



Austin Independent School District

Department of Program Evaluation

Publication Number 08.30
March 2009

Amy Imes, Ph.D.
Lisa Schmitt, Ph.D.
Karen M. Cornetto, Ph.D.

STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS:

SUMMARY FOR 2006-2007 THROUGH 2008-2009

A healthy school climate is characterized by positive relationships among students, all campus staff, and the community. School climate is a key factor in several important outcomes including student achievement, reduced violence, higher morale, and faculty trust (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). More specifically, research in AISD indicates that staff climate survey results are related to student Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) performance in both math and reading (Bush-Richards, Cornetto, & Schmitt, 2008; Schmitt, 2006).

The AISD Staff Climate Survey was developed from the research-based Organizational Climate Inventory (OCI), which measures several dimensions of school climate (Hoy et al., 2002) including *Collegial Leadership*, *Professional Teacher Behavior*, and *Achievement Press*. In addition to items from the OCI, the 2008-2009 AISD Staff Climate Survey included items developed by researchers to measure *Community Engagement* (Tschannen-Moran, Parish, & DiPaola, 2006), climate items designed for relevance to all campus staff, school safety items, and items measuring the implementation of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) on campus.

SYNOPSIS OF 2008-2009 STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS

The Campus Staff Climate survey was administered to campus employees in Fall 2008, and 7,093 completed surveys were returned. The total number of respondents by school level for the past three years can be found in Table 1 on the following page.

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Key findings for response trends are presented below.

- The number of survey respondents generally has increased over time.
- While exact response rates are not possible to create for each staff role group, over three quarters of teachers and nearly two-thirds of administrators and other professional employees responded to the survey in 2008-2009.
- The response of Classified/Support staff to the survey increased more than that of any other staff role group from 2005-2006 to 2007-2008, but declined somewhat in the 2008-2009 school year at the high school level. In contrast, more teachers responded in 2008-2009 than ever before.

Table 1. Survey Respondents

	2006-2007			2007-2008			2008-2009		
	EL	MS	HS	EL	MS	HS	EL	MS	HS
Teacher	2,676	840	988	2,786	836	970	2,849	870	1,033
Administrator/Other Prof	333	92	147	373	103	143	378	112	147
Classified/Support Staff	737	235	297	773	299	332	774	274	248
Unspecified	254	81	113	288	101	141	215	66	127
Total	4,000	1,248	1,545	4,220	1,339	1,586	4,216	1,322	1,555

KEY FINDINGS FOR CLIMATE SUBSCALE RESULTS

Scores for Overall Climate and each climate subscale are reported in Table 2. Scores greater than 3.0 are considered to be “positive,” scores between 2.5 and 3.0 are “fair,” and scores below 2.5 are “not positive.” Despite some fluctuations in item level responses and some slight increases and decreases in average subscale scores compared with the prior year, most climate subscale scores did not change meaningfully.¹

Consistent with previous data from AISD and with other climate research (see Schmitt, 2006), school climate continues to be rated more positively overall among elementary campuses than among secondary campuses. Scores for *Safety*, *Collegial Leadership*, *Community Engagement*, and *Achievement Press* varied the most by campus level, while *General Climate* and *Professional Teacher Behavior* varied the least from level to level. Appendixes A, B, and C contain subscale results by campus.

Table 2. Overall Climate and Subscale Scores for 2008-2009

	All EL	All MS	All HS
Community Engagement	2.93	2.73	2.75
Collegial Leadership	3.09	2.91	2.95
Professional Teacher Behavior	3.22	3.09	3.11
Achievement Press	2.94	2.66	2.68
General Climate	3.21	3.08	3.08
Safety	3.13	2.44	2.65
Overall Climate Average	3.09	2.82	2.88

Note. The *Safety* subscale score was calculated based on staff reports of the frequency of student behaviors; items from this subscale (as presented in Table 8) were recomputed to a scale of 1 to 4 with 4 representing a high level of safety.

¹ Effect sizes (Cohen’s d) were calculated using the means from year to year. Effect sizes are a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two means. Mean differences were flagged as meaningful where $d \geq .18$.

CAMPUS CLIMATE SUBSCALE RESULTS

In the tables that follow, results for each climate subscale are presented by campus level, along with averages of scaled responses to each item. For the climate subscales in Tables 3 through 7, staff rated each item on a scale from **1** (*Rarely Occurs*) to **4** (*Very Frequently Occurs*)². Arrows indicate that a change from the previous year was statistically meaningful.³ Scores also have been coded such that those in **bold** are above 3.0 and considered “positive.”

COLLEGIAL LEADERSHIP

Collegial Leadership refers to the extent to which school principals treat teachers and staff with openness, egalitarianism, and friendliness and set clear expectations and standards for performance. Detailed information regarding the items that comprise this scale is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Collegial Leadership

<i>Collegial Leadership Items</i>	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
2. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.	3.07	3.00	3.05	2.93	3.04	2.87↓	2.80	2.65	2.96↑
10. The principal puts suggestions made by faculty into operation.	2.73	2.70	2.81	2.64	2.74	2.65	2.40	2.34	2.65↑
11. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.	2.98	2.93	2.98	2.74	2.92↑	2.74↓	2.68	2.59	2.84↑
16. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.	3.27	3.25	3.30	3.29	3.27	3.16	3.07	2.92	3.13 ↑
18. The principal is willing to make changes.	2.98	2.93	2.99	2.91	2.97	2.86	2.80	2.71	2.93↑
22. The principal maintains definite standards for performance.	3.25	3.22	3.29	3.18	3.20	3.13	2.93	2.90	3.07 ↑
35. The principal is friendly and approachable.	3.24	3.21	3.23	3.06	3.20	3.03	2.98	2.92	3.11 ↑
Collegial Leadership Subscale	3.07	3.05	3.09	2.96	3.07	2.91↓	2.80	2.71	2.95↑

² Respondents also had the option of marking “N/A.”

