



RETURNING MATERIALS:  
Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

<p>AUG 14 1998</p> <p>AUG 12 1998</p> <p>AUG 17 1998</p> <p>MAR 27 1998</p> <p>MAR 15 1998</p> <p>MAR 15 1998</p>		
---	--	--

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF AN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP  
TRAINING PROGRAM ON FIFTEEN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

By

David B. Chapin

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1988

5583032

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECT OF AN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP  
TRAINING PROGRAM ON FIFTEEN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

By

David B. Chapin

Throughout the 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86 school years the fifteen schools that participated in this study were involved in a leadership training program which was designed to improve the leadership capacity of elementary principals, and thus, to increase student achievement. The study was designed to analyze the schools involved in the program to determine the effect, if any, the program had on those schools. Connecticut Survey data and 4th Grade MEAP scores were collected and rank-ordered for each of the fifteen schools. Following the rank-ordering, on-site visitations took place at three schools showing an improving status, and three schools showing a non-improving status throughout the 1983 to 1986 time frame. A total of twenty-five individual interviews were conducted involving six principals, four central office administrators and fifteen teachers.

The data collection showed the following:

1. The training program did not have a significant impact on the test scores from the fifteen schools.

2. The Connecticut Survey shows a significant impact was made in the fifteen schools in three areas: clear school mission, instructional leadership, and high expectations for students.

3. A relationship does not exist between the MEAP scores and the Connecticut Survey results.

4. In three of the six visited schools the interviews showed the schools were consistent with their improving or non-improving status; in the other three schools inconsistencies between the quantitative and qualitative data were discovered.

5. School personnel attributed some or all of these outcomes to the training program:

- > Improved school-wide discipline.
- > Brighter, cleaner physical plant.
- > Improved communication within the school.
- > Staff meetings devoted to improvement of the instructional program.
- > Better feedback for teachers relative to their teaching and lesson planning.
- > More inservice training for teachers.
- > Formation of school improvement teams.
- > Development of mission statements and schools goals.
- > Development of systems for rewarding

students.

- > Better systems for monitoring student performance.
- > Development of grade level objectives and minimum standards.

6. School personnel cited these factors as impacting the implementation process:

- > Leadership of the building principal.
- > Amount of money budgeted for school improvement.
- > Amount of autonomy within each building.
- > Time.
- > Interest of the teaching staff.
- > Relevance.

This work is a tribute  
to the strength and devotion of my family.  
It is dedicated with love to  
Laurie, Andrew, Cari  
and my parents  
Richard and Eleanor

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to my advisor and committee chairman, Dr. Louis Romano, for his professional guidance and personal support throughout the writing of this dissertation. His helpful posture will long be remembered.

I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Lezotte, Dr. Brookover, and Dr. Suehr for their interest, support, and professionalism.

I would like to acknowledge the timely contributions of Dr. Muth, Dr. Joyce, Dr. Houang, and Dr. Rudman from the College of Education who assisted during my challenging and enriching journey through Michigan State University.

Special thanks are extended to Lynn Benore of the Middle Cities Association and Mel Billik of the Midland Public Schools for unique contributions to the research component of the dissertation.

I am grateful to my colleagues within the Midland Public Schools for their encouragement throughout the course of this project, and for the supportive posture of the district leadership. Thanks to Dr. Arthur Frock, Superintendent of Schools, and many others who helped to bring this dissertation to fruition.

A very special thank you is extended to the Plymouth

School family. You are indeed a great group of people.

Thanks to Becky Chapin, Bob Chapin, Eleanor and Jim Pinkham for your constant support and interest.

Finally, thank you Dorethy Ramseyer. You are a grand typist and great friend.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....vii

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Need for the Study.....	3
Scope of the Study.....	5
Overview.....	8
Endnotes.....	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	11
Introduction.....	11
Effective Schools Literature.....	11
Reactions to the Effective Schools Literature.....	17
Implementation Literature.....	20
Impact of Literature on the Study.....	27
Endnotes.....	29
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	31
Introduction.....	31
Participating Schools.....	32
Collection of Quantitative Data.....	34
Collection of Qualitative Data.....	54
Summary.....	58
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	60
Introduction.....	60
Analysis of Quantitative Data.....	60
Summary of Quantitative Data Analysis.....	71
Analysis of Qualitative Data.....	73
School 2.....	73
School 9.....	82



School 11.....	88
School 1.....	92
School 5.....	96
School 15.....	104
Summary.....	107

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS

Introduction.....	115
Summary.....	115
Conclusions.....	121
Recommendations For Research.....	126
Reflections.....	127

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	129
----------------------------	-----

APPENDICES.....	137
-----------------	-----

APPENDIX A Correspondence.....	137
--------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX B Connecticut School Interview.....	146
--	-----

APPENDIX C On-Site Interview Format.....	168
--	-----

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 1.....	38
2. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 2.....	39
3. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 3.....	40
4. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 4.....	41
5. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 5.....	42
6. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 6.....	43
7. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 7.....	44
8. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 8.....	45
9. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 9.....	46
10. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 10.....	47
11. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 11.....	48
12. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 12.....	49
13. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 13.....	50
14. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 14.....	51
15. QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 15.....	52
16. RANK ORDER OF QUANTITATIVE DATA.....	53
17. 12 SCHOOLS IN STUDY COMPARED TO STATE OF MICHIGAN CATEGORY 4 4TH GRADE MEAP SCORES .....	62
18. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGE IN CONNECTICUT SURVEY DATA AND MEAP SCORES FROM 1983 TO 1986.....	65
19. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGE IN CONNECTICUT SURVEY DATA AND 1983 MEAP SCORES.....	68

20. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CONNECTICUT SURVEY CORRELATES AND MEAP SCORES FROM 1983 TO 1986.....	69
21. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CONNECTICUT SURVEY CORRELATES AND 1983 MEAP SCORES.....	70

## I. THE PROBLEM

### INTRODUCTION

A great deal of research has taken place in recent years related to the effectiveness of individual schools in bringing about a high level of student achievement. This body of research, widely known as effective schools research, has gained widespread interest in the 1980's as school reform has surfaced as a major political issue. The effective schools literature theorizes that individual schools can indeed make a difference in the quality of education a child receives, and emphasizes the importance of the school principal in creating an improved school.<sup>1</sup>

The effective schools literature provides a research base for specific school improvement plans and has influenced training programs designed for educators who are interested in bringing about an improved school. One such program occurred during the 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86 school years and involved a total of seventy-eight Michigan elementary schools. The program, developed by the Middle Cities Association, was funded by grants from the Kellogg Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. The goal of

the training program was to improve the leadership capacity of elementary principals, and thus, to increase student achievement. In order to accomplish this goal the Middle Cities Association designed the training program to address 1) effective schools research and its implementation, 2) effective teaching research and its implementation, 3) the evaluation and supervision of instruction, and 4) factors critical to the implementation of a school improvement model.<sup>2</sup>

During the first year of the program only the principals from the representative schools participated in the training sessions. However, based on feedback from these principals, the second and third year of the program also included selected teachers from the participating schools. The format of the training program included dissemination of educational research findings and extensive direct participation in demonstrations, simulations, video-tape critiques, and supervised local district assistance.<sup>3</sup> There is a need to evaluate the leadership training program to determine its effectiveness in bringing about individual school improvement.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study was designed to analyze the schools involved in the Middle Cities Association leadership training

program to determine the effect, if any, the program had on the participating schools.

The following research questions were addressed:

1. What impact, if any, did the training program have within each of the participating schools?
2. What factors within each school setting, if any, encouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
3. What factors within each school setting, if any, discouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
4. Were there significant differences in the amount of change that took place between the participating schools?
5. If differences did exist, what specific differences were there between schools?

#### NEED FOR THE STUDY

The effective schools research theorizes that improvement in student achievement can be realized if certain conditions exist within the school setting. The leadership training program developed by the Middle Cities Association was an intermediate step between the theory and the actual practice of educating young people within a school setting. However, the long term impact of the training program on the participating schools has not



received any significant evaluation. This study evaluates the impact of the program for several reasons.

First, the goal of the training program was to increase student achievement within the participating schools. If this goal was achieved, then the implications for the future use of this training procedure are of interest to all school leaders. If the goal was not achieved, or achieved on a limited basis (e.g. in some schools, or in some classrooms), a thorough analysis of those factors which served to effect the goal would be beneficial for all participants and for future programming.

Second, the allocation of funds for educational purposes is an issue of paramount importance to school personnel. If this study were to show that specific gains were made by participating schools, then it is possible the study could be used to justify funds for future programs.

Third, there exists potential within the field of education for agencies such as the Middle Cities Association to develop training programs which create a fusion between researchers and practitioners. An analysis of the participating schools to determine the long term influence of the program serves to strengthen the relationship and increase the dialogue between the two.

Fourth, time is a critical resource in solving problems within today's school setting. The participating principals and teachers contributed a great deal of personal time to engage themselves in the leadership

training program. It is necessary to investigate the participating schools, and analyze the result of the study, so that in the future prospective participants can determine if the end-result justified the investment of time.

And, fifth, in a more general sense there exists the possibility the study will identify the importance of certain conditions which bring about change within a school setting. Findings related to the change process are potentially useful to all educators, no matter what specific issue, program, or idea is being introduced.

#### SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Although the design of the study is discussed in detail in the third chapter, there are factors related to the scope of the study that need to be identified at the outset. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected and used in the development of significant findings and the formation of conclusions. Specifically, standardized test scores and the Connecticut School Interview composed the quantitative component of the data; on-site interviews with school personnel, informal observations within schools, and the collection of documents served as the basis for the qualitative data.

The following assumptions were made for the study:

1. That the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) and other standardized test data used by the participating schools are accurate measures of school-wide student achievement.
2. That the Connecticut School Interview is an accurate measure of staff perceptions and attitudes.
3. That the on-site interviews generated honest, candid responses from all respondents.

Several factors served to limit the breadth of the project. These factors were as follows:

1. The study involved only schools that participated in the Middle Cities Association Leadership Training Program.
2. The study involved only schools that agreed to participate in the study. Agreement to participate was secured through the building principal.
3. The schools involved in the study were all elementary schools within the state of Michigan.

Several key terms and phrases were used throughout the study and will appear frequently within the context of these pages. For the purpose of this study, these terms and phrases are defined as follows:

Participating principal. The administrator within each participating school who was most actively involved in the inservice training and subsequent implementation. In most cases this person was the school principal. In some cases this role was carried out by an assistant principal.

Participating teacher. The teacher within each participating school who was invited by their school district's administration to be an active

participant in the training program during the 1984-85 and 1985-86 school years.

Other staff members in participating schools.

The staff members within each participating school who were not actively involved in the inservice training during the 1984-85 and 1985-86 school years, but were randomly selected to participate in the on-site interviews detailed in Chapters 3 and 4.

Effective schools research. The body of research cited by Dr. Lawrence Lezotte in one of the first sessions of the training program. Specifically, Dr. Lezotte refers to seven correlates which are in evidence in effective schools. These correlates are: frequent monitoring of pupil progress, clear and focused school goals, positive home-school relationships, safe and orderly environment, principal as instructional leader, high expectations for all students, and high levels of time on task.<sup>4</sup> These correlates will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 2.

Middle Cities Association. An association of twenty-five public school districts in the state of Michigan. The association serves its member districts in four general areas: legislative services, task force services, support services, and research and development.<sup>5</sup>

Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP).

The standardized testing program conducted in all 4th grade classrooms within the state of Michigan on an annual basis. The testing program extracts information from students, and subsequently schools, in two distinct disciplines - math and reading. The program is criterion-referenced.

Connecticut School Interview (Connecticut Survey).

A 73-question survey instrument used to determine the attitudes and perceptions of school staff members. The survey is subdivided into seven distinct categories: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, time on task, monitoring pupil performance, and home-school relations.

## OVERVIEW

This first chapter has been designed primarily to clearly define the specific problem being studied. It is also the intent to discuss the need for the study and to clarify the specifics of the project. The chapters which follow will simply follow the basic structure which has been composed in this first chapter.

A review of the pertinent literature will be the focus of the second chapter. The chapter will be devoted to researching the effective schools literature, the responses to the effective schools literature, the change literature, and then will conclude with a summary of relevant findings. The past studies and research which are summarized in Chapter 2 provide valuable input in the establishment of a plan for the collection of data, and the development of sound hypotheses.

The research design will be detailed in Chapter 3. Specific information relative to quantitative data collection, qualitative data collection, and instrumentation will be provided in this section.

The fourth Chapter will be devoted to a presentation of all of the collected data. The presentation of data will be categorized in two major areas: quantitative data and qualitative data.

The final chapter will draw from the collected data,

the hypotheses, and the literature review, and will address pertinent conclusions from the study. The chapter will deal with anticipated conclusions, unanticipated conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

## ENDNOTES

1. Lezotte, Lawrence W. Effective Schools Research and School Improvement Implications. Paper presented at the Invitational National Conference of Citizens Participation for School Improvement, St. Louis, 1982, p. 6.
2. Benore, Lynn. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/Middle Cities Education Association Project on Educational Leadership Training for Elementary Principals Year II Report. Michigan State University, 1985, p. 1-2.
3. Ibid. p. 3.
4. Benore, Lynn. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/Middle Cities Education Association Project on Educational Leadership Training for Elementary Principals Year I Report. Michigan State University, 1984, p. 4.
5. Muth, C. Robert. Middle Cities Association 1985 Annual Report. Michigan State university, 1985, p. 4.

## II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

### INTRODUCTION

The intent of this chapter is to highlight the literature, research, and dialogue which served to influence this study. As noted in Chapter I, the study has its origin in the effective schools research. Consequently the review of the pertinent literature begins with a summary of the key studies which have impacted this body of research. A review of the discussion which has followed in the wake of the effective schools literature and a summary of the implementation literature are also important components of this chapter. The chapter concludes with the key points from the literature and their direct impact on the structuring of the study.

### EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS LITERATURE

This study is based on the premise that it is possible for there to be noticeable differences from one school to another, and from one school district to another. The research which addresses this premise is loosely entitled "Effective Schools Literature." The studies that have



contributed to this literature have slightly different findings, but they are bound by a common theme: some schools are more effective than others in facilitating student achievement. The effective schools literature focuses on the reasons for this, and analyzes the characteristics of those schools which are the most effective in facilitating student achievement. The following studies address the issue of school effectiveness.

#### WEBER STUDY, 1971

George Weber developed a study in 1971 around the hypothesis that some inner-city schools exist in the United States where reading achievement is higher than in most inner-city schools. His study, entitled Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools, focused on four high-achieving inner-city elementary schools. Weber concluded:

"Reading achievement in the early grades in almost all inner-city schools is both relatively and absolutely low. This project has identified four notable exceptions. Their success shows that the failure in beginning reading typical of inner-city schools is the fault not of the children or their background -- but of the schools. None of the successes was achieved overnight; they required from three to nine years. The factors that seem to account for the success of the four schools are strong

leadership, high expectations, good atmosphere, strong emphasis on reading, additional reading personnel, use of phonics, individualization, and careful evaluation of pupil progress. On the other hand, some characteristics often thought of as important to school improvement were not essential to the success of the four schools: small class size, achievement grouping, high quality of teaching, school personnel of the same ethnic background as the pupils', preschool education, and outstanding physical facilities.<sup>1</sup>"

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS STUDY: STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 1976

In the mid-1970's J. V. Madden coordinated a study of 21 pairs of elementary schools in the state of California. The schools were matched on the basis of pupil characteristics, but differed on standardized achievement measures. Madden identified five factors that seemed to differentiate effective from less effective schools. In more effective schools:

"1. teachers reported receiving significantly more support; 2. there was an atmosphere conducive to learning; 3. the principal had more impact on educational decision-making; 4. there was more evidence of pupil progress monitoring; and 5. there was more emphasis on achievement."<sup>2</sup>"

BROOKOVER, SCHOOLS CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE, 1977

Wilbur Brookover and his colleagues Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, and Joe Wisenbaker investigated 91 public elementary schools in Michigan in

1977 and concluded that schools can make a difference in what students learn. Brookover et al. specify this statement as follows:

"Our data indicate that high achieving schools are most likely to be characterized by the students' feeling that they have control over their mastery of the academic work and the school system is not stacked against them. This is expressed in their feelings that what they do may make a difference in their success and that teachers care about their academic performance. Teachers and principals in higher achieving schools express the belief that students can master their academic work, they expect them to do so, and they are committed to seeing that their students learn to read, do mathematics and other academic work. These teacher and principal expectations are expressed in such a way that the students perceive that they are expected to learn and the school academic norms are recognized as setting a standard of high achievement. These norms and teacher's commitment are expressed in the instructional activities which absorb most of the school day. There is little differentiation among students or the instructional programs provided for them. Teachers consistently reward students for their demonstrated achievement in the academic subjects and do not indiscriminately reward students for responding regardless of the correctness of their response.

