10.21	2.47	7.98	3.12	7.86	1.98	8.50	3.40	8.50	3.96	7.83	3.16	8.59	2.81
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Urgency	14.78	2.67	16.53	2.03	16.00	1.67	14.50	2.52	13.73	3.37	17.42	2.31	15.00	3.27	15.47	2.74	15.33	1.63
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Principal Support	9.07	3.33	11.03	2.32	13.36	1.61	11.61	2.51	7.41	3.38	11.00	3.05	9.93	3.13	9.90	2.92	11.21	2.77
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Principal Control	11.29	1.63	12.10	1.80	12.51	1.55	10.22	2.06	9.97	2.03	12.81	1.63	12.04	1.93	10.38	2.21	10.86	2.45
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
School Management	14.91	3.46	17.00	2.73	18.16	2.67	14.41	3.22	9.93	4.51	15.29	3.17	15.47	3.27	15.18	2.72	14.57	3.06
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Open Communication	12.02	4.16	14.71	2.87	15.16	2.48	14.34	2.99	9.66	3.75	13.35	3.64	12.46	4.93	12.90	4.03	14.03	2.61
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Autonomy	10.42	2.83	11.73	1.62	11.78	1.90	11.65	2.50	8.73	3.22	11.17	2.21	9.54	3.31	10.60	2.62	10.80	2.01
N	21		15		19		20		15		12		13		21		15	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Moral Leadership	6.54	1.96	8.32	1.14	8.61	1.72	7.15	1.68	5.00	2.27	8.12	1.48	7.41	1.95	6.09	1.61	6.62	1.80
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Instructional Leadership	29.00	5.63	32.74	3.68	34.29	3.90	28.13	5.16	23.55	7.09	33.08	4.67	30.64	6.07	26.68	5.90	28.07	5.48
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Collegiality	15.37	2.81	16.35	2.33	16.33	2.23	14.76	3.43	11.97	3.74	15.69	2.85	14.64	2.70	13.91	3.38	14.17	2.93
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Pulling Together	10.38	2.51	12.10	1.68	12.10	1.73	9.49	2.39	7.97	2.82	10.27	2.38	9.11	3.12	9.38	2.36	10.52	2.31
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Norms of Performance	20.48	5.12	26.20	4.41	24.54	3.93	20.05	4.74	17.76	5.17	22.33	4.89	22.63	5.92	20.19	6.31	21.14	4.77
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Learning Orientation	19.08	2.68	20.45	2.67	19.62	2.63	19.07	3.29	16.72	3.37	19.08	3.77	18.68	3.85	17.48	4.18	18.14	3.00
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Motivation

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Satisfaction	6.00	1.35	6.16	1.19	6.31	1.20	5.60	1.25	4.97	1.21	6.00	1.52	5.74	1.70	5.71	1.22	5.83	1.42
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Hard Work	2.70	1.03	3.61	1.10	2.54	1.18	3.29	1.05	3.90	.90	2.84	.76	3.43	.98	2.76	1.06	2.56	.79
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Efficacy and Qualifications

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Instructional Efficacy	24.23	3.66	22.84	3.98	23.24	4.08	22.69	3.75	23.31	3.57	21.35	4.47	23.32	4.01	23.33	3.77	22.10	3.06
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Test-related Efficacy	8.28	1.37	8.35	1.02	8.44	1.21	8.10	1.08	8.17	1.36	8.56	1.61	8.11	1.37	8.33	1.21	8.36	1.13
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Colleagues' Skills	11.36	2.39	12.55	1.52	12.03	1.39	11.24	2.00	10.28	2.78	11.73	1.95	11.43	2.20	11.00	2.74	11.55	1.38
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