³ Effect sizes (Cohen’s d) were calculated using the means from year to year, representing a measure of the magnitude of the difference. Mean differences were flagged as meaningful where $d \geq .18$. In general, effect sizes are considered small at $d = .20$, medium at $d = .50$, and large at $d = .80$ (Coe, 2000; Valentine & Cooper, 2003). However, research indicates that these benchmarks may not adequately address the magnitude of effects in all areas because some areas, like education, are likely to have smaller effect sizes than others (Valentine & Cooper, 2003).

Compared to the prior year, Collegial Leadership scores fluctuated at the middle and high school levels. At the high school level, average responses to each item of Collegial Leadership were higher than in the previous year, resulting in an overall increase in the Collegial Leadership subscale average. In middle schools, staff generally reported less positive levels of Collegial Leadership in 2008-2009 when compared to 2007-2008, reverting back to the level reported in 2006-2007. The fluctuations in this subscale over the last few years at middle schools are due largely to changes in staff reports regarding the extent to which a “principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal” and a “principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.”

PROFESSIONAL TEACHER BEHAVIOR

Professional Teacher Behavior refers to the extent to which teachers are respectful of their colleagues’ competence, committed to students, and cooperative with each other. Similar to prior years, Professional Teacher Behavior scores are in the positive range (above the desirable 3.0 level) for all campus levels in 2008-2009, suggesting that campus staff view teachers as supportive, respectful, cooperative, and dedicated to their students. Additional information about each item in the scale can be found in Table 4.

Table 4. Professional Teacher Behavior

<i>Professional Teacher Behavior Items</i>	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
4. Teachers help and support each other.	3.26	3.28	3.29	3.28	3.23	3.23	3.04	3.14	3.23
12. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	3.14	3.15	3.14	3.10	3.05	3.01	2.94	2.97	3.07
14. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.	3.12	3.15	3.14	3.08	3.06	3.03	2.96	3.01	3.08
17. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.	3.25	3.25	3.26	3.20	3.14	3.14	3.06	3.06	3.14
21. Teachers “go the extra mile” with their students.	3.38	3.39	3.41	3.27	3.24	3.27	3.15	3.22	3.29
23. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	3.06	3.09	3.10	3.03	3.00	2.95	2.75	2.87	2.95
33. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	3.06	3.06	3.05	2.90	2.87	2.89	2.78	2.79	2.91
36. Teachers show commitment to their students.	3.48	3.47	3.47	3.33	3.29	3.28	3.18	3.26	3.28
Professional Teacher Behavior Subscale	3.21	3.25	3.22	3.14	3.13	3.09	2.97	3.07	3.11

ACHIEVEMENT PRESS

The degree to which students, parents, teachers, and principals exert pressure for high standards and school improvement is described as *Achievement Press*. Although overall staff reports of Achievement Press are below the desired level of 3.0, these average scores are driven by low campus staff ratings of items regarding parent and student Achievement Press. In contrast, staff rate school-level Achievement Press items more positively than parent and student-level items. Detailed information regarding the items in this scale is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Achievement Press

<i>Achievement Press Items</i>	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
3. The school sets high standards for academic performance.	3.49	3.47	3.53	3.25	3.30	3.31	2.96	3.06	3.16
6. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.	3.40	3.40	3.40	3.20	3.16	3.14	3.00	3.06	3.07
7. Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.	2.36	2.38	2.44	2.27	2.21	2.25	2.12	2.22	2.33
8. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.	3.30	3.26	3.27	3.20	3.20	3.12	3.03	3.03	3.10
13. Parents press for school improvement.	2.29	2.24	2.38	2.15	2.21	2.26	2.17	2.20	2.33
15. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.	3.12	3.11	3.13	2.89	2.89	2.92	2.75	2.81	2.87
19. Students respect others who get good grades.	2.96	2.96	3.02	2.38	2.38	2.41	2.38	2.47	2.59
25. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.	2.11	2.13	2.25	2.02	2.04	2.09	2.01	2.13	2.24
32. Students try hard to improve on previous work.	2.66	2.67	2.72	2.24	2.24	2.24	2.14	2.22	2.30
34. The learning environment is orderly and serious.	3.08	3.08	3.12	2.81	2.81	2.78	2.53	2.63	2.70
Achievement Press Subscale	2.90	2.87	2.94	2.66	2.63	2.66	2.52	2.59	2.68

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Community Engagement refers to the extent to which the school has fostered a productive relationship with its community and can count on involvement and support from parents and community members. This subscale also measures the degree to which the school provides the community with information about its accomplishments. Community Engagement is a new scale introduced in 2008-2009 intended to gauge the extent to which schools are connected to the community. The subscale scores for each school level were in the fair range, indicating opportunities exist for schools to improve their links to the community (Table 6).

Table 6. Community Engagement

<i>Community Engagement Items</i>	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
5. Our school makes an effort to inform the community about our goals and achievement.	-	-	3.24	-	-	3.09	-	-	3.05
9. Our school is able to enlist community support when needed.	-	-	2.87	-	-	2.73	-	-	2.75
20. Teachers feel pressure from the community.	-	-	2.97	-	-	2.74	-	-	2.85
26. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.	-	-	2.63	-	-	2.41	-	-	2.49
31. Community members attend meetings to stay informed about our school.	-	-	2.60	-	-	2.39	-	-	2.42
38. Organized community groups (e.g. PTA, PTO) meet regularly to discuss school issues.	-	-	3.19	-	-	2.93	-	-	2.93
39. School staff are responsive to the needs and concerns expressed by community members.	-	-	3.05	-	-	2.84	-	-	2.84
Community Engagement Subscale	-	-	2.93	-	-	2.73	-	-	2.75

Note. This subscale was new in 2008-2009.