"In contrast, the schools that are achieving at lower levels are characterized by the students' feelings of futility in regard to their academic performance. This futility is expressed in their belief that the system functions in such a way that they cannot achieve, that teachers are not committed to their high achievement, and that other students will make fun of them if they actually try to achieve. These feelings of futility are associated with lower teacher evaluations of their ability and low expectations on the part of teachers and principals. The norms of achievement as perceived by the students and the teachers are low. Since little is expected and teachers and principals believe that students are not likely to learn at a high level, they devote less time to instructional activity,

write off a large proportion of students as unable to learn, differentiate extensively among them and are likely to praise students for poor achievement.

"These characteristics of low achieving schools are more frequently found in schools whose student bodies are black and/or poor. The exceptions to this rule, however, demonstrate that high achievement is possible in schools composed of minority or poor white students. In such schools the climate is much like that of the high achieving schools.<sup>3</sup>"

RUTTER, FIFTEEN THOUSAND HOURS, 1979

During a four year period prior to 1979 Michael Rutter, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore, and Janet Ouston studied twelve London secondary schools in an effort to answer these questions: Do a child's experiences at school have any effect on the child; does it matter to which school he goes; and which are the features of school that matter? The major, pertinent conclusions follow:

"Although schools differed in the proportion of behaviourally difficult or low achieving children they admitted, these differences did not wholly account for the variations between schools in their pupils' later behaviour and attainment. Even when comparisons between schools were restricted to children who were quite similar in family background and personal characteristics prior to secondary transfer, marked school variations remained.<sup>4</sup>"

And,

"The differences between schools in outcome were systematically related to their characteristics as social institutions. Factors as varied as the

degree of academic emphasis, teacher actions in lessons, the availability of incentives and rewards, good conditions to take responsibility were all significantly associated with outcome differences between schools. All of these factors were open to modification by the staff, rather than fixed by external constraints.<sup>5</sup>"

EDMONDS, 1979

Ronald Edmonds was a visible advocate of the "schools make a difference" philosophy. His study, done in conjunction with John Frederickson in 1979, involved more than 11,000 pupils in the Lansing, Michigan Public Schools. The findings from this study produced the following characteristics of effective schools:

"1. The principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction; 2. a pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus; 3. an orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning; 4. teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to obtain at least minimum mastery; and 5. the use of measures of pupil achievement as the basis for program evaluation.<sup>6</sup>"

#### OTHER STUDIES

Additional, similar studies have been conducted and their results have been disseminated in recent years.

Michael Cohen writes:

"A number of Effective Schools studies suggest that differences in effectiveness among schools, defined in terms of student performance on tests of basic skills, can be accounted for by the following five factors:

1. Strong administrative leadership by the school principal, especially in regard to instructional matters;
2. A school climate conducive to learning; i.e., a safe and orderly school free of discipline and vandalism problems;
3. School-wide emphasis on basic skills instruction, which entails agreement among the professional staff that instruction in the basic skills is the primary goal of the school;
4. Teacher expectations that students can reach high levels of achievement, regardless of pupil background; and
5. A system for monitoring and assessing pupil performance which is tied to instructional objective.<sup>7</sup>"

#### REACTIONS TO THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS LITERATURE

Research on what makes a school effective has drawn a great deal of attention. School improvement models have been created based on the effective schools research; the research has prompted statewide legislation in some states; and inservice programs, similar to the Middle Cities/Kellogg Foundation educational leadership training program, have been developed<sup>8</sup>. The furor of activity has stimulated a good deal of discussion relative to the merits of the effective schools literature. A review of the following critiques is an important part of the total understanding of the effective schools research, and it also provides some key insights into the actual implementation of this research relative to the individual

schools participating in the Middle Cities/Kellogg Foundation Educational Leadership Training Program.

PURKEY AND SMITH, 1982

Stewart Purkey and Marshall Smith responded to the "effective schools research" in the December, 1982 issues of Educational Leadership. Their thoughts are:

"Specific criticisms of particular studies and methodologies notwithstanding, and disregarding a number of inconsistencies in findings, there remains an intuitive logic to the results of the research. Flaws in the original research should not discredit the notion of discovering effective school characteristics -- seeds for school improvement that can be sown elsewhere. However, blanket acceptance would be dangerous.

"For example, there has been no systematic sampling of different types of schools. The existing research tends to concentrate on urban elementary schools with successful reading and/or math programs in the lower grades. Given that, the generalizability of the research is limited. There is also a dearth of longitudinal studies. It is not clear that the reading scores of a third-grade class in an effective school will look the same when the class is in the sixth or eighth grade. Similarly, it seems reasonable and prudent to expect an effective school to have been so historically before raising the banner of success over its doors.

"Finally, the implicit assumption of many reviews of the literature and the press seems to be that once aware of a set of 5 -- or 7 or 12 -- key features, schools can simply decide to adopt them. Even if these 'easy-to-assemble model' features were necessary for effective schools, they would not be sufficient. In fact, current theories of school organization suggest that

there are structural and procedural characteristics of schools that militate against this sort of top-down change.<sup>9</sup>"

CUBAN, 1984

Larry Cuban formulated the following thoughts in the May, 1984 issue of the Harvard Educational Review:

"Several problems with the research on and practices in effective schools have already become evident.

"No one knows how to grow effective schools. None of the richly detailed descriptions of high performers can serve as a blueprint for teachers, principals, or superintendents who seek to improve academic achievement. Constructing a positive, enduring school climate remains beyond the planner's pen. Telling principals what to say and do in order to boost teacher expectations of students or to renovate a marginal faculty into one with esprit de corps remains beyond the current expertise of superintendents or professors. Road signs exist, but no maps are yet for sale.

"There is no agreement on definitions. Half a dozen methodologically identical studies have produced as many different definitions of effectiveness. The concept of 'climate' varies with the researcher and practitioner using it. Moreover, some feel that the term 'leadership' is undefinable. 'Instructional leadership,' for some, resides in the role of principal; for others, in the teaching staff; and for others, it is beyond definition.

"The concept of effectiveness is too narrow. Tied narrowly to test scores in lower-order math and reading skills, school effectiveness research and programs ignore many skills, habits, and attitudes beyond the research of paper-and-pencil tests. Educators and parents prize other outcomes of schooling that transcend current



definitions of effectiveness. Some of these outcomes are sharing, learning to make decisions, developing self-esteem, higher-order thinking skills, and a sense of the aesthetic.

"Research methodologies leave much to be desired. Most of the studies that use multiple variables and regression models of analysis have failed to control for school populations and previous history of achievement. Furthermore, because many studies are done on 'outliers,' generalizing to the larger population of mainstream sites is, at best, risky.

"Most research has been limited to elementary schools. With a few exceptions, effective schools research has occurred in the lower elementary grades. Junior and senior high schools are organizationally and culturally quite different from the lower grades.

"Little attention is directed to the role of district leadership. Concentration upon the local school site and the principal's leadership dominates the research. This implicitly ignores the pivotal role that school boards and superintendents play in mobilizing limited resources, giving legitimacy to a reform effort and the crucial interplay between central office and school site that can spell the difference between implementation success and failure.<sup>10</sup>"

#### IMPLEMENTATION LITERATURE

The Middle Cities/Kellogg Foundation Educational Leadership Training Program was developed in direct relationship to the ideas and concepts emulating from the effective schools literature. The inservice program, and others like it, was designed to encourage the implementation of techniques that would allow for an emphasis on the following: safe and orderly environment,

clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, time on task, monitoring pupil performance, home-school relations<sup>11</sup>. Therefore, it becomes necessary to review not only these correlates, but also the factors which are influential in the success or failure of their implementation. Following are several viewpoints relative to the implementation process.

CORBETT, DAWSON, AND FIRESTONE, 1984

In 1984 H. Dickson Corbett, Judith Dawson, and William Firestone published a book entitled, School Context and School Change. Their book addresses change within the school setting and the role of the internal school conditions in bringing about change. They write:

"These conditions are likely to affect any school change project. They are already present in a school when a particular project begins (although they certainly can be subsequently altered). Eight local school conditions helped shape the change process and outcomes at the 14 schools studied. They are discussed in the order of the magnitude of their effects on the projects. The conditions are 1) the availability of school resources; 2) the availability and nature of incentives and disincentives for innovative behavior; 3) the nature of a school's linkage; 4) existing school goals and priorities; 5) the nature and extent of faculty factions and tensions; 6) turnover in key administrative and faculty positions; 7) the nature of knowledge use and current instructional and administrative practices; and 8) the prior history of change projects.<sup>12</sup>"

HUBERMAN AND MILES, 1984

In the early 1980's Michael Huberman and Matthew Miles conducted an extensive research project which focused on school improvement projects being implemented in a number of different settings. Their book entitled, Innovation Up Close How School Improvement Works, reports on twelve specific efforts to improve schools. The twelve specific sites were chosen from a larger sample of 146 schools studies by survey methods. Their findings are summarized as follows:

"Educational innovations appeared to be adopted or developed in districts with reasonable environmental stability and at least a 'moderate' past interest in new programs. . . Much of the district-level dynamism for school improvement came from the central office administrators, often coordinators of assistant superintendents for curriculum and instruction, who kept their eyes open for promising practices outside the district or energetically promoted a local product.

"The innovations were adopted as the result of multiple, sometimes tangled, motives. . . There was less user interest in innovation-specific benefits than in second-order rewards. In roughly half the cases, the incentives for adoption were tied up with career plans for moving in, over, up, or away or, alternatively, for consolidating one's position. In the later phases of these innovations, too many career-driven incentives crippled a project, but too few deprived it of the necessary energy to follow through to stable continuation.

". . . innovations posed problems initially for their target users, who sized them up as complex,

hard to do, unclear, and flexible -- sometimes too flexible. The classroom fit was seen as only fair; the users felt the new practice would make demands calling for substantial changes in the ways they managed their yearly work. By contrast, most of the administrators saw the practice initially as relatively simple, straightforward, and manageable, and they anticipated that varying amounts of organizational change would result from adoption.

"Initial use was nearly always rough; few sites experienced a smooth early period. In terms of desirable outcomes, smooth early use was a bad sign. Smoothly implementing sites seemed to get that way by reducing the initial scale of the project and by lowering the gradient of actual practice change. This 'downsizing' got rid of most headaches during the initial implementation but also threw away most of the potential rewards; the project often turned into a modest, sometimes trivial, enterprise.

"Large-scale, change-bearing innovations lived or died by the amount and quality of assistance that their users received once the change process was under way.

"As the new practices were executed, they were modified. From the moment of initial use to the end of data collection, over half of the sites changed from one-third to two-thirds of the core components of the innovation-as-designed, by variously reducing them, adding to them, or reconfiguring them; the main trend was toward attrition. Whether and how much an innovation was changed depended on the intensity of the demands it made locally and, in response to that intensity, on the micropolitics of the schools.

"In the course of consolidating a new practice, there were often substantial and widespread changes in the users' practices and attitudes: changes in everyday classroom routines and expansion of instructional repertoires, changes in interpersonal ties, cognitive growth, shifts in attitudes toward pupils or peers, shifts in professional self-image, and transfers of innovation-specific skills to other parts of the user's practice.

"The innovations . . . studied did not seem, in the main, to bring about many organizational

changes beyond those associated with introducing and institutionalizing the new practice itself.

"Gradually the users and their innovations settled down. Firm practice mastery usually came within 18 months in the case of the complex projects, and within six months in the case of the 'downsized' innovations.

"An important objective in the innovation process was extending a new practice to the full pool of eligible users in the school and district or, alternatively, achieving full use for a specific target group. Most sites came out with at least moderate levels of local diffusion. They did it essentially by maintaining administrative pressure on users during implementation while furnishing within-building and district-to-building assistance that, in turn, led to stronger user commitment, user mastery, and impact on students. Administrative pressure by itself -- the administrator as thug -- got nowhere; the users remained uncommitted, minimally skillful, and locked into a teacher-administrator disharmony that eventually did the project in.

"The innovations were meant, in the first instance, to enhance pupils' performance and performance-related attitudes. It is clear that both externally developed and locally developed innovations could achieve such gains. The evidence here is compelling, if not fully robust, that the impacts were substantial at about half our sites and moderate at several others. The higher-impact sites got there in one of two ways: via 'stabilized mastery' (strong user commitment, fed by good assistance leading to practice mastery and stabilization of use) or via 'enforcement' (administrative pressure, leavened by good district-to-school assistance, and little latitude given users to make changes in the innovation). By contrast, low student impact resulted from low user commitment and/or 'program-blunting,' that is taking out the more ambitious or demanding components and thereby trivializing the potential effects.

"Strong institutionalization seemed to require some administrative pressure, lack of serious local resistance, and at least minimal teacher-administrator harmony. It also thrived on staff and leadership stability, organizational

transformations that rooted the new practice in local structures and procedures, and levels of assistance adequate to bring about stabilized use by a large percentage of the eligible users<sup>13</sup>."

MILLER, SAYRE, TINSLEY, 1984

Stephen Miller, Kathleen Sayre, and Deanna Tinsley writing in the Spring, 1984 Teacher Educator state:

"Unless specific times are committed to an innovation and closely monitored for adherence, the concepts and ideas introduced during a general inservice at the beginning of the year will never take the place of the old ways of doing things, no matter how effective the original inservice is in creating ownership. Schools or districts that fail to allow or enforce adequate time for learning social skills consistent with an innovation create conditions that have virtually no change of achieving effective change.

"Role overload becomes a real danger to any innovation. Saddled with too many tasks or simply the responsibility of teaching a full load, teachers and principals will fall back on 'tried and true' techniques<sup>14</sup>."

FULLAN, 1985

Michael Fullan reviewed several studies on the implementation process within the school setting in the January, 1985 issue of The Elementary School Journal. He summarizes as follows:

"1) change takes place over time; 2) the initial stages of any significant change always involve anxiety and uncertainty; 3) ongoing technical assistance and psychological support assistance are crucial if the anxiety is to be coped with; 4) change involves learning new skills through practice and feedback -- it is incremental and developmental; 5) the most fundamental breakthrough occurs when people can cognitively understand the underlying conception and rationale with respect to 'why this works better'; 6) organizational conditions within the school (peer norms, administrative leadership) and in relation to the school (e.g. external administrative support and technical help) make it more or less likely that the process will succeed; and 7) successful change involves pressure, but it is pressure through interaction with peers and other technical and administrative leaders<sup>15</sup>."

SIROTNIK, 1985

Kenneth Sirotnik has briefly analyzed the effective schools literature and the implementation of the espoused concepts in the Spring, 1985 Educational Administration Quarterly. In summary, his major contention is:

"But the chances for success increase substantially when people who spend their daily work life in schools are involved from the beginning, when they have the opportunity to relate to their own successes and failures from their own points of reference, when they can examine new knowledge in light of their own beliefs and practices . . . And they must be provided the support -- resources and time -- to engage in this activity<sup>16</sup>."