Change Strategies

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Program Coherence	12.40	2.89	13.77	2.60	15.26	3.18	9.71	2.80	9.43	2.63	12.38	2.79	12.11	3.14	11.34	2.99	12.48	2.96
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Strategic Orientation	7.02	1.18	7.81	1.38	8.13	1.28	6.12	1.70	5.39	1.77	7.23	1.50	6.50	2.01	6.06	1.79	6.76	1.48
N	44		31		39		42		29		26		28		49		29	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
District Instructional System	12.77	2.91	10.57	3.88	13.53	2.46	11.05	3.18	12.23	2.65	14.29	2.23	15.87	2.59	12.93	2.94	13.85	2.79
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
District Operational System	19.74	3.18	13.43	6.22	19.29	6.58	16.29	3.36	14.00	4.57	20.17	4.49	21.85	4.85	19.23	4.45	18.00	4.88
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Data Usage	24.22	3.57	25.85	5.77	27.68	4.37	23.23	4.30	23.31	6.07	26.18	4.12	27.07	6.67	25.83	6.34	25.29	5.34
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Background

	Blind School ID																	
	A		B		C		D		E		F		G		H		I	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Parental Support	19.11	5.06	19.10	7.82	17.65	4.76	16.95	5.51	18.57	4.13	13.85	5.86	20.09	6.58	18.52	6.80	17.86	5.74
N	23		16		20		22		14		14		15		28		14	

Appendix S
P-Weights Applied to Teacher Questionnaire Data

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
Original "high-performance" and "low-performance" groups	4.114	5.839	3.487	3.238	6.241	5.231	6.464	3.694	4.690
Recent 2-year high- and low-performance groups	3.841	3.194	2.538	4.024	5.828	6.500	6.036	—[a]	3.414

Note. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I = School A, School B, etc.

[a]No p-weight exists for School H in the second configuration of schools because its growth status did not sufficiently fall in either the high or low growth group. As it fell somewhat in the middle of the high and low groups, it was excluded from this second analysis.

APPENDIX T

Teacher Questionnaire Scales: Survey Regression Results

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Test results between original "high-performance" and "low-performance" groups				
Accountability				
Goal importance	4-20	14.7	14.3	–0.45
External validation	3-15	10.4	9.9	–0.84
Authoritativeness	3-15	11.2	10.7	–1.15
Threat	3-15	10.1	9.0	–1.17
Pressure	1-5	4.1	4.1	0.25
Focus	3-15	10.1	10.3	0.27
Diagnostics	5-25	16.0	15.9	–0.12
Validity	3-15	6.9	7.5	0.94
Fairness	5-25	10.2	11.4	1.16
Realism	5-25	11.5	12.8	1.30
Raised expectations	4-20	13.1	12.8	–0.27
Goal integrity	1-13	8.8	8.6	–0.34
Leadership				
Urgency	4-20	15.8	15.1	–0.98
Principal support	3-15	11.8	9.5	–3.04*
Principal control	3-15	11.6	11.2	–0.64
School management	4-20	15.6	14.6	–0.75
Open communication	4-20	14.2	12.4	–2.17
Autonomy	3-15	11.3	10.2	–2.08
Instructional leadership	8-40	30.9	28.5	–1.10
Moral leadership	2-10	7.6	6.7	–1.37
Organizational culture				
Collegiality	4-20	15.2	14.4	–0.96
Pulling together	3-15	10.6	9.8	–0.98
Norms of performance	6-30	22.0	21.5	–0.32
Learning orientation	5-25	19.0	18.5	–0.75
Motivation				
Involvement	1-4	2.6	2.6	–0.40
Effort – 1	1-5	4.0	4.0	–0.33
Effort – 2	1-5	4.1	4.0	–1.42
Hard work	.7-4.7	2.8	3.3	1.60
Commitment to stay	1-3	2.5	2.5	–0.39
Morale	1-4	3.2	3.1	–0.14
Satisfied	2-8	5.9	5.7	–0.90