GENERAL CLIMATE

To assess *General Climate* at campuses, campus staff reported their level of agreement with six items regarding general work attitudes and affiliation among staff. Campus staff at each school level rated the General Climate of their campuses positively, as indicated by subscale scores greater than 3.0. For high schools, the 2008-2009 rating is significantly more positive than

ratings reported in the two years prior. General Climate ratings have been relatively consistent over the last three academic years for elementary and middle schools; further information regarding item-level ratings for this scale can be found in Table 7.

Table 7. General Climate Items

<i>Additional General Climate Items</i>	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
24. Campus staff are friendly to each other.	3.28	3.29	3.28	3.26	3.18	3.19	3.11	3.13	3.21
27. Campus staff exhibit pride in their affiliation with the school.	3.15	3.14	3.17	3.03	2.98	3.02	2.90	2.97	3.11↑
28. Campus staff are willing to go out of their way to help.	3.19	3.20	3.18	3.13	3.08	3.07	3.00	3.04	3.11
29. Campus staff accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	3.03	3.06	3.05	2.92	2.90	2.88	2.78	2.80	2.90
30. Campus staff are committed to their jobs.	3.32	3.31	3.30	3.19	3.13	3.16	3.04	3.06	3.13
37. The goals of my school are made clear.	3.28	3.27	3.32	3.22	3.18	3.19	2.97	2.88	3.04↑
General Climate Subscale	3.16	3.17	3.21	3.05	3.00	3.08	2.90	2.92	3.08↑

SCHOOL SAFETY, BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT, AND POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT

The next section of the survey addressed the safety of the school environment for students and staff, including the prevalence of undesirable student behavior on campus, staff satisfaction with how student behavior is managed on each campus, and staff familiarity with issues related to *Positive Behavior Support* (PBS). The *Frequency of Undesirable Student Behaviors* did not change significantly from 2007-2008 to 2008-2009 for any of the selected behaviors campus staff rated. These items measured staff reports about the frequency of selected undesirable student behaviors on campus, rated on a scale of 0 (*never happens*) to 4 (*happens daily*). The individual item and average subscale scores for each school level are shown in Table 8. It is desirable to have an average response of **less than 2.0** for each item, indicated in bold type.

Campus staff also indicated their level of satisfaction with campus-level *Behavior Management* issues for the first time in 2008-2009. Staff rated how satisfied they were with the way their campus addresses student behavior, classroom management, and management of campus common areas using a scale of 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 4 (*very satisfied*). It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold. Elementary school staff generally reported greater satisfaction with these aspects of campus management than did campus staff at middle and high schools. Detail regarding these results can be found in Table 9.

Table 8. Frequency of Undesirable Student Behaviors

To the best of your knowledge, <i>how often</i> do the following events occur at your school?	All EL			All MS			All HS		
	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09	06-07	07-08	08-09
40. Student racial tension	0.89	0.88	.82	1.66↓	1.63	1.69	1.74↓	1.50↓	1.47
41. Student bullying	1.71	1.66	1.65	2.52↓	2.35↓	2.50	2.15↓	1.78↓	1.81
42. Widespread disorder in classrooms	0.93	0.95	.90	1.65	1.60	1.64	1.79	1.51↓	1.47
43. Student acts of disrespect for Teachers	1.58	1.54	1.54	2.52	2.42	2.47	2.58	2.32↓	2.26
44. Student acts of disrespect for Non-teaching Professional or Administrative Staff	1.45	1.41	1.42	2.37	2.27	2.30	2.40↓	2.15↓	2.08
45. Student acts of disrespect for Classified or Support Staff	1.39	1.37	1.37	2.28	2.16	2.20	2.30↓	2.03↓	1.97
46. Gang activities	0.39	0.41	.38	1.60	1.63	1.73	1.83	1.65	1.58

Table 9. Behavior Management

How satisfied are you with the way your campus addresses:	ALL EL	All MS	All HS
47a. Student Behavior	3.13	2.76	2.75
47b. Classroom Management	3.30	2.98	2.96
47c. Common Area Management	3.25	2.94	2.92
Behavior Management Subscale	3.23	2.89	2.88

Campus staff also provided information about their knowledge and use of *Positive Behavior Support* (PBS) services offered at their campuses. Item-level and subscale data for the PBS subscale is presented by school level in Tables 10 through 12. These items were asked for the first time in 2008-2009. Positive Behavior Support Subscale scores are an average of PBS items 56-59.

Not surprisingly, teachers and professionals at campuses reported greater familiarity with the availability and use of PBS services than did classified personnel. Staff at the elementary and middle schools reported greater overall knowledge of PBS services available and the guidelines associated with these services than did high school staff, as well as greater ability to refer students to these services.

In general, the majority of teachers and professionals at elementary and middle schools reported having used PBS strategies in a classroom/common area and being aware of PBS guidelines for success. In contrast, less than a third of teachers and professionals at high schools indicated agreement with these items. Approximately 80% of teachers at elementary and middle schools reported that they know how to refer students to campus resources compared to 60% of teachers at high schools. At least 75% of professionals at all campus levels reported having this ability.