IMPACT OF LITERATURE ON THE STUDY

Although the specific design of the study is detailed in Chapter III, it is helpful to pinpoint the influence of the earlier studies. First, the work done by Weber, Madden, Brookover, Rutter, Edmonds, and others confirm that differences do exist within elementary school settings and that some schools are more effective than others in facilitating student achievement. This research provides the basic frame of reference for the entire study. In fact, the identified characteristics of the more effective schools were used in designing the interview instrument for the on-site component of the study. The characteristics of effective schools also influenced the design of the Connecticut Survey Instrument which was used to extract perceptions from the staff members of the schools that were participants in the study.

Second, the work done by Purkey, Smith, Cuban, Corbett, Dawson, Firestone, Huberman, Miles, Miller, Sayre, Tinsley, Fullan, and Sirotnik helped focus the study on areas within the school setting that worked to facilitate or hinder the implementation process. The influence of their studies surfaced in establishing a direction for the statistical analysis of the quantitative data, and also during the on-site interview process.

Let this study add to the literature that reveals some



schools and some conditions do exist that create a better opportunity for student learning.

## ENDNOTES

1. Weber, George. Inner-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington D.C., 1971, p. 2.
2. Ibid. p. 30.
3. Sweeney, James. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership, February, 1982, p. 347.
4. Brookover, Wilbur, et al. Schools Can Make A Difference. Michigan State University, 1977, p. 240.
5. Ibid. p. 234-236.
6. Rutter, Michael, et al. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge, 1979, p. 177-78.
7. Ibid. p. 178
8. Edmonds, Ronald R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, p. 4.
9. Cohen, Michael. "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings." American Education, January-February, 1982, p. 15.
10. See for example: Evans, Robert W. "One State's Approach: Ohio's Effective School Program." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, p. 74-76.
11. Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, p. 66-67.
12. Cuban, Larry. "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level." Harvard Educational Review, May, 1984, p. 131-132.
13. Lezotte, Lawrence W. Effective Schools Research and School Improvement Implications. Paper presented at the Invitational National Conference of Citizens Participation for School Improvement, St. Louis, 1982, p. 4-5.

14. Corbett, H. Dickson; Dawson, Judith A.; and Firestone, William A. School Context and School Change. New York, 1984, p. 5-6.
15. Huberman, A. Michael and Miles, Matthew B. Innovation Up Close. New York, 1984, p. 271-277.
16. Miller, Stephen K.; Sayre, Kathleen A.; Tinsley, Deanna S. "Effective Schools and Educational Change: Implications for Teacher Educators." The Teacher Educator. Spring, 1984, p. 9.
17. Fullan, Michael. "Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level." The Elementary School Journal. January, 1985, p. 396.
18. Sirotnik, Kenneth A. "School Effectiveness: A Bandwagon in Search of a Tune." Educational Administration Quarterly. Spring, 1985, p. 138:139.

### III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY

#### INTRODUCTION

The study is designed to determine the impact the Middle Cities/Kellogg Foundation Educational Leadership Training Program had on fifteen elementary schools in the state of Michigan. In order to address this issue the following research questions are posed:

1. What impact, if any, did the training program have within each of the participating schools?
2. What factors within each school setting, if any, encouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
3. What factors within each school setting, if any, discouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
4. Were there significant differences in the amount of change that took place between the participating schools?
5. If differences did exist, what specific differences were there between schools?

The study is an effort to provide thorough, insightful, and useful answers to the research questions. The following chapter will discuss the plan used to answer these

questions, the schools that participated in the study, and the methodology used in collecting data from the schools.

#### PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

As noted in Chapter I, seventy-eight Michigan elementary schools participated in the Middle Cities Association/Kellogg Foundation Educational Leadership Program in 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86. Thus, the first step in this study was to communicate with the seventy-eight schools in order to seek their permission to conduct the study. The process began through conversations with the Middle Cities Association staff in which their support of the study was solicited and their assistance in procuring permission from the schools was sought. The Middle Cities Association proved to be very supportive and the conversations resulted in a memorandum being sent to the principals of the seventy-eight schools seeking their consent to "allow researchers from outside the Middle Cities project staff access to information sent in by your school and on file at the Middle Cities office." This memorandum was sent from Dr. C. Robert Muth, Executive Director of the Middle Cities Association, and Dr. Lawrence Lezotte, Project Director of the Educational Leadership Training Program. (See Appendix A).

After receiving and tabulating the responses to this

memorandum, a second letter was sent to those schools who responded in the affirmative. The second letter notified the building principals of the specific information which was going to be used in the study, informed the principals of the possibility of an on-site interview, and again asked the principals to return a signed consent form. A copy of the second letter is also included in Appendix A.

The final step involved in identifying the participating schools necessitated taking a look at the Middle Cities Association files for each of the consenting schools to determine which schools had filed complete results from the Connecticut School Interview. The study was aimed toward schools that had completed and filed a Connecticut School Interview at the beginning of the leadership training program in 1983-84 and had also completed and filed Connecticut School Interview results at the end of the program in 1985-86.

The process of securing schools that had filed consenting responses to both of the aforementioned memos, and had completed and filed the pre and post Connecticut School Interview pared the group of schools participating in the study from seventy-eight to fifteen.

Throughout the correspondence with the schools the issue of confidentiality was clearly discussed and defined. The statement made in writing was, "No reference will be made to names of schools or school districts, rather schools will be referred to as 'School A,' 'School B,' etc.

Confidentiality was maintained for the participating schools throughout the study.

#### COLLECTION OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

The quantitative data collected for the study was divided into two parts: 1) Connecticut School Interview Data and 2) Standardized Test Score Data.

#### CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW

The Connecticut School Interview (Connecticut Survey) was originally developed by Robert M. Villanova and was intended for use with the Connecticut State Department of Education. The Connecticut School interview was revised in 1983 by Lawrence Lezotte and Ronald Edmonds and has been used to assist school personnel in determining their school's effectiveness. The Lezotte-Edmonds revised Connecticut Survey, Elementary School Form, is a 73-question survey instrument which is subdivided into seven categories: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, time on task, monitoring pupil performance, and home-school relations. Each question asks the respondent to express their opinion on a five point scale

(5 being a favorable opinion, 1 being a non-favorable opinion). The survey was administered to personnel at the fifteen schools participating in this study at the outset of the leadership training program in 1983-84 and at the conclusion of the program in 1985-86. The results of the survey are detailed in Tables 1 through 15 within this chapter. A copy of the revised Connecticut School Interview is included in Appendix B.

The Connecticut Survey was selected for use with this study for four reasons. First, the survey was administered within all of the participating schools at the beginning and end of the leadership program. Consequently, the results offered valuable insights relative to staff perceptions of their school at two critical stages of the leadership program. Second, the Connecticut Survey is a proven, field-tested instrument. During the planning stages of the study, consideration was given to creating an original survey instrument for the purpose of eliciting staff perceptions and attitudes. This idea was disregarded in favor of the field-tested Connecticut Survey. Third, the seven subcategories of the Connecticut Survey address issues which are relevant to the research questions posed in this study. And, fourth the Connecticut Survey data was available for use with this study following the procurement of permission from the participating schools.



## STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA

As the literature review attests, student outcomes as measured by standardized test score data is important input in determining the level of a school's effectiveness. This study would be incomplete without assessing the test score data from the fifteen participating schools. Therefore, test results were collected and organized for the four year period from 1983 until 1986 for each of the schools.

For purposes of comparing schools, it would have been ideal to use the same standardized test data for all fifteen schools. Based on this ideal the study was designed to use the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) as the single test data to be collected. The MEAP is administered to all 4th, 7th, and 10th grade students in the state of Michigan on an annual basis. The test is criterion-referenced and questions students in math and reading. Student scores are categorized in four levels (category 4 is the highest, category 1 is the lowest). School scores are generated in terms of percentage of students in category 1, percentage of students in category 2, percentage of students in category 3, and percentage of students in category 4.

Due to the fact that three of the fifteen schools in the study are K-3 schools, the MEAP results were only available for twelve of the schools. Thus, the 4th grade MEAP data was used for twelve schools, the Iowa Test of

Basic Skills was used for two schools, and no test score data was available for the third K-3 school. The information gained through the collection of test score results is displayed in Tables 1 through 15.

A statistical analysis of the quantifiable data is presented in Chapter IV.

TABLE 1  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 1

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>	
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	4.1	3.6	-0.5
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.8	3.5	-0.3
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.8	3.8	0.0
High expectations . . . . .	3.9	3.8	-0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.3	3.3	0.0
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	3.7	3.9	+0.2
Home-school relations. . . . .	4.1	3.8	-0.3
TOTAL . . . . .	26.7	25.7	-1.0

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4th GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	70.0	90.0
1984 . . . . .	97.1	94.1
1985 . . . . .	75.8	84.8
1986 . . . . .	85.1	76.6

TABLE 2  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 2

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>	
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.9	4.1	+0.2
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.5	4.2	+0.7
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.8	4.1	+0.3
High expectations. . . . .	3.2	4.0	+0.8
Time on task . . . . .	3.7	4.2	+0.5
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.1	4.5	+0.4
Home-school relations . . . . .	3.5	3.6	+0.1
TOTAL . . . . .	25.7	28.7	+3.0

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	69.2	71.8
1984 . . . . .	77.0	71.0
1985 . . . . .	71.9	73.0
1986 . . . . .	79.1	80.4

TABLE 3  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 3

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.7	3.5	-0.2
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.3	3.7	+0.4
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.4	3.5	+0.1
High expectations. . . . .	3.4	3.5	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.5	3.2	-0.3
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	3.9	3.9	0.0
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.7	3.7	0.0
TOTAL . . . . .	24.9	25.0	+0.1

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	70.2	62.1
1984 . . . . .	75.1	75.6
1985 . . . . .	80.7	76.0
1986 . . . . .	74.7	76.8

TABLE 4  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 4

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	4.3	4.4	+0.1
Clear school mission . . . . .	4.3	4.5	+0.2
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.8	4.3	+0.5
High expectations . . . . .	3.9	4.0	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.9	4.0	+0.1
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.2	4.5	+0.3
Home-school relations . . . . .	3.7	4.1	+0.4
TOTAL . . . . .	28.1	29.8	+1.7

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	97.2	94.4
1984 . . . . .	97.3	94.6
1985 . . . . .	85.7	97.1
1986 . . . . .	89.5	89.5

TABLE 5  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 5

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>		
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF	
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	4.0	4.0	0.0	
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.1	3.1	0.0	
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.1	3.4	+0.3	
High expectations . . . . .	3.5	4.1	+0.6	
Time on task . . . . .	4.0	3.6	-0.4	
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	3.4	3.2	-0.2	
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.1	2.7	-0.4	
TOTAL . . . . .	24.2	24.1	-0.1	

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	100.0	93.3
1984 . . . . .	88.5	84.6
1985 . . . . .	95.4	86.1
1986 . . . . .	91.1	87.1

TABLE 6  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 6

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.6	3.8	+0.2
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.2	3.5	+0.3
Instructional leadership . . . . .	2.5	3.1	+0.6
High expectations. . . . .	3.7	3.8	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.4	3.5	+0.1
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.1	3.9	-0.2
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.4	3.6	+0.2
TOTAL . . . . .	23.9	25.2	+1.3

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	67.6	83.8
1984 . . . . .	76.2	81.0
1985 . . . . .	85.0	82.5
1986 . . . . .	80.0	88.6



TABLE 7  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 7

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . .	3.7	3.8	+0.1
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.8	4.0	+0.2
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.4	4.1	+0.7
High expectations. . . . .	3.4	3.9	+0.5
Time on task . . . . .	3.5	3.8	+0.3
Monitoring pupil performance . . . .	4.2	4.5	+0.3
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.1	3.0	-0.1
TOTAL. . . . .	25.1	27.1	+2.0

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	84.8	60.6
1984 . . . . .	76.5	38.2
1985 . . . . .	72.2	63.9
1986 . . . . .	71.4	60.0

TABLE 8  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 8

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.6	3.6	0.0
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.7	4.0	+0.3
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.2	3.3	+0.1
High expectations. . . . .	3.4	3.7	+0.3
Time on task . . . . .	3.7	3.8	+0.1
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.2	4.2	0.0
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.4	3.4	0.0
TOTAL . . . . .	25.2	26.0	+0.8

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	80.8	69.7
1984 . . . . .	92.0	85.3
1985 . . . . .	86.9	83.3
1986 . . . . .	89.7	93.6

TABLE 9  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 9

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>	
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.7	4.0	+0.3
Clear school mission . . . . .	2.9	3.6	+0.7
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.1	3.4	+0.3
High expectations. . . . .	3.3	3.5	+0.2
Time on task . . . . .	3.7	3.8	+0.2
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	3.7	3.8	+0.1
Home-school relations. . . . .	2.8	3.4	+0.6
TOTAL . . . . .	23.1	25.5	+2.4

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	64.8	57.7
1984 . . . . .	81.4	52.5
1985 . . . . .	72.1	64.5
1986 . . . . .	74.2	74.2

TABLE 10  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 10

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . .	4.0	4.1	+0.1
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.8	4.0	+0.2
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.2	3.5	+0.3
High expectations. . . . .	3.8	3.9	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.6	3.9	+0.3
Monitoring pupil performance . . . .	3.6	4.2	+0.6
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.4	3.7	+0.3
TOTAL. . . . .	25.4	27.3	+1.9

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	89.7	88.2
1984 . . . . .	86.8	86.8
1985 . . . . .	88.2	88.2
1986 . . . . .	94.3	88.7

TABLE 11  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 11

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>	
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	4.0	4.4	+0.4
Clear school mission . . . . .	4.2	4.4	+0.2
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.3	3.9	+0.6
High expectations. . . . .	4.0	4.1	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.7	4.0	+0.3
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.0	4.3	+0.3
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.7	3.6	-0.1
TOTAL . . . . .	26.9	28.7	+1.8

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	82.1	78.0
1984 . . . . .	96.1	98.0
1985 . . . . .	98.3	93.1
1986 . . . . .	98.4	95.1

TABLE 12  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 12

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.6	4.0	+0.4
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.7	4.4	+0.7
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.5	4.0	+0.5
High expectations. . . . .	3.5	3.9	+0.4
Time on task . . . . .	4.0	4.2	+0.2
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.3	4.7	+0.4
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.4	3.9	+0.5
TOTAL . . . . .	26.0	29.1	+3.1

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - 4TH GRADE MEAP

Percentage of students in category 4:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	80.7	72.8
1984 . . . . .	80.6	72.2
1985 . . . . .	81.4	76.1
1986 . . . . .	79.8	75.2

TABLE 13  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 13

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.9	4.4	+0.5
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.9	4.0	+0.1
Instructional leadership . . . . .	3.6	3.8	+0.2
High expectations. . . . .	3.9	4.3	+0.4
Time on task . . . . .	3.8	4.3	+0.5
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.2	4.4	+0.2
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.5	3.7	+0.2
TOTAL. . . . .	26.8	28.9	+2.1

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - Not Available

TABLE 14  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 14

CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.9	3.5	-0.4
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.8	3.7	-0.1
Instructional leadership . . . . .	2.7	2.5	-0.2
High expectations. . . . .	3.5	3.6	+0.1
Time on task . . . . .	3.9	3.8	-0.1
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	4.0	3.5	-0.5
Home-school relations. . . . .	3.0	2.9	-0.1
TOTAL. . . . .	24.8	23.5	-1.3

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - Iowa Test of Basic Skills

National Percentile for 3rd Grade Students:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	47.0	45.6
1984 . . . . .	52.2	51.3
1985 . . . . .	23.7	33.1
1986 . . . . .	44.2	50.1



TABLE 15  
 QUANTITATIVE DATA FOR SCHOOL 15

		<u>INTERVIEW</u>	
CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW	PRE	POST	DIFF
Safe and orderly environment . . . . .	3.9	3.3	-0.6
Clear school mission . . . . .	3.8	3.1	-0.7
Instructional leadership . . . . .	2.8	2.4	-0.4
High expectations. . . . .	3.8	3.8	0.0
Time on task . . . . .	4.1	3.7	-0.4
Monitoring pupil performance . . . . .	3.4	3.4	0.0
Home-school relations. . . . .	2.9	3.4	+0.5
TOTAL. . . . .	24.7	23.1	-1.6

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORE DATA - Iowa Test of Basic Skills

National Percentile for 3rd Grade Students:	MATH	RDG
1983 . . . . .	52.4	37.5
1984 . . . . .	57.0	49.5
1985 . . . . .	49.6	46.1
1986 . . . . .	54.8	52.1

TABLE 16

## RANK ORDER OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
SCHOOL	CONN. TOTAL DIFF	RANK	MEAP 83/86 DIFF	RANK	COLUMN C+E	RANK
1(IL)	-1.0	13	+ 1.7	8	21	11
2(IH)	+3.0	2	+18.5	5	7	2
3	+0.1	11	+19.2	4	15	7
4	+1.7	8	-12.6	10	18	10
5(IL)	-0.1	12	-15.1	12	24	12
6	+1.3	9	+17.2	6	15	7
7	+2.0	5	-14.0	11	16	9
8	+0.8	10	+32.8	2	12	5
9(IH)	+2.4	3	+25.9	3	6	1
10	+1.9	6	+ 5.1	7	13	6
11(IH)	+1.8	7	+33.4	1	8	3
12	+3.1	1	+ 1.5	9	10	4
13	+2.1	4	*	*	*	*
14	-1.3	14	*	*	*	*
15(IL)	-1.6	15	*	*	*	*

(IH) On-site interviews were conducted at schools 2, 9, and 11 due to their high ranking.