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Efficacy and qualifications				
Instructional efficacy	12-30	22.3	23.4	2.49*
Test-related efficacy	3-10	8.4	8.2	–1.10
Colleagues' skills	3-15	11.6	11.3	–0.80
Preparedness	1-4	3.5	3.3	–1.20
Years teaching	0-41	12.9	11.6	–0.71
Change strategies				
Program coherence	4-20	12.5	11.8	–0.51
Strategic orientation	2-10	7.1	6.6	–0.89
Role of planning	1-5	3.8	3.7	–0.47
Data usage	12-36	25.5	25.3	–0.20
District operational system	6-30	18.4	17.7	–0.37
District instructional system	4-20	13.2	13.0	–0.16
Test results between recent 2-year high- and low-performance groups				
Accountability				
Goal importance	4-20	13.9	15.5	3.53**
External validation	3-15	9.5	11.1	3.05*
Authoritativeness	3-15	10.5	11.5	2.45*
Threat	3-15	9.9	8.9	–1.30
Pressure	1-5	4.3	3.8	–2.35*
Focus	3-15	9.6	11.3	5.23***
Diagnostics	5-25	15.0	17.7	2.38*
Validity	3-15	6.6	8.2	3.24**
Fairness	5-25	10.0	11.9	1.99
Realism	5-25	11.7	13.1	1.15
Raised expectations	4-20	12.2	14.4	3.56**
Goal integrity	1-13	8.3	9.6	2.65*
Leadership				
Urgency	4-20	15.1	15.9	1.30
Principal support	3-15	9.8	11.9	2.13
Principal control	3-15	11.3	11.8	0.82
School management	4-20	14.1	16.6	1.92
Open communication	4-20	12.4	14.6	2.79*
Autonomy	3-15	10.3	11.4	1.90
Instructional leadership	8-40	28.9	31.7	1.24
Moral leadership	2-10	6.8	7.8	1.34

	Range	Estimated mean		*t*
		Low	High	
Organizational culture				
Collegiality	4-20	14.5	15.6	1.29
Pulling together	3-15	9.4	11.6	3.42**
Norms of performance	6-30	20.6	23.9	2.10
Learning orientation	5-25	18.5	19.4	1.23
Motivation				
Involvement	1-4	2.6	2.6	1.12
Effort – 1	1-5	4.0	4.0	–0.41
Effort – 2	1-5	4.0	4.0	–0.16
Hard work	.7-4.7	3.2	3.0	–0.68
Commitment to stay	1-3	2.4	2.5	2.69*
Morale	1-4	3.1	3.4	2.66*
Satisfied	2-8	5.7	6.1	1.98
Efficacy and qualifications				
Instructional efficacy	12-30	23.0	22.7	–0.47
Test-related efficacy	3-10	8.2	8.4	1.69
Colleagues' skills	3-15	11.2	12.0	2.41*
Preparedness	1-4	3.4	3.4	–0.09
Years teaching	0-41	10.5	14.6	2.69 *
Change strategies				
Program coherence	4-20	11.2	13.8	2.77*
Strategic orientation	2-10	6.5	7.6	2.32*
Role of planning	1-5	3.9	3.5	–1.55
Data usage	12-36	24.8	26.3	1.47
District operational system	6-30	18.5	16.9	–0.77
District instructional system	4-20	13.3	12.7	–0.51

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Appendix U

School Background Facts: Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney Results

Test Results Between Original "High-Performance" and "Low-Performance" Groups

Background variable	z	*p-value*
API growth score	–2.47	0.014
Student enrollment	0.25	0.807
Free/reduced-price lunch eligibility	1.23	0.219
English language learners	–0.74	0.462
Mobility rate	0.74	0.461
Average parent education level	0.74	0.459

Appendix V
Interview Codes

Code	Definition
Educational experience	
Academic engagement	Students find classes interesting and challenging
Academic press	Teachers have high expectations of students
Teacher care	Teachers care for and listen to students
Peer collaboration	Students like to work cooperatively
Attitudes towards test and accountability	Students' opinions of state test system
Accountability	
Accountability response	Nature of school's response to accountability system, e.g., defensive or constructive
Curricular effects	Accountability system's impact on school's curricular program
Fairness	System is a fair gauge of teachers' performance
Expectations	Teachers' expectations of students, as impacted by the accountability system
Goal integrity	System goals and demands are balanced with teachers' values and student needs
Importance for school	Accountability system's impact on schools' affairs
Problem awareness	Teachers' consciousness of school's challenges
Pressure	Accountability imposes pressure on school
Realism	System targets are realistic
Rigor (of State system/tests)	Degree of cognitive challenge of state tests
Support (by State system)	Degree of assistance provided by state accountability system
External effectiveness	Degree to which school makes growth on state tests
Learning conditions	
Change in demographics	Changes in the student population, e.g., changes in feeder schools
Community characteristics	Nature of families attending the school, e.g., economic and linguistic descriptors
English Language Learners	Population of Limited English Proficient students
Facilities	Physical condition of school campus
Physical resources	Availability of learning materials
Parental support for school	Academic involvement of parents
Reputation	Image of school among community
Safe and orderly campus	Safety around the school campus
School climate	School's mood, both for students and teachers, e.g., warm, inviting