Table 10. Positive Behavior Support for Elementary Schools

<i>Positive Behavior Support Items</i>	Teachers			Classified			Professional		
	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A
48. There is a Positive Behavior Support team on my campus.	13.5	62.6	3.3	6.5	50.5	10.7	18.6	60.5	5.4
49. There is a behavior support team (other than PBS or IMPACT) on my campus.	25.1	41.9	3.2	10.8	41.6	10.3	23.7	44.4	6.9
50. I am aware of what the PBS team (or behavior support team) does on my campus.	11.9	57.7	9.8	16.4	37.3	14.9	8.1	58.5	16.8
51. I am regularly updated about PBS activities/process.	22.5	49.3	11.1	28.7	26.6	20.7	20.5	47.5	21.3
52. I am aware of the PBS toolkit.	33.1	34.8	10.6	34.8	17.6	21.8	27.4	39.5	20.8
53. I have used PBS strategies in the classroom/common area.	15.3	60.1	10.2	26.2	21.2	32.1	12.2	52.8	26.4
54. I attended a professional development session related to PBS this year.	34.8	44.9	9.1	38.8	15.0	28.5	28.4	45.9	18.6
55. I am aware of the PBS guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	18.6	56.6	9.9	30.9	25.0	23.6	16.2	54.5	19.8
56. I have taught students the guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	6.3	86.4	3.5	23.9	25.8	36.8	8.9	64.9	23.4
57. I know how to refer students to campus resources such as IMPACT, behavior support specialists, School to Community Liaisons, etc.	4.8	86.1	1.5	21.9	31.3	28.4	2.9	82.7	8.9
58. I feel there is consistent reinforcement of commendable student behavior on my campus.	15.1	73.5	1.0	11.6	50.5	16.9	6.5	78.3	2.9
59. I know how to refer students to external agencies (e.g. Communities in Schools, Safe Place, etc.)	24.0	55.6	2.1	23.2	29.4	26.5	10.3	68.6	10.0
PBS Subscale	12.6	75.4	2.0	20.2	34.2	27.2	7.2	73.6	11.3

Note. Staff responded to each item using one of the four response options (No, Yes, Not Sure, or Not Applicable). The percent of staff who responded “Not Sure” are not presented. As a result, the percentages presented due not total to 100% of responding staff.

Table 11. Positive Behavior Support for Middle Schools

<i>Positive Behavior Support Items</i>	Teachers			Classified			Professional		
	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A
48. There is a Positive Behavior Support team on my campus.	4.3	77.9	0.7	4.9	51.1	6.7	5.4	77.5	3.6
49. There is a behavior support team (other than PBS or IMPACT) on my campus.	11.9	53.5	1.6	3.4	42.9	8.7	18.9	54.1	3.6
50. I am aware of what the PBS team (or behavior support team) does on my campus.	11.6	65.3	2.5	15.2	38.6	10.9	11.0	70.6	4.6
51. I am regularly updated about PBS activities/process.	24.9	54.5	3.4	31.2	26.7	18.8	20.7	59.5	9.0
52. I am aware of the PBS toolkit.	33.9	43.9	2.1	37.4	17.2	20.6	33.0	50.9	7.1
53. I have used PBS strategies in the class-room/common area.	13.7	71.4	2.6	23.9	23.9	31.9	12.7	58.2	25.5
54. I attended a professional development session related to PBS this year.	28.2	59.2	2.3	33.7	22.2	28.4	38.5	53.2	7.3
55. I am aware of the PBS guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	19.3	61.3	2.7	31.8	24.2	23.1	18.8	65.2	6.3
56. I have taught students the guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	9.6	83.9	1.6	20.9	26.9	38.4	12.5	59.8	24.1
57. I know how to refer students to campus resources such as IMPACT, behavior support specialists, School to Community Liaisons, etc.	9.4	79.3	0.7	20.9	34.3	25.4	7.2	86.5	3.6
58. I feel there is consistent reinforcement of commendable student behavior on my campus.	29.7	57.5	0.8	18.9	43.4	13.2	20.5	67.9	3.6
59. I know how to refer students to external agencies (e.g. Communities in Schools, Safe Place, etc.)	15.9	70.6	1.2	21.1	36.1	22.6	8.0	80.4	6.3
PBS Subscale	16.2	72.8	1.1	20.5	35.2	24.9	12.1	73.7	9.4

Note. Staff responded to each item using one of the four response options (No, Yes, Not Sure, or Not Applicable). The percent of staff who responded “Not Sure” are not presented. As a result, the percentages presented do not total to 100% of responding staff.

Table 12. Positive Behavior Support for High Schools

<i>Positive Behavior Support Items</i>	Teachers			Classified			Professional		
	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A	% No	% Yes	% N/A
48. There is a Positive Behavior Support team on my campus.	12.4	34.0	1.8	12.2	25.2	15.6	26.9	31.0	5.5
49. There is a behavior support team (other than PBS or IMPACT) on my campus.	9.2	33.5	1.9	8.8	25.2	14.3	22.2	38.9	4.2
50. I am aware of what the PBS team (or behavior support team) does on my campus.	30.1	21.5	5.8	19.6	19.2	19.2	24.7	23.9	21.8
51. I am regularly updated about PBS activities/process.	47.3	12.6	7.4	33.1	10.6	24.2	40.1	17.6	21.1
52. I am aware of the PBS toolkit.	46.9	14.8	6.9	36.4	9.8	24.2	42.9	16.9	22.5
53. I have used PBS strategies in the class-room/common area.	34.9	27.5	6.4	28.3	12.0	30.5	32.6	15.6	36.2
54. I attended a professional development session related to PBS this year.	47.9	23.6	5.9	39.9	8.6	29.2	51.4	14.1	24.7
55. I am aware of the PBS guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	45.9	19.1	6.0	36.0	11.0	27.9	40.6	19.6	25.9
56. I have taught students the guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	19.3	65.5	2.9	25.5	20.4	35.7	18.1	37.5	34.7
57. I know how to refer students to campus resources such as IMPACT, behavior support specialists, School to Community Liaisons, etc.	17.5	60.9	1.3	25.0	35.2	19.5	8.9	75.9	8.3
58. I feel there is consistent reinforcement of commendable student behavior on my campus.	34.1	43.9	1.2	20.6	38.2	14.3	20.9	55.2	4.2
59. I know how to refer students to external agencies such as Communities in Schools, Safe Place, etc.	23.1	58.1	0.8	22.0	44.1	16.5	11.2	78.3	4.2
PBS Subscale	23.5	57.1	1.6	23.3	34.5	21.5	14.8	61.7	12.9

Note. Staff responded to each item using one of the four response options (No, Yes, Not Sure, or Not Applicable). The percent of staff who responded “Not Sure” are not presented. As a result, the percentages presented due not total to 100% of responding staff.