(IL) On-site interviews were conducted at schools 1, 5, and 15 due to their low ranking.

\* Schools 13, 14, and 15 have a K-3 enrollment. Therefore, the 4th grade MEAP data was not available for these schools.

COLLECTION OF QUALITATIVE DATA

An elementary school setting is very complex. Students, teachers, parents, administrators, and many others influence the daily school routine. This study is designed to address not only the quantifiable data, but to also deal with the intricacies and nuances of the everyday school setting through a comprehensive collection of qualitative data. Specifically, the quantitative data was organized to determine which of the fifteen schools showed an improving status, and which of the fifteen schools revealed a non-improving or declining status. Qualitative data in the form of on-site school visitations and personal interviews with teachers, principals, and central office administrators was extracted from three schools showing an improving status and from three schools showing a non-improving status.

## SELECTION OF SCHOOLS FOR ON-SITE INTERVIEW

Following the collection of quantitative material, a rank-ordering was made of the Connecticut Survey and the standardized test results to determine the amount of improvement, or lack of improvement, for each of the schools throughout the four year time span. The rank-ordering is displayed in Table 16.

The Connecticut Survey rank is based on the TOTAL DIFF score. For example, School 1 registered a TOTAL DIFF score of -1.0, and School 2 registered a TOTAL DIFF score of +3.0. Consequently School 2 ranks higher on the Connecticut Survey. A ranking of 1 is highest, while a ranking of 15 is lowest. Column C in Table 16 shows the Connecticut Survey ranking for each school. The scores range from a low of -1.6 to a high of +3.1.

The standardized test score ranking is based on the MEAP scores and thus is computed only for schools one through twelve. The ranking is based on the net difference between the 1983 and 1986 math score (percentage of students in category 4), plus the net difference between the 1983 and 1986 reading score. For example, School 3 shows a 1983 math score of 70.2 and a 1986 math score of 74.7 for a net of +4.5. It also shows a 1983 reading score of 62.1 and a 1986 reading score of 76.8 for a net of +14.7. Therefore, the ranking is based on  $4.5 + 14.7$  for a total of +19.2. A ranking of 1 shows the most improvement in MEAP scores from 1983 to 1986, while a ranking of 12 shows the least improvement. Column E in Table 16 shows the standardized test score ranking for each of the 12 schools having the MEAP data. The scores range from a low of -15.1 to a high of +33.4.

Finally, the rank order data from the Connecticut Survey and the standardized test scores are added together to determine a combined ranking for all of the quantitative

data. The combined rank order is displayed in column G of Table 16.

The rank-ordering process was used to determine three schools that showed potential to be improving schools, and three schools that appeared to not be improving during the four year time frame. Based on the quantitative data, schools 2, 9, and 11 were selected for on-site interviews due to their potential as improving schools, and schools 1, 5, and 15 were chosen for interviews due to their non-improving status. The selection of schools 9 and 15 was influenced by the fact that they were both from the same school district, and the quantitative data suggested one was an improving school and one was a non-improving school. Including both schools 9 and 15 in the on-site interviews allowed the study to analyze within-district differences in school settings. In all, five public elementary schools and one parochial elementary school representing four public school districts and one diocese were selected for on-site visitations and interviews.

#### FORMAT FOR ON-SITE INTERVIEWS

The intent of the on-site interview and visitations was to ascertain the perceptions of teachers, principals, and central office administrators relative to the impact of the Middle Cities Association/Kellogg Foundation

Educational Leadership Training program on the specific elementary school in question. Correspondence with the six identified schools detailing the intent of the interviews took place prior to the actual on-site visitation. (See Appendix A). Throughout the interviews no indication was given to the schools relative to their improving or non-improving status.

The basic plan at each site was to talk individually with the school principal, the one teacher who had been the most involved with the training program (lead teacher), two fourth grade teachers, and the central office administrator most closely associated with the training program and its implementation. Fourth grade teachers were selected at each site so that the insights of staff members not directly involved with the original training program could be solicited. In actuality, a total of twenty-five individual interviews took place involving six principals, four central office administrators, and fifteen teachers.

A structure was established for each interview so that some consistency could be maintained from person to person and school to school. The work of Miles and Huberman, and Corbett, et. al. influenced the interview instrument. (See Appendix C). The interviews ranged in time from approximately fifteen minutes to two and one-half hours with each interview being tape-recorded so that an accurate recall was possible. Documents such as handbooks, test score analyses, grade level objectives, and parent

communications were collected at each school, and informal observations were also noted within each building. A follow-up letter of appreciation was sent to each building principal. (See Appendix A).

### SUMMARY

The study is designed to determine if the Middle Cities Association/Kellogg Foundation Leadership Training Program had an impact on the participating schools. Enroute to answering this question, quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Specifically, Connecticut Survey data collected in 1983 and also in 1986 was tabulated for each of the fifteen schools that participated in the study. The Connecticut Survey is a field-tested survey instrument used to elicit staff perceptions relative to school effectiveness. Also, standardized test score data was collected for the participating schools. The 4th grade Michigan Education Assessment Program results were used for twelve of the fifteen schools for a four year period (1983 through 1986). The results from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills were used for two of the participating schools due to their K-3 enrollment. Test data was not available for one school which was also a K-3 building.

The qualitative component of the study was designed so direct on-site discussion with teachers, principals, and

central administrators could take place. Consequently the results from the Connecticut Survey and from the standardized test scores were rank-ordered to determine which of the fifteen schools showed the most and least amount of improvement from 1983 until 1986. After analyzing the rank order of the schools three schools showing a lot of improvement and three schools showing little or no improvement were selected for on-site interviews.

The study began with a population of seventy-eight prospective participants. However, through the process of seeking permission to conduct the study within the schools, and working with the Middle Cities Association to secure both pre and post Connecticut Survey results, the original field of seventy-eight schools was pared to fifteen.

The results of the quantitative and qualitative data collection are presented in Chapter IV.



#### IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

##### INTRODUCTION

The intent of this chapter is to present the quantitative and qualitative data for review and analysis. The chapter begins with a statistical analysis of the Connecticut Survey and standardized test score data. Next, the information collected during the on-site visitations is presented for review. The chapter concludes with a summary section that addresses the relationship between the quantitative and qualitative data.

##### ANALYSIS OF QUANTITATIVE DATA

Eight different perspectives, relevant to the research questions, were used in determining the significant quantitative findings. Accordingly, this section is divided into eight subsections.

##### SCHOOLS IN STUDY COMPARED TO STATE OF MICHIGAN

The first analysis shows the MEAP scores of the

schools participating in this study compared with the average of all schools in the state of Michigan. As stated earlier, three of the fifteen participating schools are K-3 schools. Therefore, the comparison actually encompasses only the twelve schools with a 4th grade enrollment. Table 17 shows the mean average of students in category 4 for the twelve schools under study and the average for all 4th grade students in the state of Michigan. The table shows the twelve schools being studied experienced their biggest test score gains as a group in the first year of the leadership training program (from 1983 to 1984). This is true when looking at the twelve schools by themselves, and also when looking at the same schools in relation to the state of Michigan. It is apparent, too, that the twelve participating schools experienced the most improvement in their reading test scores, as opposed to their math scores.

The twelve schools in the study improved their MEAP scores at approximately the same rate as the state of Michigan. The test schools improved their math scores 4.1 percentage points and their reading scores 5.3 points during the 1983 to 1986 time frame while all schools in the State improved their math scores 4.5 percentage points and their reading scores 4.4 points.

#### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FIFTEEN SCHOOLS IN THE STUDY

Before progressing too far with the results it is

TABLE 17

12 SCHOOLS IN STUDY COMPARED TO STATE OF MICHIGAN  
CATEGORY 4 4TH GRADE MEAP SCORES

	12 SCHOOLS IN STUDY		STATE OF MICHIGAN <sup>1</sup>	
	MATH	READING	MATH	READING
1983	79.8	76.9	80.5	75.9
1984	85.4	77.8 (81.4)*	82.6	77.7
1985	82.8	80.7	83.6	79
1986	83.9	82.2	85.0	80.3

GAIN/LOSS FROM PREVIOUS YEAR

83 to 84	+5.6	+ .9 (+4.5)*	+2.1	+1.8
84 ro 85	-2.6	+2.9 (- .7)*	+1.0	+1.6
85 to 86	+1.1	+1.5	+1.4	+1.0
83 to 86	+4.1	+5.3	+4.5	+4.4

<sup>1</sup> Source: Detroit Free Press. January 19, 1988, p. A3

\* The 1984 MEAP reading score for school #7 was 38.2 (see table 7). This score is not consistent with other scores from this school. Therefore, the 1984 mean average was computed parenthetically for the schools in the study excluding school #7.

necessary to determine if any quantifiable differences exist between the fifteen schools in the study. The results from the Connecticut Survey, stated in Tables 1 through 15, were used in order to make this determination. The specific data used were the differences in the pre and post for each correlate within each school (7 correlates, 15 schools). An Analysis of Variance, F Test, showed that there is an overall significant difference between the fifteen schools at both the .05 level and the .01 level. The test yielded the following results:

F statistic = 5.7177

at .05 level  $F_{14,90} = 1.80$

at .01 level  $F_{14,90} = 2.28$

#### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ANY TWO SCHOOLS

Having established that quantifiable differences do exist within the collective group of fifteen schools, it is logical to further pursue the issue of differences between schools by looking at any two schools within the group to determine if significant differences do exist between any two schools. A 2-tailed t test was applied to the differences in pre and post Connecticut data for each correlate within any two schools (7 correlates, 2 schools). The specific Connecticut data used can be found for each school in Tables 1 through 15. The results of the 2-tailed

t test show there is a significant difference between some schools and there is not a significant difference between other schools. For example:

At .05 alpha, critical  $t = +$  or  $- 2.179$

Schools 2 and 1,  $t = -4.330$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 2 and 5,  $t = +2.616$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 2 and 15,  $t = +3.538$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 9 and 15,  $t = +3.199$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 9 and 5,  $t = +2.201$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 9 and 1,  $t = -3.952$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 11 and 1,  $t = -3.254$  (significant difference)  
 Schools 11 and 5,  $t = +1.672$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 11 and 15,  $t = +2.707$  (significant difference)

Schools 2 and 9,  $t = +.668$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 2 and 11,  $t = +1.336$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 9 and 11,  $t = +.720$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 1 and 5,  $t = -.778$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 1 and 15,  $t = +.470$  (no significant difference)  
 Schools 5 and 15,  $t = -1.017$  (no significant difference)

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONNECTICUT SURVEY AND MEAP DATA

This study would be incomplete if an examination of the relationship between the Connecticut Survey and MEAP data was not made. Consequently, a correlation coefficient was used to determine if a significant relationship exists between the differences in MEAP scores and Connecticut data from 1983 to 1986. Pairs of scores were derived from (1986 math + reading scores) - (1983 math + reading scores for same school), and the corresponding total difference in pre

TABLE 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGE IN CONNECTICUT SURVEY DATA AND  
MEAP SCORES FROM 1983 TO 1986

A SCHOOL #	B CONN. TOTAL DIFF 83 TO 86	C MEAP DIFF 83 TO 86 <sup>1</sup>
1	-1.0	+ 1.7
2	+3.0	+18.5
3	+0.1	+19.2
4	+1.7	-12.6
5	-0.1	-15.1
6	+1.3	+17.2
7	+2.0	-14.0
8	+0.8	+32.8
9	+2.4	+25.9
10	+1.9	+ 5.1
11	+1.8	+33.4
12	+3.1	+ 1.5

$r .05 = + \text{ or } - .602$

$r = .1319$

<sup>1</sup>Percentage of students in category 4.

and post Connecticut data for that school. The results, displayed in Table 18, show that a significant relationship does not exist.

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONNECTICUT SURVEY AND 1983 MEAP DATA

Table 19 shows a further analysis of the relationship between the Connecticut Survey data and the MEAP results. The analysis displayed in Table 19 focuses on the beginning MEAP scores from 1983 and their impact on the attitudes of staff members as shown in the differences in their 1983 Connecticut Survey response and their 1986 response. The mean average between the 1983 math and reading MEAP score for all 12 schools showing MEAP data, and the total difference in pre and post Connecticut Survey data for the same school were used in this test. Again, a correlation coefficient was used to determine if a relationship existed. Table 19 shows that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the two sets of data.

#### DIFFERENCES IN CONNECTICUT SURVEY CORRELATES

As stated earlier, the Connecticut Survey is subdivided into seven different correlates. Therefore, an analysis of the differences by correlate for all fifteen schools shows the areas where the leadership training program had the most impact. In order to address this a

one-tailed t test was used, and the differences in pre and post Connecticut data were collected for each correlate. Statistically significant differences were found in three of the seven correlates. The one-tailed t test yielded the following results:

At .05 alpha, critical  $t = +$  or  $- 1.761$   
 Clear School Mission,  $t = +1.976$  (significant difference)  
 Instructional Leadership,  $t = +3.284$  (significant difference)  
 High Expectations,  $t = +3.861$  (significant difference)  
 Safe and Orderly Environment,  $t = +.464$  (no significant difference)  
 Time on Task,  $t = +1.251$  (no significant difference)  
 Monitoring Pupil Performance,  $t = +1.727$  (no significant difference)  
 Home School Relations,  $t = 1.546$  (no significant difference)

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CORRELATES AND MEAP DATA

The next statistical analysis takes a look at the three significant correlates (i.e. clear school mission, instructional leadership, and high expectations) and their relationship to the differences between the 1983 and 1986 MEAP data within each school. Pairs of scores were derived from (1986 MEAP Math + Reading) - (1983 MEAP Math + Reading for same school), and the corresponding differences for CSM + IL + HE from the pre and post Connecticut Survey data. Table 20 shows the use of a correlation coefficient and the results this test produced. A significant relationship was not established between the three correlates and the



TABLE 19

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGE IN CONNECTICUT SURVEY DATA AND  
1983 MEAP SCORES

A SCHOOL #	B CONN. TOTAL DIFF 83 TO 86	C 1983 MEAP AVG OF READ AND MATH <sup>1</sup>
1	-1.0	80.0
2	+3.0	70.5
3	+0.1	66.15
4	+1.7	95.8
5	-0.1	96.65
6	+1.3	75.7
7	+2.0	72.7
8	+0.8	75.25
9	+2.4	61.25
10	+1.9	88.95
11	+1.8	80.0
12	+3.1	76.75

r .05 = + or - .602

r = - .2517

<sup>1</sup> Percentage of students in category 4.