Code	Definition
Instructional program	
Curriculum differentiation	Ability grouping, or tracking
Bubble kids	Students targeted for extra test preparation and/or resources
Alignment versus Creativity	Tension between standards-based alignment and instructional flexibility
Monitoring versus Commitment	Tension between adhering to common instructional goals due to performance monitoring versus norms and values
Fidelity versus Adaptation	Tension between implementing programs in their original form versus a modified form to meet students' needs
Prescription versus Professional Judgment	Tension between making instructional decisions based on a directive versus one's professional expertise
Electives	Availability of elective classes in addition to core subjects
Extra-curricular activities	Availability of activities to supplement the traditional academic program
Interdisciplinary teaching	The use of thematic units or lessons
Enacted curriculum	Lower or higher order cognitive complexity of instructional activities
Remediation	Reading and language arts intervention programs
School instructional program (English)	Adopted English Language Arts and ELD programs
School instructional program (math)	Adopted Mathematics programs
Special programs and activities	Supplemental resources for students
Leadership	
Autonomy	Teachers' professional judgment and creativity are respected
Administrative shifts	Changes in administration over time
Instructional leadership	Administration's teaching standards and understanding of how children learn
Organizational management	Administration's supervision of school's affairs
Communication	Nature of discussions between faculty and administration, e.g., open or closed
External consultants	Outside assistance, e.g., reform coordinator or school improvement coach
Performance monitoring	Administration's oversight of teachers' performance
Principal interpretation	Administration's communication about accountability pressures
Principal leadership	Administration's leadership style
Faculty culture	
Individual learning	Opportunities for individual teachers to develop skills
Effort	Willingness to put in effort beyond traditional expectations

Code	Definition
Collegiality; Faculty cohesion	Cooperative effort and support among staff
Commitment	Teachers have commitment to stay at the school
Faculty stability	Changes in faculty over time
Pulling together	Cooperative effort and support among staff driven by accountability demands
Involvement	Teachers' level of involvement in improvement activities, e.g. low or high
Morale/Improvement expectations	Teachers believe school is on continuous improvement path and/or are enthusiastic about school's future
Teacher (collective) efficacy	Teachers feel that the staff can effectively reach students
Teacher (individual)efficacy	Teacher feels that s/he can effectively reach students
Teacher leadership	Teachers assume additional responsibilities for school's improvement
Responsibility	Teachers feel a shared responsibility for student achievement
Teacher skill	Teachers are qualified to meet performance demands
Change history and strategies	
Data	Use of assessment data for decision-making
District assessments	District-mandated benchmark tests
District materials	District-mandated curricula, textbooks, and program materials
District professional development	District-mandated staff development opportunities
Low performing schools grants	State funding based on school's performance status
Milestones	Key events in a school's history
Money	Financial resources at school's disposal
Engagement	Administration's active solicitation of teachers' involvement in school improvement efforts
Organizational learning	School-wide systems for teacher learning
Goal setting	School's explicit use of targets or objectives in their improvement plans
Happenstance	School's performance changes due to coincidence or chance
Planning	School's use of explicit, long-term school improvement plans, as well as teachers' use of similar instructional or curricular plans
Priorities	Areas of focus for school's improvement
Professional development	Nature of teacher learning opportunities, e.g. basic skill versus expertise development
Quick fixes	Immediate, short-term improvement tactics
Strategic approach	Deliberate, long-term improvement plan
Role of district	District's influence on school's affairs
Sources of improvement	Perceived causes of growth or decline

Code	Definition
Stable/Erratic and Upward/Downward growth	School's various performance trajectories
Student discipline	School's approach to student behavior
Test preparation	Instructional activities explicitly intended to prepare for state tests
Time for test subjects	Allocation of instructional time for subjects assessed by state tests
Turn-around	Administration's abrupt reversal of school's performance trajectory