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Elementary Climate Scores by Campus

School	Professional									
	Community Engagement	Collegial Leadership	Teacher Behavior	Achievement Press	General Climate	Safety	Behavior Management	Overall Climate	# Surveys	
All EL	↗ 2.94	↕ 3.09	↕ 3.23	↗ 2.94	↕ 3.22	↕ 3.13	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.10	4,160	
Allan	↘ 2.57	↕ 3.10	↕ 3.31	↘ 2.74	↕ 3.29	↘ 2.90	↕ 3.18	↘ 2.99	43	
Allison	↘ 2.70	↕ 3.02	↕ 3.07	↘ 2.58	↕ 3.05	↘ 2.83	↗ 2.99	↘ 2.87	49	
Andrews	↘ 2.66	↕ 3.07	↕ 3.10	↗ 2.85	↕ 3.02	↕ 3.01	↕ 3.24	↗ 2.95	60	
Baranoff	↕ 3.53	↘ 2.89	↕ 3.20	↕ 3.25	↕ 3.22	↕ 3.31	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.24	61	
Barrington	↘ 2.26	↗ 2.80	↗ 2.80	↘ 2.56	↗ 2.72	↕ 3.16	↕ 3.05	↘ 2.71	44	
Barton Hills	↕ 3.58	↕ 3.24	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.57	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.57	↕ 3.47	38	
Becker	↗ 2.77	↕ 3.16	↕ 3.33	↘ 2.61	↕ 3.26	↘ 2.23	↘ 2.45	↗ 2.89	25	
Blackshear	↗ 2.78	↕ 3.06	↕ 3.32	↘ 2.93	↕ 3.29	↕ 3.15	↕ 3.37	↕ 3.09	39	
Blanton	↘ 2.70	↕ 3.09	↕ 3.33	↕ 3.07	↕ 3.43	↕ 3.40	↕ 3.40	↕ 3.16	52	
Blazier	↘ 2.68	↗ 2.99	↕ 3.11	↘ 2.96	↕ 3.22	↕ 3.38	↕ 3.49	↕ 3.05	54	
Boone	↕ 3.09	↘ 2.90	↕ 3.39	↕ 3.09	↕ 3.41	↕ 3.50	↕ 3.41	↕ 3.23	64	
Brentwood	↕ 3.16	↕ 3.13	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.12	↕ 3.26	↕ 3.18	↕ 3.25	↕ 3.18	51	
Brooke	↗ 2.85	↕ 3.24	↕ 3.18	↕ 3.01	↕ 3.22	↕ 3.17	↕ 3.38	↕ 3.10	51	
Brown	↗ 2.94	↘ 2.86	↕ 3.08	↘ 2.77	↕ 3.04	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.01	↘ 2.99	53	
Bryker Woods	↕ 3.61	↕ 3.30	↕ 3.69	↕ 3.56	↕ 3.70	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.45	↕ 3.55	40	
Campbell	↗ 2.93	↘ 2.52	↘ 2.97	↘ 2.97	↗ 2.95	↕ 3.20	↕ 3.03	↘ 2.92	39	
Casey	↘ 2.66	↘ 2.56	↕ 3.22	↗ 2.86	↕ 3.09	↕ 3.03	↕ 3.13	↘ 2.90	58	
Casis	↕ 3.67	↗ 3.41	↘ 3.58	↘ 3.44	↕ 3.52	↕ 3.36	↕ 3.43	↕ 3.50	53	
Clayton	↕ 3.54	↘ 2.86	↕ 3.19	↕ 3.35	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.45	↕ 3.11	↕ 3.27	72	
Cook	↘ 2.40	↕ 3.32	↗ 2.97	↘ 2.57	↗ 2.88	↘ 2.57	↗ 2.99	↘ 2.78	78	
Cowan	↕ 3.19	↕ 3.14	↕ 3.46	↕ 3.11	↕ 3.43	↕ 3.41	↕ 3.50	↕ 3.29	61	
Cunningham	↗ 2.92	↕ 3.41	↕ 3.26	↘ 2.98	↕ 3.24	↕ 3.10	↕ 3.28	↕ 3.14	57	
Davis	↕ 3.62	↕ 3.70	↕ 3.66	↕ 3.44	↕ 3.73	↕ 3.42	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.59	53	
Dawson	↗ 2.80	↕ 3.10	↕ 3.28	↕ 3.02	↕ 3.31	↕ 3.37	↕ 3.55	↕ 3.14	37	
Doss	↕ 3.64	↕ 3.63	↕ 3.66	↕ 3.40	↕ 3.63	↕ 3.38	↕ 3.60	↕ 3.56	57	
Galindo	↗ 2.95	↕ 3.38	↕ 3.33	↘ 2.97	↕ 3.42	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.16	↕ 3.21	59	
Govalle	↘ 2.50	↘ 2.57	↕ 3.19	↘ 2.48	↕ 3.05	↘ 2.44	↗ 2.83	↘ 2.71	39	
Graham	↗ 2.91	↕ 3.50	↕ 3.41	↕ 3.10	↕ 3.36	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.60	↕ 3.29	70	
Gullett	↕ 3.42	↘ 2.82	↕ 3.29	↕ 3.19	↕ 3.25	↕ 3.30	↕ 3.33	↕ 3.21	39	
Harris	↗ 2.87	↕ 3.14	↕ 3.28	↘ 2.92	↕ 3.26	↕ 3.17	↕ 3.15	↕ 3.11	57	
Hart	↗ 2.81	↕ 3.27	↕ 3.24	↗ 2.86	↕ 3.18	↕ 3.11	↕ 3.23	↕ 3.08	62	
Highland Park	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.42	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.42	↕ 3.47	↕ 3.39	↕ 3.63	↕ 3.43	73	
Hill	↕ 3.46	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.46	↕ 3.32	↕ 3.54	↕ 3.48	↕ 3.35	↕ 3.46	54	
Houston	↗ 2.78	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.19	↘ 2.78	↕ 3.19	↕ 3.02	↕ 3.13	↕ 3.12	78	
Jordan	↗ 2.85	↕ 3.39	↕ 3.18	↗ 2.92	↕ 3.21	↕ 3.04	↕ 3.39	↕ 3.10	52	
Joslin	↗ 2.88	↗ 3.00	↕ 3.26	↘ 2.96	↕ 3.22	↕ 3.37	↕ 3.48	↕ 3.12	42	
Kiker	↕ 3.74	↕ 3.60	↕ 3.77	↕ 3.50	↕ 3.77	↕ 3.51	↕ 3.61	↕ 3.65	38	
Kocurek	↘ 2.63	↘ 2.63	↕ 3.21	↘ 2.74	↕ 3.12	↕ 3.04	↘ 2.90	↘ 2.90	62	
Langford	↘ 2.33	↗ 2.68	↗ 2.98	↘ 2.46	↗ 2.91	↘ 2.43	↗ 2.82	↘ 2.63	71	
Lee	↕ 3.47	↘ 2.86	↕ 3.55	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.64	↕ 3.53	↕ 3.51	↕ 3.40	42	
Linder	↘ 2.40	↘ 2.93	↕ 3.11	↘ 2.69	↕ 3.06	↕ 3.16	↕ 3.11	↘ 2.89	36	
Lucy Read	↘ 2.57	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.92	↘ 2.95	↗ 2.94	↕ 3.57	↕ 3.33	↘ 2.97	58	
Maplewood	↕ 3.06	↘ 2.82	↕ 3.06	↘ 3.00	↕ 3.11	↕ 3.15	↕ 3.26	↕ 3.03	42	
Mathews	↕ 3.42	↕ 3.48	↕ 3.33	↕ 3.08	↕ 3.39	↕ 3.13	↕ 3.32	↕ 3.30	38	
McBee	↘ 2.56	↕ 3.01	↕ 3.04	↘ 2.72	↗ 2.94	↘ 2.95	↕ 3.03	↘ 2.88	73	
Menchaca	↘ 2.79	↘ 2.74	↗ 2.98	↘ 2.81	↕ 3.01	↕ 3.34	↕ 3.03	↘ 2.94	71	
Metz	↘ 2.55	↘ 2.93	↕ 3.13	↘ 2.87	↕ 3.19	↕ 3.33	↕ 3.32	↕ 3.00	59	
Mills	↕ 3.58	↕ 3.27	↕ 3.47	↕ 3.45	↕ 3.49	↕ 3.48	↕ 3.48	↕ 3.46	67	