TABLE 20

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CONNECTICUT SURVEY  
CORRELATES AND MEAP SCORES FROM 1983 to 1986

A SCHOOL #	B CONN. DIFF FOR CSM+IL+HE	C MEAP DIFF 83 TO 86 <sup>1</sup>
1	- .4	+ 1.7
2	+1.8	+18.5
3	+ .6	+19.2
4	+ .8	-12.6
5	+ .9	-15.1
6	+1.0	+17.2
7	+1.4	-14.0
8	+ .7	+32.8
9	+1.2	+25.9
10	+ .6	+ 5.1
11	+ .9	+33.4
12	+1.6	+ 1.5

$r .05 = + \text{ or } - .602$

$r = .0231$

<sup>1</sup> Percentage of students in category 4.

TABLE 21

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CONNECTICUT SURVEY  
CORRELATES AND 1983 MEAP SCORES

A SCHOOL #	B CONN. DIFF FOR CSM+IL+HE	C 1983 MEAP AVG OF READ AND MATH <sup>1</sup>
1	- .4	80.0
2	+1.8	70.5
3	+ .6	66.15
4	+ .8	95.8
5	+ .9	96.65
6	+1.0	75.7
7	+1.4	72.7
8	+ .7	75.25
9	+1.2	61.25
10	+ .6	88.95
11	+ .9	80.0
12	+1.6	76.75

r .05 = + or - .602

r = - .2807

<sup>1</sup> Percentage of students in category 4.

corresponding MEAP data.

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT CORRELATES AND 1983 MEAP DATA

Using the same principle that was applied in the preceding paragraph, an attempt was made to establish a statistical relationship between the three significant correlates and the 1983 MEAP data. A correlation coefficient was applied to the 1983 MEAP mean average between math and reading, and the corresponding differences for CSM + IL + HE from the pre and post Connecticut Survey data. Table 21 shows that there was not a significant relationship between this data.

#### SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

The presence of both test data and survey data allowed for an insightful quantitative analysis of the fifteen schools and the leadership training program. The data was examined from eight different perspectives, and the following findings surfaced:

1. A comparison of the schools in this study was drawn to the schools in the state of Michigan. The schools in the study improved their MEAP Category 4 4th grade reading scores 5.3 percentage points from 1983 to 1986, and their math scores 4.1 points during the same time. The 4th

graders in the state of Michigan improved the same scores 4.4 points in reading and 4.5 points in math. The schools in the study experienced their biggest test score gains during the first year of the leadership training program (from 1983 to 1984).

2. A look at the pre and post Connecticut Survey data shows that a statistically significant overall difference exists between the fifteen schools in the study.

3. Furthermore, a closer look at specific pairs of schools show that a significant difference exists between some schools while there is not a significant difference between other schools.

4. There is not a significant relationship between the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores and the 1983 and 1986 MEAP scores.

5. There is not a significant relationship between the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores and the 1983 MEAP scores.

6. A significant difference in the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores was found in three of the seven correlates. A significant difference was found in clear school mission, instructional leadership, and high expectations.

7. There is not a significant relationship between the three significant correlates and the differences between the 1983 and 1986 MEAP data within each school.

8. There is not a significant relationship between

the three significant correlates and the corresponding 1983 MEAP data.

#### ANALYSIS OF QUALITATIVE DATA

The second part of Chapter IV is devoted to a school-by-school analysis of the qualitative data. Schools 2, 9, and 11 were selected for on-site visitations due to their improving scores on both the MEAP and Connecticut Survey, and the analysis of these schools appears first. Schools 1, 5, and 15 were selected for on-site visitations due to their non-improving status relative to the MEAP and Connecticut Survey data. An analysis of these schools appears after the improving schools.

#### **SCHOOL 2**

School 2 is one of eighteen elementary schools located in a large Michigan school district. The school houses students in grades K, 4, 5, and 6. The official 4th Friday report from September, 1987 showed a total enrollment of 287 students. Of these 287 students, 122 (43%) were minority students. Approximately 33% of the students received free or reduced lunches during the 1987-88 school year. There was very little turnover in the staff during the period under study.

School 2 was one of five schools from its own district

that participated in the original leadership training program in 1983-84. The other thirteen elementary schools within the district were subsequently involved in the training during the 1984-85 and 1985-86 school years. The principal of School 2 attended the training program along with the instructional specialist from the school. The principal and instructional specialist became interested and well-versed in effective schools literature and the essential elements of effective instruction. In fact, the principal later served as a presenter at other schools in the area. The leadership training program appears to have had a direct impact on the following developments at School 2:

1. A school improvement team was organized at the school and monthly meetings of this group were still in existence at the time of the visitation. Participation in this group is rotated among the teaching staff, with representation from each grade level a key determinant in the make-up of the group. The school improvement team has conducted a needs assessment with the staff and the community and has written a visible and well-maintained school mission statement.

2. Staff meetings at the school have been designed to teach and demonstrate the essential elements of effective instruction. The principals have followed-up with observations in the classrooms and written suggestions for improvements.

3. School-wide discipline has improved markedly since the 1983-84 school year.

4. School assemblies have been organized to recognize positive student behaviors, honor rolls have been posted in the school, and newsletters to the home have emphasized positive happenings at the school.

5. Test results, including a disaggregated analysis, have been monitored carefully by school personnel. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the district grade level objective tests reveal a pattern of improving scores at the school. It is important to note this due to the K, 4, 5, 6 configuration at the school and the fact that the MEAP test is administered at the beginning of the 4th grade year.

There were two significant developments within the school during the 1983 through 1986 time frame that may have affected the implementation process. At the conclusion of the 1984-85 school year, the principal was transferred to another elementary school within the district. The instructional specialist, who participated in the leadership training program, was promoted to the principalship. The transition appeared to be smooth, although there was some indication that the current principal (former instructional specialist) possessed a management style that was better received than the former principal.

The board of education changed the name of the school,



with little or no consultation with the school community, at the beginning of the 1985-86 school year. The current principal reported that the name change caused some hard feelings within the community, and even at the time of the on-site visitation a few parents remain who dislike the new name of the school.

At the district level several factors were in evidence which influenced the school improvement implementation process at School 2.

1. The Superintendent of Schools appeared to exert a strong influence on the development of the school improvement process. At the time of the visitation, the Superintendent insisted that each school submit a school improvement plan on an annual basis, and he was instrumental in making the arrangements for district-wide participation in the leadership training program.

2. The elementary school principals in this district report directly to the Director of Elementary Education. The person in this position maintains a key role in supervising the school improvement process. Within the time frame of this study, three different individuals held the position of Director of Elementary Education. The frequent turnover in this position had an adverse effect on School 2.

3. The principal and director both indicated that the implementation process has been very different within the 18 schools in the district. These differences had caused

some morale problems within the district.

4. Two teacher contract settlements in the 1980's were especially trying for the district. Energy channeled toward the bargaining process may have impacted school improvement process plans within the school.

5. Little or no money was available for continued inservice on the essential elements of effective instruction and effective schools practices after the initial leadership training.

The on-site visitation at school # 2 took place within one school day. Interviews were conducted with three teachers, the current principal, and the Director of Elementary Education. The following quotations are relevant:

4th Grade Teacher (1):

"As you know anything new people are afraid to try it. They are afraid of failure, but we did know we had some problems with our low students. They're not achieving as they should. We knew something had to be done."

"So, what (former principal) would do would come on Tuesdays and talk with us about participatory sets . . . a lot of the terminology, she would give us a background (about EEEI). She would go over and over that, and then she would ask us to try, not all at once, but gradually try some of this."

"We had weekly meetings for about 2 years. The first year was very strenuous. Then as she felt we were trying various techniques, she didn't have as many (meetings)."

"My teaching improved. I felt more enthusiastic . . . and the low kids were

coming up with the right answers."

"The teachers being willing to try a new program, not every teacher, but the majority were willing to try."

"And, second, the make-up of our children . . . we have a lot of students that are low. And, we knew there's a problem there. We had not reached those students."

"We knew our leader at that time, that was her main objective. That was her mission."

"One drawback is the lack of parent support."

"During the second year of the program, we felt threatened. She would come into the room and check on us, and if we weren't doing things we would get called in on the carpet. It was like it went to her head. She was doing this for higher up and we were almost like the guinea pigs. She was getting all the credit for it . . . and I guess we didn't get enough pats on the back."

"I think we're a better school as a result."

4th Grade Teacher (2):

"I think we've really tried to follow that (leadership training program) up with spending a lot of time on task and really being aware that that will help to improve the students scores. I think it improves their attitudes. Basically I think we've followed along the lines of trying to use the elements of effective instruction."

"A lot of inservice (took place) during our regular building meetings . . . The two of them (principal and lead teacher) did a lot of demonstrating for us, and had some of the teachers do some demonstrating."

"I think it (inservice) really made us aware of what we were doing in the classroom and that if we were doing it right it was a pat on the back, and if they thought we could improve it was a way of giving us something to improve."

"The time on task has really been our big push."

"I've been teaching for 30 years and I could see some things that I was doing that could be improved upon."

"The other thing that I think really helped was when she (principal) did that coming in the room thing and writing down everything you say, and then had a conference with us, and went over everything. She was quite thorough, I think, in doing that with everyone. That made you more aware of what you were doing."

"I don't believe it (observations and conferences) was threatening at all. I think that if it was threatening to teachers they would have voiced that, and I didn't hear a whole lot of people feeling threatened."

"I think that here all the teachers were willing to give it a try . . . I think people were quite willing to listen . . . I think the school had come through a time, under other leadership, where they could see that things were falling apart, and that something had to be done."

"The pull-out programs are often times a hindrance (e.g. instrumental music, speech, etc). We try to schedule around those things but when you have that many . . . it becomes difficult."

"We need to have instructional materials farther in advance."

6th Grade Teacher:

"We've gotten our goals in better perspective."

"One of the things that really came up (in tabulating the Connecticut Survey) was a concern for discipline. I think that we have seen that our discipline procedure has gained in effectiveness."

"I think (now a) more productive staff meeting . . . but it's gotten so I don't

resent them as I use to . . . I almost always come away from a meeting with something worthwhile."

"I think there's been a real effort to involve parents in a productive way."

"I think it (school improvement effort) has taken off, and I think it's largely due to the people we've had as principals. Their energy, and enthusiasm, and encouragement have really made it practically impossible to give up."

"I think the support of the administration, all of the materials that have been sent to us have been aimed at that (school improvement)."

Principal:

"Each principal and their staff member was supposed to come back and do a staff meeting of all that you had learned at that time. So some people went ahead full steam, let's go, others kinda hung in the middle, and some didn't do it. So we were always getting calls saying I know you all are doing the right thing and what did you do. Some schools did nothing."

"Even in this building we had a lot of people who were very skeptical, saying that this too shall pass . . . I'd say but the thing is you always want your school to be an effective school, so when is that ever going to pass? That's never going to pass. You always want to hopefully do better than you're doing."

"I truly believe that it's worthwhile, and I truly believe that people need to realize that we want an effective school. I don't care if it's the year 2050, we still want to have an effective school."

"I think part of it (involvement) is getting the staff committed. I think you have one real strong group that is committed to school improvement on our staff. Then we have some others that are definitely not committed to it."

"I think that's been part of what's really held us back, because I think they truly don't believe that all kids can learn."

"I think they still have a block in their mind about if a kid is poor, if a kid is a minority, if a kid is on free and reduced lunch, that because they have all these little obstacles there, they're not able to learn."

"There are some people that have a style of their own in the way that they teach . . . that have been doing that for twenty years, and it's really difficult to try to change that person from their style -- good, bad, or indifferent."

"If you're trying to do, and if you're putting forth that effort, and you want to make a difference then you (the principal) can be pulled to do other things. Or, they'll say your name was one of the ones submitted by teachers and administrators to do this because they feel you're trustworthy, you're honest, you will do it fairly. I say, yes, but I have to do my job fairly."

"So I think they realize that if they (teachers) bring things up through the school improvement committee . . . then we will take action on it."

Director of Elementary Education:

"First of all, the key to any particular building, in my opinion, is the leadership displayed in the building by the principal."

"What we recommend to our principals is that they develop and work with a school improvement program and a school improvement team. We have a model that we have established based on school improvement."

"We're not at the effective schools point yet. But we're moving in that direction . . . You've got four basic steps. First of all the awareness and training to get there. You then convey that to your teachers. You then need to begin that process of implementation. And eventually you arrive. I think we're

somewhere between three and four."

"In (Principal of School 2)'s particular case, she really believes in the clinical supervision model, she believes in everything we have worked for in dealing with essential elements of effective instruction and she does a very good job with it."

"We also have some schools that are doing a better job with this than others, and that again is on the leadership of the principal. (Principal of School 2) is one of our more effective people at doing it."

"All of our schools are required to turn in their school improvement plan to me."

"Out of 18 elementary schools we have had 4 of our schools that have been nominated for outstanding school status both in the state and nationally. We have had 2 national award winners, so the model is up there."

"Our great weakness is that we just don't have adequate inservice time for all of our programs that we are trying to implement."

"He's (superintendent) very, very strong, and the message is strong and constant as to what we need to do . . . He knows his stuff."

"There's a lot of other evidence other than test data . . . Our dropout rate has been cut in half from 14% to 7% . . . Our rate of daily attendance has gone from 87% up to about 96% . . . Percent of teacher attendance has also increased over the years."

## **SCHOOL 9**

School 9 is a public school located on the outer edge of a large Michigan school district. Most of the students are bussed to the school due to a district-wide forced bussing program. The physical plant is relatively new (about 20 years old) and it is bright, clean and well

maintained. The school serves students in grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. School 9 also houses programs for learning disabled, emotionally impaired, and educable mentally impaired students. The 1987 4th Friday report shows the school enrolled 685 students, of which 175 were minority students (26%). The principal reports that 85% of the students receive free or reduced lunches.

All schools within School 9's district were represented in the effective schools meetings. The Superintendent of Schools required all principals to attend the meetings, and at the time of the on-site visitation all teachers within the district were being required to attend inservice meetings relative to the essential elements of effective instruction. The teachers were being released from their classroom duties so that they could attend. The leadership training program appeared to impact School 9 in the following ways:

1. The principal secured grant money to bring two developmental psychologists to the school to conduct an extended study of the school and to make recommendations for the improvement of test scores. The principal attributes this effort to the leadership training program.

2. The principal acknowledged that the Connecticut Survey helped identify weaknesses at the school, and was partly responsible for an improved school-wide discipline plan.

3. During the 1983 to 1986 time frame an increased



emphasis was placed on improving the physical plant and grounds. Trees were planted, colorful banners were purchased and displayed on the grounds, the playground was improved with a larger play area and additional equipment, and action pictures of students were added to the hallways.

Several factors appeared to influence the implementation process at School 9. The principal admitted to being a "footdragger" and "not very happy" about being required to attend the initial effective schools meetings. However, it is important to note that School 9 improved their MEAP scores and Connecticut Survey data, and there existed tangible improvements within the building even though the principal was not an enthusiastic participant in the beginning. However, it eventually became apparent to the principal that the leadership training program was applicable to the setting at School 9. The principal stated, "it made sense." Furthermore, the school district that School 9 was within seemed to allow for adjustments in school improvement planning within the building. For example, School 9 started out with a formal school improvement team, but it dissolved after a year. The principal stated, "we took what we wanted and made it ours. That's how we developed ownership." Another example relates to the funding for the third party to analyze the school and make recommendations for improving test scores. This idea was unique to School 9.