Note: Arrows represent the desirability of the mean score: ↕=3.0 or above, ↗=2.75-3.0, ↘=2.5-2.75, ↘=below 2.5.

The +/- symbols indicate statistically meaningful increases or decreases from the previous school year.

Appendix A. Elementary Climate, Continued

School	Professional										# Surveys
	Community Engagement	Collegial Leadership	Teacher Behavior	Achievement Press	General Climate	Safety	Behavior Management	Overall Climate			
All EL	↘ 2.94	↑ 3.09	↑ 3.23	↘ 2.94	↑ 3.22	↑ 3.13	↑ 3.23	↑ 3.10	4,160		
Norman	↘ 2.80	↑ 3.54 +	↑ 3.17 +	↘ 2.90 +	↑ 3.19 +	↑ 3.16	↑ 3.52	↑ 3.13	43		
Oak Hill	↑ 3.26	↑ 3.28	↑ 3.36	↑ 3.16	↑ 3.35	↑ 3.45	↑ 3.55	↑ 3.31	63		
Oak Springs	↘ 2.57	↘ 2.78 -	↘ 2.98	↘ 2.51 -	↘ 2.94	↘ 2.70	↑ 3.05	↘ 2.77	43		
Odom	↘ 2.71	↑ 2.76 +	↑ 3.31	↘ 2.80	↑ 3.18	↘ 2.83	↑ 3.10	↘ 2.93	44		
Ortega	↘ 2.94	↑ 3.03 -	↑ 3.24 -	↘ 2.97	↑ 3.29 -	↑ 3.29	↑ 3.18	↑ 3.14	34		
Overton	↘ 2.98	↑ 3.33 +	↑ 3.26	↘ 2.98	↑ 3.30	↘ 2.93	↑ 3.20	↑ 3.13	69		
Palm	↘ 2.64	↘ 2.86	↑ 3.07	↘ 2.61	↑ 3.06	↘ 2.77	↑ 3.22	↘ 2.83	68		
Pease	↑ 3.48	↑ 3.42	↑ 3.51	↑ 3.35	↑ 3.50	↑ 3.43	↑ 3.50	↑ 3.44	26		
Pecan Springs	↓ 2.44	↓ 2.44 -	↑ 3.19	↘ 2.67	↑ 3.03	↘ 2.76	↘ 2.76	↘ 2.75	61		
Perez	↘ 2.84	↘ 2.91 +	↘ 2.84	↘ 2.78	↑ 2.87	↘ 2.99	↘ 2.83	↘ 2.88	81		
Pickle	↓ 2.41	↘ 2.51 -	↘ 2.56	↓ 2.43 -	↓ 2.45 -	↘ 2.78	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.52	59		
Pillow	↑ 3.47	↑ 3.59	↑ 3.62	↑ 3.28	↑ 3.73	↑ 3.49	↑ 3.78	↑ 3.53	52		
Pleasant Hill	↘ 2.73	↑ 3.14 +	↘ 2.98	↘ 2.65 +	↘ 2.87	↑ 3.15	↑ 3.20	↘ 2.92	64		
Reilly	↑ 3.00	↑ 3.29	↑ 3.42	↑ 3.08	↑ 3.43	↑ 3.53	↑ 3.61	↑ 3.28	44		
Ridgetop	↑ 3.20	↑ 3.61 +	↑ 3.53	↑ 3.03	↑ 3.55 +	↑ 3.23	↑ 3.40	↑ 3.36	25		
Rodriguez	↘ 2.56	↑ 3.09 +	↑ 3.15	↘ 2.71	↑ 3.18	↘ 2.72	↑ 3.14	↘ 2.91	85		
Sanchez	↘ 2.76	↑ 3.14	↘ 2.96	↘ 2.66	↘ 2.98	↑ 3.09	↑ 3.13	↘ 2.93	48		
Sims	↘ 2.62	↑ 3.12	↘ 2.96	↘ 2.67	↘ 2.95	↘ 2.76	↘ 2.81	↘ 2.90	45		
St. Elmo	↘ 2.84	↘ 3.00 +	↑ 3.33	↘ 2.91	↑ 3.29 +	↑ 3.48	↑ 3.58	↑ 3.14	37		
Summit	↑ 3.24	↑ 3.09 +	↑ 3.49	↑ 3.22	↑ 3.48	↑ 3.29	↑ 3.24	↑ 3.33	74		
Sunset Valley	↘ 2.78	↑ 3.47	↑ 3.31	↘ 2.89	↑ 3.31 +	↑ 3.20	↑ 3.27	↑ 3.16	37		
Travis Heights	↘ 2.85	↓ 2.47 +	↑ 3.10	↘ 2.77	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.64	↘ 2.75	↘ 2.80	55		
Walnut Creek	↓ 2.43	↘ 2.56 -	↘ 2.87	↓ 2.48 -	↘ 2.78 -	↘ 2.91	↘ 3.00	↘ 2.69	75		
Widen	↘ 2.86	↑ 3.15 +	↘ 2.99	↘ 2.67	↑ 3.02 +	↑ 2.81	↘ 2.99	↘ 2.93	59		
Williams	↑ 3.12	↑ 3.27 -	↑ 3.38	↑ 3.03	↑ 3.40	↑ 3.09	↑ 3.32	↑ 3.21	56		
Winn	↓ 2.49	↑ 3.20 +	↑ 3.03	↘ 2.62	↘ 2.90 +	↘ 2.76	↘ 2.95	↘ 2.83	38		
Wooldridge	↘ 2.85	↘ 2.77 +	↘ 2.92	↘ 2.76	↘ 3.00	↘ 2.86	↑ 3.07	↘ 2.86	66		
Wooten	↘ 2.80	↘ 2.90	↑ 3.08	↘ 2.67	↘ 2.96	↘ 2.83	↘ 2.97	↘ 2.87	59		
Zavala	↘ 2.92	↑ 3.41	↑ 3.36	↘ 2.96	↑ 3.50	↘ 2.74	↑ 3.04	↑ 3.16	34		
Zilker	↑ 3.31	↑ 3.28 +	↑ 3.40	↑ 3.26	↑ 3.37 +	↑ 3.39	↑ 3.30	↑ 3.33	45		