The on-site visitation at School 9 took place within one school day. A lengthy interview was conducted with the principal and also with the Director of Elementary Education. The school was unable to make arrangements for formal interviews with teachers. The following quotations prove insightful:

Principal:

"The building was formerly a junior high school, and had a reputation as being really tough and bad. There was a lot of racial conflict here in the early 70's. . . But, especially since the project in Battle Creek, we've made a concentrated effort. We've put in about 6,000 dollars worth of trees, we have the banners, we have a courtyard with about a thousand flowers. So, if you walk into an area and perceive you are going to be raped, and get your hind end kicked, even though that may not happen -- if that's your perception you are automatically at a disadvantage. So that's the reason for all the accruments."

"One of the raps this school gets is that it has the biggest concentration of lower SES kids. Historically it has always had the poorest test scores, and it has the toughest kids, the poorest kids, 85% receive free lunch, and over 65% come from single parent families. But we are located on the outer edge of the city."

"Five years ago we were bottom rung in terms of the MEAP scores and last year we had the highest in the city. Not necessarily because our kids were brighter, but I think it had to do with expectations. And I think the most important ingredient is the staff. You gotta have a staff who enjoys what they do, and isn't one that feels that these kids are never going to achieve anything simply because of where they come from and who they are."

"The first meetings we attended were in Battle Creek. We were not asked, but told, to go to Battle Creek to a conference. And, we didn't even know what the hell it was. Which was probably not the most auspices start. I pretty much like to know what I'm getting into, so I was pretty much a footdragger when it began because I feel . . . that if I'm going to have anything work effectively that I'd like to be in on the fact they wanted us to develop this technique to try to make things work. So, I was a resister when I first went in."

"It (mandate to attend) came from the Superintendent through a memo from the Director of Elementary Instruction. We were told we were to go down to a two day meeting on effective schools. We didn't know what we were getting into. They called it the Kellogg Project, which is kinda ominous, we didn't know if we were going to be nuclearphysicists or what. I was not real happy."

"The one good thing that happened was that when we talked about the information . . . the information that went into what was an effective school or what were the elements of effective instruction, they made a lot of sense. The information made a lot of sense..

"The elements of effective instruction materials were so precise . . . you couldn't deviate . . . that was a threat to me. I was very angry about it. But, again, when I moved away from it and looked at the information I found it to be really good information."

"When the staff took the survey, and in some cases they were not real complimentary about what was happening on a particular correlate, initially it was a threat. But when I, and my colleague, looked at it we said 'yah, hell yes.' Whether it is perceived or whether it is real . . . if we are going to make this place work and function then we're going to have to do something about that particular item."

"It (Connecticut Survey) was helpful, after the initial shock."

"My biggest criticism at the beginning was the way we were brought into it. We weren't brought into it, we were placed into it. And, that was not only my perception, but many of my colleagues."

"We said, 'OK' we're not gonna take what they give us in total. We took what we wanted out of it. We were told to develop a school improvement team, and we did for a year. Just because the central administration said you have to have it. What we did was get them off our back. We did something to get them off our back, we give them what they wanted, and then we took what we wanted and made it ours. That's how we developed ownership."

"The impetus still was the Connecticut. So, to that point it was good. (And), the impetus still was the meetings (in Battle Creek). . . It did focus us on those things that do make a difference. So to that end it was really good."

"So, it terms of calling it a school improvement team -- 'no', but we do have vehicles that are still addressing the correlates."

Director of Elementary Education (for both schools 9 and 15):

"(District) has been involved since 82-83."

"We decided that our board should make a decision that we would all be participants (in EEEI training). Therefore we asked for \$20,000 to be put in our budget for effective schools training and also for any component that might follow that."

"At that time we sent our administrators for training in effective schools followed by their training in essential elements of effective instruction."

"Five of the eight buildings (in the district) worked very quickly at getting their mission statement in place."

"I would say that we have been successfully involved . . . I would say we are probably 70% totally involved."

#### **SCHOOL 11**

School 11 is one of four elementary schools located in a medium-sized Michigan school district. The school serves students in grades K through 6. The 4th Friday report from September, 1987 reported a total of 469 students were enrolled at the school. Eight of these students (2%) were minority students, and 50 students (11%) were receiving free or reduced lunches at that time.

All four of the elementary principals in School 11's district were required by the superintendent to attend the leadership training. The principal of School 11 at the time of the original training retired at the end of the 1985-86 school year. The principal that was interviewed during the on-site visitation had been at the school since the beginning of the 1986-87 school year. The new principal came from outside the school district and did not attend any of the leadership training program sessions. However, the new principal had attended several sessions related to Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP). The people interviewed credited the new principal with making some instructional improvements at the school.

It was apparent during interviews with school personnel within the district that School 11 did not

follow-up very well with the leadership training program. In fact, the Co-ordinator of Elementary Curriculum ranked the school as the third (of four) best participant within the district. The new principal also pointed to other schools within the district as being farther along with the school improvement effort than School 11.

Clearly the former principal was not successful in bringing techniques, ideas, and concepts from the leadership training program to School 11. However, ITIP training within the school began to gain some interest at about the same time the school experienced a change in their principalship. All elementary teachers within the school district have received either ITIP or EEEI training. The training was paid for by the district.

It is worthy to note that School 4 and School 10 (see Chapter III) are both located within the same school district as School 11. A close look at School 4 data showed a major improvement in MEAP data during the 1976 and 1980 time frame, and therefore there was not an opportunity for major MEAP improvement during the years 1983 to 1986.

The following quotations are pertinent to the School 11 summary:

4th Grade Teacher (1):

"There was a committee that met after Middle Cities (training) with that particular principal (now retired), but there were some people that when (current principal) approached them and asked them about meeting

they forgot they were on the committee."

"Our district has been very interested in sending people out and getting this information (ITIP and EEEI training) and bringing it back and plugging it in our district in the best way possible."

"A couple of years ago what happened was the Middle Cities tended to run out here. I was very interested in going on with it, especially being a presenter here I felt it was my responsibility to keep that ball rolling and investigate things further. And, I heard people going to ITIP. They seemed to have it more together as far as taking the stuff back and applying it, then from what I was hearing at Middle Cities. Part of that . . . had to do with the head person at that time in our building.

"The Middle Cities I didn't feel fanned out to the staff the way that the ITIP has. Be it the character of the program, or be it the character of the principal, I'm not sure."

"Another thing is Middle Cities involved how many teachers? One teacher from our staff. One teacher and the principal. And, unless your head person has things going and has plans for it to be in the building, that was it. Under Middle Cities (retired principal) did form a committee. Most of those people can't remember serving on the committee, which is sad."

"We've had (current principal) with us (on ITIP), and that makes things go, just because of his enthusiasm and attitude."

"A lot of it boils down to that head person (principal), their attitude, and their beliefs . . . Because obviously they can go to those meetings and they can come back and it can die."

4th Grade Teacher (2):

"Really there's only one condition that you really have to have and that's the strong leadership of the principal. That gets everyone involved in it, and that's what you

really need. You need someone who not only . . . says we want you to do this, but works with you and gets involved himself, rather than sit back and say you do it."

"We test every year, we get together as a staff, and we sit down and go through the weak areas. And, we look at the overall picture and we sit around as a group and we discuss what happened, why has it happened, how can we correct it, then we base our own personal goals that we set each year . . . We started analyzing that (test scores) when (current principal) came."

Principal:

"The person who was here was doing what he was supposed to do in letter (relative to the leadership training program) . . . So if he was supposed to develop a committee . . . he would write the stuff up, maybe show it to them, maybe . . . and turn it in as being the stuff and they were listed as the committee. When I talked to members of those committees about the things that they developed, they didn't know anything about it. They weren't involved in it, they didn't participate in it. It was done and sent in."

Was there any impact on the school? "None, it was filed, as best as I can tell."

"There was a high level of confusion on the part of the person (retired principal) on what leadership should be. Supposedly a very good politician and very good at dealing with people one on one. No mission, no direction, and no real solid idea of how to get there."

Elementary Curriculum Co-ordinator (also an elementary school principal in the district):

"I think it (school effectiveness movement) had a tremendous impact (on the school system). You cannot talk to one teacher or administrator in this district who does not know about the school effectiveness movement and program and the ITIP or EEI. Every teacher in this district has had at least eight hours of training in ITIP or EEI



(elementary teachers)."

"We have our own cadre of trainers."

"The philosophy is a generally accepted philosophy in this district, on school effectiveness."

"(Superintendent) definitely lets you know that it is the principal of every building that determines the achievement of students. That is where it all begins."

"(Superintendent) is a very strong leader in the school effectiveness movement."

"I know they (teachers attending EEEI and ITIP) had a real sense of what it means to grow professionally."

#### **SCHOOL 1**

School 1 is a parochial school located in a large city within the state of Michigan. The school serves students in grades K through 8. The 4th Friday report from September, 1987 showed an enrollment of 307 students with 14 students receiving free or reduced lunches. The report also showed that 14 students (5%) were minority students.

The principal at School 1 appeared to be a conscientious participant in the leadership training program from the very outset. She attended all of the scheduled meetings and was able to actively involve a lead teacher from the staff in the training programs. The staff developed a mission statement (that was clearly stated in the 1987-88 school handbook), and establishes goals on a annual basis. All teachers at the school have received

some training in the essential elements of effective instruction.

The principal was cited by the staff as being very competent in the teaching of the essential elements of effective instruction. In fact, the principal was trained so that she could present the essential elements of effective instruction to schools in her geographic area. She actually did train large groups of school personnel and was recognized publicly by her superintendent and peers for her contributions to school improvement. Within School 1, the principal devoted staff time to EEEI, reminded teachers of the various components of EEEI in the weekly staff bulletin, demonstrated lessons within the classroom, and actively coached teachers in EEEI.

The data collected during the on-site visitation at School 1 proved to be inconsistent with the MEAP and survey data from the school. School 1 was selected for an on-site visit due to its decrease in both MEAP and Connecticut Survey data, and yet the interviews with the principal and teachers showed the school had implemented many ideas and concepts from the leadership training program. Quotations from the interviews follow:

3rd Grade Teacher (lead teacher):

"(Principal) has throughout this time involved all of the teachers. Everyone somehow has had some classes, some to a larger degree than others, with essential elements of effective instruction."

"(Principal) has presented programs to us at staff meetings. One year she took one meeting a month and presented a portion of it (EEEI) to the teachers."

"In the weekly bulletin (principal) will remind us to work on sets or time on task in order to stimulate our thinking."

"Ideally what we were looking for was for me to be available to other teachers on the staff -- that peer coaching situation. I just haven't been able to find time to do that."

"I think they (standardized tests) have their value, but you just can by no means see what growth the kids make. I take the tests with a grain of salt."

"We actually had a committee that worked on a mission statement, and we constantly brought that back to the staff."

"When I use effective elements the kids are much more excited about learning and that enthusiasm carries home."

What factors effected the level of school-wide participation? "Number 1 would be (principal). The principal is the key person. Their approach . . . how prepared, how knowledgeable (principal) was, and (principal)'s enthusiasm encouraged all of us."

"Also I think the fact that not everyone was required to go to these classes initially, or required to take their own free time to do it was helpful."

"And also the fact that (principal) was able to present at staff meetings . . . to help build enthusiasm, and once we got that going people would say I'd like to take my time and learn more about this."

"(Principal) has come into our classroom and actually taught a lesson, and we sit in the back and watch. As far as I know everyone has had that opportunity. So (principal)'s actually shown us how it's done, and that has

been tremendous. I know many, many people have commented, now I see what you're saying there."

Hindrances? "We have a lot of responsibility above and beyond the classroom. So when it comes to taking another project that is a lot to ask."

4th Grade Teacher:

"(Principal) would come into staff meetings and share with us the things that would help us in the classroom, and the same thing with (lead teacher). We didn't hear it just once, we heard it a couple of times. Each time I learned more about the essential elements."

"(Principal) came into my classroom, and using the essential elements taught social studies, and it was just great."

"Now I know what (principal) is looking for . . . the communication is much better . . . (principal) can stress what area was my strong point, or maybe next time work on closure."

What factors impacted school-wide implementation? "(Principal) has been the main factor, her enthusiasm has been the key."

When asked who would like to take this class (EEEI), "I spoke up and said I would because I want to be the best teacher I can be. I know I could learn something from this."

Principal:

"First of all I was trained the first year. I took the thirty hours, and really got hooked on it. So I decided I wanted to look into becoming a trainer . . . The second year of the program we got a lead teacher involved in the program. As (lead teacher) got involved, I got another teacher interested and she attended a workshop with (lead teacher), and that's kind of what sparked it."

"Then I got our superintendent aside, and said look if we are going to compete in today's society then we've got to know this information (EEEI). So he encouraged me to begin training the administrators. So I presented all of that to our administrators . . . So that led into three summers of workshops for teachers . . . I did the presentation for 250 to 300 people four different times to get the basic stuff (EEEI)."

"In our own building I would maybe like in the month of April say anyone who would like a refresher on set and closure I will do a session on Wednesday at 3:00 for anyone who would like to attend. We've done that right along. Some times we take faculty meeting time."

"From the beginning . . . we had those positive reinforcement conferences . . . and everyone got so excited about those . . . we didn't say one negative thing about anyone in this building . . . I script-taped their lessons and could prove to them right on tape how great they are, and they just went nuts, they loved it. And the next year when we started to do the growth conferences . . . then we said now here's a little thing right here that wasn't there but I'm going to teach you how to put it in there."

"That was my job to really worry about instructional skills, if they were in place, and how to put them in place if they weren't. I owe that to this program (leadership training program)."

## **SCHOOL 5**

School 5 is located in a small Michigan school district. There are four principals in the district, two are elementary principals, one is the middle school principal, and one is the high school principal. The elementary principals and middle school principal attended

the leadership training program. School 5 houses grades 4 and 5 only. The September, 1987 4th Friday Report shows 240 students were enrolled at the school. Forty-five (19%) were receiving free or reduced lunches at the time, and 10 (4%) were minority students.

The superintendent in the district required the principal of School 5 to attend the original leadership training program during the 1983-84 school. The principal attended all of the sessions in 1983-84, and then involved a fifth grade teacher in the program during the 1984-85 school year. This teacher, who was well respected by her peers, eventually played a key role in implementing the essential elements of effective instruction within School 5.

The principal appeared to be skilled at involving staff members in the school improvement process and in securing funding for staff training programs. However, as one teacher stated, "I see (Principal) as a leader, but not an instructional leader." A formal school improvement plan was developed during the 1985-86 school year. It did not appear to be well-maintained, and the interviewed teachers were not familiar with the plan.

The principal, working with the superintendent, was able to organize a staff training program within the district relative to the essential elements of effective instruction. As a result, all teachers in School 5 have received training in EEEI. In addition three members of

the staff have received a \$1,000 stipend to attend an extended EEEI training session during the summer. The teachers noted that the training has created better lines of communication within the school and has changed the content of staff meetings to more of an instructional focus.

School 5 was selected for an on-site interview due to its low ranking relative to the MEAP and Connecticut Survey data. Yet, there was evidence that the leadership training program concepts was being implemented within the school.

The on-site visitation took place within one school day. Three teachers, the principal, and the superintendent all participated in one-on-one interviews. The following quotes provide further information on the implementation process within School 5:

Principal:

"In 1984 the board adopted or made a resolution that we would take part in the Middle Cities project . . . then the superintendent came and said would you be involved with the program."

"In the second year of the project . . . we would have a team of a principal and a teacher from the elementary schools and that's what helped it sell here. We had a lead teacher, a very respected teacher, that volunteered to go through the training. As she went through the training the eyes of the staff were upon us . . . It was helpful for me to have that teacher involved, because she sold the program . . . As an administrator coming in trying to sell the program, I'd have a difficult time."

"I've got to admit that there was no magic on my part. It was primarily a teacher who sold the program to the staff. And I worked with the teacher to try to keep things coordinated."

"It was expected (attendance at the leadership training program). When the boss is paying the bill and they've made a commitment, there is also a responsibility on your part to make sure you go."

"We started a staff training project. We made a proposal to (superintendent) and the board, and they gave us the go-ahead. Well, trainers are hard to find so I called (well-known presenter in EEEI) and said would you like to do our program. I just figured (presenter) would turn us down because (presenter) has enough statewide and nationwide business, but (presenter) laughed and said OK I'll do it . . . We opened it up to staff (K-12) . . . in 85-86 . . . and for the most part my staff attended and others from other buildings. We had approximately 30 people who said they wanted to take part in the training. We sat down with teachers and negotiated dates . . . The first year the teachers were very giving. We did two Saturdays, two days before school, an inservice day, and half a school day. So it cost the district in terms of student time, a half day . . . In the first year all 30 teachers received 30 hours of EEEI training."

"Now I'm looking at most K-5 staff members having at least 60 hours of EEEI training."

"We've been very successful because (lead teacher) has gotten the training, has felt very positive about it, and has shared with staff and the staff has respected her opinion . . . We have no one who has sat out there and said they will not take part in this training in this building."

"Last year we implemented an assertive discipline plan because one of the concerns (from the Connecticut Survey), was we have a relatively safe and secure and orderly building, but what about the exceptions."

How has the leadership training program



impacted your school? "In terms of concrete have we improved student achievement, I'm not sure."

"The biggest impact has been in attitude, staff attitude, in terms of I've got good skills, I know I'm doing a good job, research is indicating I'm doing those things that make a difference. That's kind of a nebulous thing to try and put a finger on and say prove it, but I think the attitude of the staff is much improved because of the training and camaraderie that's come out of this. And, I think if we can get the peer coaching going, that attitude is going to improve even more."

"This project has not gone as far as I wanted it to because there are two buildings (within the district) that are not at the same point of awareness and involvement that this building is."

"I can't say money (is a deterrant) . . . up to this point (superintendent) has committed money to a staff training program that had never been here before."

"I firmly believe the key is still back to the building principal. If I hadn't pushed, and if I hadn't selected wisely on staff then the thing would have died."

5th Grade Teacher (Lead Teacher):

"When they (staff) found out the hours (EEEE training) this was going to involve they looked at me and said is this going to be worth it? I said yes I believe it is, and I believe it's going to make a big change. And, so they went for it, mostly on my word."

"We got some Middle Cities trained people as our instructors when we started and they did an excellent job for us and the program just took off."

"The biggest impact it (EEEE training) had has been the whole uniting of staff in the effort of education. Giving us a common ground to work from. It's given us a reason

to talk . . . it's given us a common language. The teachers used to complain about a staff meeting a month, now they say let's meet every week. It's just a whole different atmosphere around here the last four or five years."

"We have a leader who is a pusher, and that helps, too. He keeps up with research and gets us information. And we have a district that's not afraid to spend money to send people for inservice."

4th Grade Teacher (1):

"It (EEEEI training) has given those of us who have a number of years between now and when we last took graduate courses or undergraduate courses a chance to update skills."

"Second I think it has given us a common ground to base some goals and some concerns and sharing of ideas. We've done a little with peer coaching and observation and it lends itself very well to sharing. It's opened some doors of communication between the staff."

"That (Connecticut Survey) I think gave us a chance to voice our ideas and concerns and establish some building-wide goals in an organized manner."

"Being involved in that (Connecticut Survey), and having a copy of that made me feel like I was a part of the process . . . The crux of the whole thing is as long as I know I have input that matters then I can stay with a program."

"Also to get with the superintendent to allow for release time so that we could continue the training, I think that was a major factor. The school system let us know that they were willing to put something into it too."

"The group of people that I'm working with is a big factor . . . We've got some school momentum going here."

"In this building finding enough time to get together and continue discussions or plans . . . I guess we get our attention diverted, that's about the only thing that has slowed us."

"I would recommend to any principal who has an opportunity to get involved in this, to do so. And to be very, very careful that it be presented in a non-threatening, non-evaluation type format in the building."

"My biggest recommendation to (principal) is to get in the room and practice it (EEEI) with kids."

4th Grade Teacher (2):

"We based (worth of the EEEI training) it on what (lead teacher) had to say, because she's a trusted member of the staff, and everyone knew what she said was valid."

"That training (EEEI) really was an exciting training. It was tiring because it would happen after school or all day on Saturday. But it was worthwhile. Nobody regretted it."

"There is a unity factor there and a friendliness that didn't seem to be there before (EEEI training). Because this year we're going into each other's room and script-taping . . . that entering into each other's room was the biggest mountain to climb. Personally, I feel being evaluated by an administrator means absolutely nothing to me. To be evaluated by my peers means everything to me."

"(Principal) provides all of the opportunities, and hopes that you will take advantage of them. But we cannot get (principal) to take our classroom and try the EEEI stuff. I see (principal) as a leader, but not an instructional leader."

**Superintendent:**

"There were some other principals (from within the district) that were involved in it (leadership training program) . . . Those buildings were not impacted as much as (School 5). Probably standing out would be the personality of (Principal of School 5). (Principal of School 5) had the personality for this and he had more time for this. (Principal of School 5) is very well organized and uses his time extremely well. That's his strength . . . That building (School 5) has been highly impacted."

"The leadership in the school has been (Principal of School 5), the leaders in the district have been the (School 5) teachers, and in my opinion the quality of education in that building is reflected in that . . . They are extremely professional, they are very dedicated, they go the extra mile, and they are extremely concerned with the outcomes. That building has been highly impacted."

"The Board has been very supportive."

"There was a tremendous committment on the part of the teachers in that group . . . They gave up some things and got committed."

"The negative to any of these kinds of programs is there is never enough time. That is a real problem in implementing or making change . . . They're on textbook committees, they're on curriculum committees, they are on the Michigan Model we brought in . . . We have a real problem utilizing the teachers time because of the lack of time they have."

"We made it very clear in the beginning that this was not an evaluation instrument."

"The one thing I still believe that if that program is going to work that at some point in that program you have to have a very committed leader."

"We felt that without the leadership of Middle Cities and without the leadership of the foundation we would have never done any of this."

**SCHOOL 15**

School 15 is located in an inner-city setting within a large Michigan school district. The district is also home to School 9. Most of the students are bussed to School 15, due to a district-wide bussing program. The 4th Friday report from September, 1987 showed the school enrolled 80 students in a preschool program and 190 students in grades K through 3. Of the 190 students, 68 (36%) were minority students, and 151 (79%) received free or reduced lunches.

The principal attended the original leadership training program due to an interest in school improvement within the central administrative office. All principals within the district were required to attend the program. A lead teacher accompanied the principal to two sessions during the 1984-85 school year. All teachers within the district had received, or plans had been made for them to receive, EEEI training. The EEEI training took place during the school day, was mandated by the district, and was paid for by the district. The district has also been active in developing grade level objectives for the general education curriculum.

The concepts from the leadership training program and from the EEEI training were not being actively implemented within School 15 at the time of the on-site visitation. The factors which discouraged the implementation included lack of follow-up from the principal, the principal being

assigned to two buildings, turnover in staff during the 1983 to 1986 time frame, and an apparent time conflict with other programs and projects.

The on-site visitation at School 15 took place within one school day. Five teachers, the principal, and the director of elementary education were all interviewed. Quotations from the interview follow:

Two third grade teachers:

"This is my fourth year here, and I'm not aware of what you just described (school improvement plans). It sounds like it would be great."

"Personally, I think the testing that we do here is not good. I see my children totally turned off by the time they are in second and third grade. We take Iowa Basics at the beginning of the year which puts them in the position of not knowing what they are doing on the test, rather than doing it in the spring. I see my kids turning off the minute they see a test booklet, and guessing . . . I think the testing program needs definite scrutiny."

"(Principal of School 9), our students channel into (School 9), will give us a paper showing us where we were strong and where we were weak . . . That's the only kind of feedback I'm getting at all."

"If we talked together about our strong points and our weak points, I think that would really be good."

Principal:

"We have a turnover of staff generally every year . . . Our millage didn't pass, so we're in the process of laying off about twenty teachers . . . So I have this turnover,

frequently."

"At the present time everyone has been inserviced in EEEI."

"Trying to handle two schools (as a principal) is really an impossible task."

"Change is not always easily accepted. You can't force change on a person I've found out. You have to want to be changed."

"This is an unusual campus because it's a shortcut, we have people walking back and forth across the playground all day. Back and forth in front of the school. They don't bother anybody, though. The people who live in this community, whereas they may not have gotten their education, they want their kids to get it. You can find somethimes a guy who's sort of a wino staggering across the playground. He'll tell kids I didn't get my education, you get yours. So we have that respect from the community where nobody bothers us during school hours. Of course there are certainly a lot of things going on here that aren't too good, but this is sort of like an oasis. People respect the school."

"On task during instructional time, in my view, is the key to effective teaching and success of schools."

"We haven't had time to perfect it (effective teaching), but all of the teachers have been given information on what it takes to be an effective teacher."

Two first grade teachers:

"Our presentor (for EEEI) was kind of strange. It was good but we spent a lot of time checking out (presentor). She was a very good presentor, but her appearance really had everyone watching her -- just by the way she was dressed. She was unreal."

"We had it (EEEI) during the school day for five days. She came three days, and we had local people for two days."

"I did get a lot of good things out of it, but it just seemed there was so much . . . You were just so bombarded."

"It was required for us to go, so we had no choice in the matter."

What happened when you got back to the building? "Nothing."

"Most of the people (at our EEEI training) were from one building, and their principal was also there with them. So I think he's the type that would go in, sit in the rooms, and help the teachers out with it." Is that happening here? "No."

"We have Michigan Model going, Gifted and Talented going, there's lots and lots and not enough time to really explore it all."

Preschool Teacher (lead teacher):

"We have been involved in so many things and I think you can be overly involved. You can get oversaturated with some of this, and particularly if you feel that you're being observed a great deal. I think people have a tendency to get a little nervous about that."

"Probably the only thing that I think I did in terms of the whole staff was working on the mission statement . . . It did carryover."

#### SUMMARY

A review of the qualitative data shows each of the schools were impacted by the leadership training program differently. Some schools obviously benefitted a great deal from the program, while other schools did not show evidence of significant impact within their setting. Furthermore, when talking directly with personnel within



their schools, it became apparent there are some inconsistencies in the quantitative and qualitative data collected as part of this study. For example, the interviews at School 1 clearly revealed that the teachers were practicing the essential elements of effective instruction within their classroom, that the principal was highly proficient as a teacher of teachers, and that a great deal of energy had gone into school improvement efforts within the school. Yet, Table 1 in Chapter III shows School 1 to be a non-improving school. And, to a lesser extent the qualitative data collection shows Schools 5 (IL) and 11 (IH) to be inconsistent with the corresponding MEAP and Connecticut Survey data. The on-site visitations at Schools 2 (IH), 9 (IH), and 15 (IL) were consistent with the MEAP and Connecticut data extracted from those schools.

During the course of the interviews with school personnel several patterns surfaced in relation to factors that influenced the implementation process. What follows is a summary of the common themes that the interviewer noted throughout the on-site visitations.

> Leadership of the building principal. If the principal was interested and enthused about school improvement, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation. Supportive data:

4th Grade Teacher, School 2: "We knew our leader at that time that was her main

objective. That was her mission."

6th Grade Teacher, School 2: "I think it (school improvement) has taken off, and I think it's largely due to the people we've had as principals."

Director of Elementary Education, School 2: "First of all, the key to any particular building, in my opinion, is the leadership displayed in the building by the principal."

4th Grade Teacher, School 11: "Really there's only one condition that you really have to have and that's the strong leadership of the principal."

5th Grade Teacher, School 5: "We have a leader who is a pusher, and that helps, too. He keeps up with research and gets us information."

Superintendent, School 5: "There were some other principals (from within the district) that were involved in it (leadership training program) . . . Those buildings were not impacted as much as (School 5). Probably standing out would be the personality of (Principal of School 5)."

> Amount of money budgeted for school improvement.

If money was available for inservice training and classroom teachers release time, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation. Supportive data:

Director of Elementary Education, School 2: "Our great weakness is that we just don't have adequate inservice time for all of our programs that we are trying to implement."

Director of Elementary Education, Schools 9 and 15: "We decided that our board should make a decision that we would all be participants (in EEEI training). Therefore we asked for \$20,000 to be put in our budget for effective schools training and also for any component that might follow that . . . I would say that we have been successfully involved."

Elementary Curriculum Co-ordinator, School 11: "I think it (school effectiveness movement) had a tremendous impact (on the school system). Every teacher in this district has had at least eight hours of training in ITIP or EEI."

3rd Grade Teacher, School 1: "Everyone somehow has had some classes, some to a larger degree than others, with essential elements of effective instruction."

Principal, School 5: "I can't say money (is a deterrent) . . . up to this point (superintendent) has committed money to a staff training program that had never been here before."

5th Grade Teacher, School 5: "We have a district that's not afraid to spend money to send people for inservice."

> Amount of autonomy within each building. If schools were allowed to make modifications and develop ownership in their school improvement plans, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation.

Supportive data:

6th Grade Teacher, School 2: "One of the things that really came up (in tabulating the Connecticut Survey) was a concern for discipline. I think that we have seen that our discipline procedure has gained in effectiveness."

Principal, School 2: "So I think they realize that if they (teachers) bring things up through the school improvement committee . . . then we will take action on it."

Principal, School 9: "We said, 'OK' we're not going to take what they give us in total. We took what we wanted out of it . . . that's how we developed ownership."

3rd Grade Teacher, School 1: "We actually had a committee that worked on a mission

statement, and we constantly brought that back to the staff."

4th Grade Teacher, School 5: "I think it (school improvement) has given us a common ground to base some goals and some concerns and sharing of ideas. We've done a little with peer coaching and observation and it lends itself very well to sharing. It's opened some doors of communication between the staff."

> Time. If school personnel were free from a cumbersome workload and conflicting projects, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation.

Supportive data:

4th Grade Teacher, School 2: "The pull-out programs are often times a hindrance (e.g. instrumental music, speech). We try to schedule around those things but when you have that many . . . it becomes difficult."

Principal, School 2: "If you're trying to do, and if you're putting forth that effort, and you want to make a difference then you (the principal) can be pulled to do other things. Or, they'll say your name was one of the ones submitted by teachers and administrators to do this because they feel you're trustworthy, you're honest, you will do it fairly. I say, yes, but I have to do my job fairly."

3rd Grade Teacher, School 1: "Ideally what we were looking for was for me to be available to other teachers on the staff -- that peer coaching situation. I just haven't been able to find time to do that."

5th Grade Teacher, School 5: "In this building finding enough time to get together and continue discussions or plans . . . I guess we get our attention diverted, that's about the only thing that has slowed us."

Superintendent, School 5: "The negative to any of these kinds of programs is there is never enough time. That is a real problem in

implementing or making change . . . They're on textbook committees, they're on curriculum committees, they are on the Michigan Model we brought in . . . We have a real problem utilizing the teachers time because of the lack of time they have."

Principal, School 15: "Trying to handle two schools (as a principal) is really an impossible task."

> Interest of the teaching staff. If teachers became enthused about the essential elements of effective instruction and were able to interest others, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation.

Supportive data:

Principal, School 2: "I think part of it (involvement) is getting the staff committed. I think you have one real strong group that is committed to school improvement on our staff. Then we have some others that are definitely not committed to it."