Note: Arrows represent the desirability of the mean score: ↑=3.0 or above, ↘=2.75-3.0, ↙=2.5-2.75
 ↓=below 2.5.

The +/- symbols indicate statistically meaningful increases or decreases from the previous school year.

Appendix B. Middle School Climate Scores by Campus

School	Professional							Overall Climate	# Surveys
	Community Engagement	Collegial Leadership	Teacher Behavior	Achievement Press	General Climate	Safety	Behavior Mangement		
All MS	↘ 2.74	↗ 2.97	↗ 3.11	↘ 2.66	↗ 3.11	↘ 2.42	↗ 2.91	↗ 2.83	1,322
Ann Richards	↗ 3.24	↗ 3.53	↗ 3.55	↗ 3.18	↗ 3.66 +	↗ 3.63	↗ 3.74	↗ 3.46	39
Bailey	↗ 3.19	↘ 2.84	↗ 3.29	↗ 3.19	↗ 3.09	↗ 3.15	↗ 3.19	↗ 3.12	92
Bedichek	↘ 2.53	↗ 3.02 -	↗ 3.17	↘ 2.63	↗ 3.18	↘ 2.57	↗ 3.18	↘ 2.85	93
Burnet	↘ 2.48	↗ 3.28	↗ 3.11	↘ 2.34	↗ 3.08	↘ 1.98	↘ 2.65	↘ 2.72	76
Covington	↘ 2.65	↗ 3.34	↗ 3.14	↘ 2.58	↗ 3.17 +	↘ 2.25	↗ 3.08	↘ 2.86	34
Dobie	↘ 2.35	↗ 3.13	↗ 3.08	↘ 2.70	↗ 3.19	↘ 2.62	↗ 3.14	↘ 2.84	47
Fulmore	↘ 2.70	↘ 2.59 -	↗ 3.10	↘ 2.68	↗ 3.14	↘ 2.35	↗ 2.94	↘ 2.77	68
Garcia	↘ 2.71	↘ 2.85	↗ 3.03	↘ 2.38 +	↗ 3.06 +	↘ 1.91	↘ 2.62	↘ 2.66	39
Kealing	↘ 2.65	↘ 2.97	↗ 3.00	↘ 2.65	↘ 2.92	↘ 1.88	↘ 2.51	↘ 2.67	95
Lamar	↘ 2.93	↗ 3.01 +	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.62	↗ 3.00 +	↘ 2.16	↘ 2.52	↘ 2.77	57
Martin	↘ 2.34	↗ 3.33 +	↗ 3.19	↘ 2.51 +	↗ 3.16 +	↘ 2.08	↘ 2.83	↘ 2.78	82
Mendez	↘ 2.43	↘ 2.69	↘ 2.98	↘ 2.33	↘ 2.92	↘ 2.40	↘ 2.83	↘ 2.62	116
Murchison	↗ 3.24	↘ 2.67 -	↗ 3.04	↗ 3.02	↗ 3.08	↘ 2.84	↗ 3.14	↘ 2.97	112
O. Henry	↗ 3.27	↗ 3.42 +	↗ 3.38 +	↘ 2.95	↗ 3.38 +	↘ 2.47	↗ 3.27	↗ 3.15	28
Paredes	↘ 2.62	↘ 2.99	↘ 2.90	↘ 2.52	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.48	↘ 2.81	↘ 2.73	98
Pearce	↘ 2.39	↘ 1.95 -	↘ 2.81	↘ 2.10	↘ 2.69	↘ 1.68	↘ 1.93	↘ 2.26	87
Small	↗ 3.05	↘ 2.97	↗ 3.27	↗ 3.02	↗ 3.22	↗ 3.04	↗ 3.30	↗ 3.10	124
Webb	↘ 2.54	↘ 2.90 -	↗ 3.04	↘ 2.44	↗ 3.16 +	↘ 2.07	↘ 2.66	↘ 2.69	35

Note: Arrows represent the desirability of the mean score: ↗=3.0 or above, ↘=2.75-3.0, ↙=2.5-2.75, ↘=below 2.5.
 The +/- symbols indicate statistically meaningful increases or decreases from the previous school year.

Appendix C. High School Climate Scores by Campus

School	Professional							Overall Climate	# Surveys
	Community Engagement	Collegial Leadership	Teacher Behavior	Achievement Press	General Climate	Safety	Behavior Mangement		
All HS	↘ 2.72	↘ 3.00	↗ 3.14	↘ 2.69	↗ 3.11	↘ 2.91	↘ 2.71	↘ 2.93	1,555
Akins	↘ 2.45	↘ 2.71	↘ 2.97	↘ 2.38	↘ 2.94	↘ 2.65	↘ 2.33	↘ 2.78	215
Anderson	↗ 3.25	↗ 3.26 +	↗ 3.15	↗ 3.04	↗ 3.19 +	↗ 3.13	↘ 2.78	↗ 3.07	154
Austin	↘ 2.97	↗ 3.02 +	↗ 3.06	↘ 2.77	↗ 3.06 +	↘ 2.93	↘ 2.59	↘ 2.72	203
Bowie	↗ 3.26	↘ 2.90 +	↗ 3.32	↘ 3.16	↗ 3.28	↗ 3.23	↗ 3.30	↗ 3.23	198
Crockett	↘ 2.33	↘ 2.87	↗ 3.11	↘ 2.41	↘ 2.97	↘ 2.69	↘ 2.36	↘ 2.77	107
Eastside	↘ 2.63	↘ 2.86	↗ 3.01	↘ 2.31	↘ 2.97	↘ 2.75	↘ 2.71	↘ 2.84	57
Garza	↘ 2.84	↗ 3.61 +	↗ 3.62	↗ 3.16	↗ 3.65	↗ 3.43	↗ 3.69	↗ 3.70	46
International	↘ 2.57	↗ 3.20 -	↗ 3.61	↘ 2.97	↗ 3.49	↗ 3.18	↗ 3.24	↗ 3.45	31
Lanier	↘ 2.35	↘ 2.90 +	↘ 2.92	↘ 2.38	↘ 2.92	↘ 2.69	↘ 2.61	↘ 2.74	103
LASA	↗ 3.25	↗ 3.06 +	↗ 3.30 +	↗ 3.33 +	↗ 3.20 +	↗ 3.25	↗ 3.34	↗ 3.45	45
LBJ	↘ 2.44	↘ 2.76	↘ 2.89	↘ 2.32	↘ 2.82	↘ 2.52	↘ 1.87	↘ 2.37	93
McCallum	↘ 2.96	↗ 3.34	↗ 3.15	↘ 2.81	↗ 3.18 +	↘ 2.98	↘ 2.39	↘ 2.89	100
Reagan	↘ 2.42	↘ 2.79 +	↘ 2.79	↘ 2.23	↘ 2.78 +	↘ 2.56	↘ 2.31	↘ 2.34	59
Travis	↘ 2.38	↘ 2.67 +	↗ 3.12	↘ 2.40 +	↗ 3.05	↘ 2.72	↘ 2.49	↘ 2.69	144

Note: Arrows represent the desirability of the mean score: ↗=3.0 or above, ↘=2.75-3.0, ↙=2.5-2.75, ↘=below 2.5.
 The +/- symbols indicate statistically meaningful increases or decreases from the previous school year.

REFERENCES

- Bush-Richards, A., Cornetto, K., & Schmitt, L. (2008). Summary of 2005-2006 through 2007-2008 AISD staff climate survey results (Publication 07.23). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District Department of Program Evaluation.
- Coe, R. (2000). What is an 'Effect Size'? A guide for users. Retrieved June 6, 2006, from Curriculum, Evaluation and Management Centre Web site:
<http://www.cemcentre.org/File/CEM%20Extra/EBE/ESguide.pdf>
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86, 38-49.
- Schmitt, L. (2006). E-Team Report: How does school climate relate to academic achievement in AISD, and what can we learn from these relationships? (DPE Publication No. 06.02). Austin, TX. Austin Independent School District Department of Program Evaluation.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate: The interplay between interpersonal relationships and student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386-415.
- Valentine, J.C. & Cooper, H. (2003). Effect size substantive interpretation guidelines: Issues in the interpretation of effect sizes. Washington, DC: What Works Clearinghouse.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Pascal D. Forgione, Jr., Ph.D.

OFFICE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Anne Ware, Ph.D.

DEPARTMENT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

Holly Williams, Ph.D.

AUTHORS

Amy Imes, Ph.D.

Lisa N. T. Schmitt, Ph.D.

Karen M. Cornetto, Ph.D.



BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Mark Williams, President

Vincent Torres, M.S. Vice President

Lori Moya, Secretary

Cheryl Bradley

Annette LoVoi, M.A.

Christine Brister

Robert Schneider

Karen Dulaney Smith

Sam Guzman

Publication Number 08.30

March 2009