3rd Grade Teacher, School 1: "And also the fact that (principal) was able to present at staff meetings . . . to help build enthusiasm, and once we got that going people would say I'd like to take my time and learn more about this."

Principal, School 5: "I've got to admit that there was no magic on my part. It was primarily a teacher who sold the program to the staff. And I worked with the teacher to try to keep things coordinated."

5th Grade Teacher, School 5: "When they (staff) found out the hours (EEEI training) this was going to involve they looked at me and said is this going to be worth it? I said yes I believe it is, and I believe it's going to make a big change. And, so they went for it, mostly on my word."

4th Grade Teacher, School 5: "We based (worth of the EEEI training) it on what (lead teacher) had to say, because she's a trusted

member of the staff, and everyone knew what she said was valid."

> Relevance. If school personnel were able to establish a relationship between school improvement plans and their individual school setting, then there was a greater opportunity for successful implementation.

Supportive data:

4th Grade Teacher, School 2: "I think that here all the teachers were willing to give it a try . . . I think people were quite willing to listen . . . I think the school had come through a time, under other leadership, where they could see that things were falling apart, and that something had to be done."

Principal, School 9: "The one good thing that happened was that when we talked about the information . . . the information that went into what was an effective school or what were the elements of effective instruction, they made a lot of sense. The information made a lot of sense."

Principal, School 5: "Last year we implemented an assertive discipline plan because one of the concerns (from the Connecticut Survey), was we have a relatively safe and secure and orderly building, but what about the exceptions."

Furthermore, the on-site visitations revealed there were outcomes generated by the leadership training program that may have been undetected in the quantitative data collection. School personnel attributed some or all of the following outcomes to the leadership training program:

- > Improved school-wide discipline.
- > Brighter, cleaner physical plant.
- > Improved communication within the school.

- > Staff meetings devoted to improvement of the instructional program.
- > Better feedback for teachers relative to their teaching and lesson planning.
- > More inservice training for teachers.
- > Formation of school improvement teams.
- > Development of mission statements and school goals.
- > Development of systems for rewarding students.
- > Better systems for monitoring student performance.
- > Development of grade level objectives and minimum standards.

## V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS

### INTRODUCTION

The final chapter is devoted to a summary of the study, significant conclusions from the research, recommendations for future research, and some final reflections.

### SUMMARY

The Middle Cities Association and Kellogg Foundation organized a leadership training program for seventy-eight Michigan elementary schools during the 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86 school years. The goal of the program was to improve the leadership capacity of elementary principals, and thus, to increase student achievement.

This study was designed to analyze the schools involved in the leadership training program to determine the effect, if any, the program had on the schools that participated in the program. Five research questions served as the focal point of the study. The five questions were:



1. What impact, if any, did the training program have within each of the participating schools?
2. What factors within each school setting, if any, encouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
3. What factors within each school setting, if any, discouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?
4. Were there significant differences in the amount of change that took place between the participating schools?
5. If differences did exist, what specific differences were there between schools?

Prior to designing the study pertinent literature and relevant studies were reviewed. The literature review found that field work done by Weber, Madden, Brookover, Rutter, Edmonds, and others confirm that differences do exist within elementary school settings and that some schools are more effective than others in facilitating student achievement. These studies helped to provide a basic framework for the research and also provided guidance in the development of instrumentation for the study. Furthermore, studies conducted by Purkey, Smith, Cuban, Corbett, Dawson, Firestone, Huberman, Miles, Miller, Sayre, Tinsley, Fullan, and Sirotnik helped to focus the study on areas within the school setting that worked to facilitate or hinder the implementation process.

Enroute to answering the five research questions both

quantitative and qualitative data were collected. Specifically, Connecticut Survey data collected in 1983 and also in 1986 was tabulated for each of the fifteen schools that actually participated in the study. Also, standardized test score data was collected for the participating schools. The 4th Grade Michigan Educational Assessment Program provided the primary test data for the study.

The qualitative component of the study was designed so direct on-site discussion with teachers, principals, and central administrators could take place. Consequently the results from the Connecticut Survey and the standardized test scores were rank-ordered to determine which of the fifteen schools showed the most and least amount of improvement from 1983 until 1986. After analyzing the rank order of the schools three schools showing improvement and three schools showing little or no improvement were selected for on-site interviews. A total of twenty-five individual interviews took place involving six principals, four central office administrators, and fifteen teachers.

The study began with a population of seventy-eight prospective participating schools. However, through the process of seeking permission to conduct the study within the schools, and working with the Middle Cities Association to secure both pre and post Connecticut Survey results, the original field of seventy-eight schools was pared to fifteen.

The quantitative data were examined from eight different perspectives, and the following findings surfaced:

1. The schools in this study were compared to all schools in the state of Michigan. The schools in the study improved their MEAP Category 4 4th grade reading scores 5.3 percentage points from 1983 to 1986, and their math scores 4.1 points during the same time. The 4th graders in the state of Michigan improved the same scores 4.4 points in reading and 4.5 points in math. The schools in the study experienced their biggest test score gains during the first year of the leadership training program (from 1983 to 1984).

2. A look at the pre and post Connecticut Survey data shows that a statistically significant overall difference exists between the fifteen schools in the study.

3. Furthermore, a closer look at specific pairs of schools show that a significant difference exists between some schools while there is not a significant difference between other schools.

4. There is not a significant relationship between the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores and the 1983 and 1986 MEAP scores.

5. There is not a significant relationship between the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores and the 1983 MEAP scores.

6. A significant difference in the pre and post Connecticut Survey scores was found in three of the seven correlates. A significant difference was found in clear school mission, instructional leadership, and high expectations.

7. There is not a significant relationship between the three significant correlates and the differences between the 1983 and 1986 MEAP data within each school.

8. There is not a significant relationship between the three significant correlates and the corresponding 1983 MEAP data.

The interviews with school personnel proved to be insightful and extremely valuable in drawing conclusions relative to the implementation of school improvement plans. Each of the six visited schools was impacted in a different manner by the leadership training program. During the interviews it became apparent there were some inconsistencies between the quantitative and qualitative data that was collected for each school. The on-site visitations at Schools 2 (IH), 9 (IH), and 15 (IL) were consistent with the MEAP and Connecticut data, while Schools 1 (IL), 5 (IL), and 11 (IH) were not.

The qualitative data collection generated the following list of factors that impacted the implementation process:

- > Leadership of the building principal
- > Amount of money budgeted for school improvement.
- > Amount of autonomy within each building.
- > Time.
- > Interest of the teaching staff.
- > Relevance.

Furthermore, the on-site visitations revealed there were outcomes generated by the leadership training program that may have been undetected in the quantitative data collection. School personnel attributed some or all of the following outcomes to the leadership training program:

- > Improved school-wide discipline.
- > Brighter, cleaner physical plant.
- > Improved communication within the school.
- > Staff meetings devoted to improvement of the instructional program.
- > Better feedback for teachers relative to their teaching and lesson planning.
- > More inservice training for teachers.
- > Formation of school improvement teams.
- > Development of mission statements and school goals.
- > Development of systems for rewarding students.
- > Better systems for monitoring student performance.
- > Development of grade level objectives and minimum standards.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions drawn from the research relate directly to the research questions posed at the outset of the study. Therefore, the questions will be restated and the relevant conclusions will be addressed as they pertain to the five questions.

**What impact, if any, did the training program have within each of the participating schools?**

A review of the standardized test score data shows that the leadership training program did not have a significant impact on the test scores from the collective group of fifteen schools. Some individual schools showed an increase in test scores from 1983 to 1986, while others showed a decrease in their scores during the same period of time.

The Connecticut Survey data reveals that a significant impact was made in the fifteen schools in three areas from 1983 until 1986. There was a clearer sense of school mission, better instructional leadership, and higher expectations for students.

Furthermore, the study shows that a relationship does not exist between the MEAP scores, and the Connecticut Survey results.

The on-site visitations provided evidence that the leadership training program did impact the schools in a

manner not shown by the quantitative data. A number of developments were in evidence at some or all of the six visited schools. The personnel at the schools attributed the evolution of these features, traits, and phenomena to the leadership training program.

- > Improved school-wide discipline.
- > Brighter, cleaner physical plant.
- > Improved communication within the school.
- > Staff meetings devoted to improvement of the instructional program.
- > Better feedback for teachers relative to their teaching and lesson planning.
- > More inservice training for teachers.
- > Formation of school improvement teams.
- > Development of mission statements and school goals.
- > Development of systems for rewarding students.
- > Better systems for monitoring student performance.
- > Development of grade level objectives and minimum standards.

**What factors within each school setting, if any, encouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?**

This section is based entirely on the interviews and observations that took place at the six schools that received an on-site visitation. The statements are cautious so as to increase the credence of their applicability to all schools participating in the leadership training program.

The school principal plays the key role in implementing school improvement plans and subsequently improving the teaching-learning process. Furthermore, the study showed that no one particular leadership skill was the best for implementing school improvement plans. For example, one school needed a master teacher; another school required a principal who was skilled at securing grant money; and a third principal was a good communicator and motivator relative to school improvement.

No school improvement plan will succeed, however, without the involvement of the teaching staff at the school. The experiences, personalities, and interest in school improvement of the teachers were important factors as the schools dealt with the concept of creating a more effective school. The schools that experienced success in the implementation process had staff members involved in leadership roles, had teachers involved in school-wide decision making (i.e. in developing the mission statement or school improvement plan), and had teachers working toward the common goal of an improved teaching-learning situation.

The role of the central administration within each district was an important factor in encouraging implementation. Those schools that experienced improving conditions within the 1983 to 1986 time frame had active, involved central administrators who believed in the relevance of school improvement. The type of involvement



varied, but examples included money being budgeted for inservice training, and school improvement plans being submitted to the administration center.

**What factors within each school setting, if any, discouraged the implementation of concepts presented during the training program?**

The study shows that over a period of time the effort generated by school personnel for school improvement planning began to decrease. This is based on a decreasing amount of money available for inservice programs, a decreased emphasis on the school improvement plan in some schools, and a lessening of time spent on instructional issues within staff meetings during the 1983 to 1986 time frame.

A lack of coordinated effort from the personnel in the administration center, principal's office, and classroom also served to discourage the implementation process. Turnover in personnel hindered the coordination of effort, as did differences in expectations and interpretations from school personnel. The latter example especially surfaced in larger districts where the school improvement process was interpreted differently within individual schools.

Other projects and priorities within the school setting hindered the implementation process. For example, school millage elections, difficult teacher contract negotiations, and other community projects sapped energy

from the school improvement effort within the six schools that were visited.

**Were there significant differences in the amount of change that took place between the participating schools?**

The study concludes that there were significant differences in the amount of change that took place between the participating schools.

**If differences did exist, what specific differences were there between schools?**

The statistical tests presented in Chapter IV show an overall difference between the fifteen schools relative to the Connecticut Survey data at the end of the training program in 1986. The statistical data shows that significant differences did exist between some pairs of schools as well.

The MEAP data also shows a wide range of differences between schools when analyzing the differences in the 1983 and 1986 scores. The range of differences between 1983 and 1986 in Category 4 4th Grade MEAP scores is -15.1 to +33.4 (see Table 16).

The very nature of school improvement planning seeks out the strengths and weaknesses of schools so that school personnel can analyze their own school and make plans to improve within the individual setting. Furthermore, the

personalities and leadership styles of individuals within each school setting contributed significantly to the differences between schools. The combination of differences in environment and leadership within the schools spawned numerous differences between the schools. The most common of which were funding, inservicing and motivating the staff, and monitoring the school improvement process.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH

There were discrepancies in the findings between the quantitative data and the on-site visitations. The findings from this study would be incomplete if they were based on only the test data, survey data, or interview data. All were helpful in forming impressions and drawing conclusions.

This study focused on fifteen schools out of the original group of seventy-eight schools that participated in the leadership training program. Therefore a recommended research project would be to apply the same five research questions to the remaining sixty-three schools. One would speculate that there is a wealth of information within those sixty-three school settings.

School 2 in this study is in a large school system with a total of eighteen elementary schools. The external conditions, related to successful implementation, that

these eighteen schools faced are logically very similar. Thus, a study which focused on individual schools within one large school system is recommended.

A final suggestion for future research would be to conduct a case study of one individual school that has exhibited outstanding traits relative to school improvement. A detailed study of a positive, vibrant, improving environment complete with reasons and rationale would add to the effective schools knowledge.

#### REFLECTIONS

As this research project draws to a close there are some feelings that will exist long after the specific conclusions and recommendations have been reviewed. The dialogue that took place between this researcher and the personnel within the six schools that participated in on-site visitations has left a lasting impression. It was indeed a privilege to interact with so many competent, caring, interested professionals. The conversations with these people within their own school settings stimulated many ideas and thoughts that are beyond the bounds of this specific research project. For that, this researcher is very grateful.

It seems necessary, too, to follow up that thought with a recommendation to all who read this study to visit

schools, ask questions, seek ideas, discuss setbacks, share successes and learn from others who are struggling with an immense responsibility -- improving schools.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrams, Joan D. "Precise Teaching Is More Effective Teaching." Educational Leadership, November, 1981, 39:138-139.
- Benore, Lynn. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/Middle Cities Education Association Project on Educational Leadership Training for Elementary Principals Year I Report. Michigan State University: Middle Cities Association, 1984.
- Benore, Lynn. W.K. Kellogg Foundation/Middle Cities Education Association Project on Educational Leadership Training for Elementary Principals Year II Report. Michigan State University: Middle Cities Association, 1985.
- Borg, Walter R. and Meredith D. Gall. Educational Research An Introduction 4th Edition. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Brandt, Ron. "On School Effectiveness: A Conversation with Peter Mortimore." Educational Leadership, May, 1981, 38:642-645.
- Brandt, Ron. "On School Improvement: A conversation with Ron Edmonds." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:13-15.
- Brookover, Wilbur, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, and Joe Wisenbaker. Schools Can Make A Difference. Michigan State University: College of Urban Development, 1977.
- Brookover, Wilbur B., Laurence Beamer, Helen Efthim, Douglas Hathaway, Lawrence Lezotte, Stephen Miller, Joseph Passalacqua, and Louis Tornatzky. Creating Effective Schools An Inservice Program For Enhancing School Learning Climate and Achievement. Holmes Beach, Florida: The Learning Publications, 1982.
- Brookover, Wilbur B. and Edsel L. Erickson. Sociology of Education. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1975

- Brophy, Jere. "Classroom Organization and Management." The Elementary School Journal, March, 1983, 83:265-285.
- Canner, Jane and Richard Guttenberg. "The New York City School Improvement Project." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:18-20.
- Clancy, Peter L. Nineteen Improving Schools and Why. Eastern Michigan University: Leadership and Counseling Department, 1982.
- Clark, David L., Linda S. Lotto, and Martha M. McCarthy. "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1980, 61:467-470.
- Clauset, Karl H. Jr. and Alan K. Gaynor. "A System Perspective on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:54-59.
- Cohen, Michael. "Effective Schools: Accumulating Research Findings." American Education, January-February, 1982, 18:13-16.
- Cohen, Michael. "Effective Schools: What the Research Says." Today's Education, April/May, 1981, 70:46G-49G
- Coleman, James S. "Public Schools, Private Schools, and the Public Interest." American Education, January-February, 1982, 18:17-22.
- Coleman, James S., Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfeld, Robert L. York. Equality of Education Opportunity. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Corbett, H. Dickson, Judith A. Dawson, and William A. Firestone. School Context and School Change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1984.
- Cuban, Larry. "Effective Schools: A Friendly But Cautionary Note." Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1983, 64:695-696.
- Cuban, Larry. "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level." Harvard Educational Review, May, 1984, 54:129-151.
- Curran, Thomas J. "Characteristics of the Effective



- School -- Starting Point for Self-Evaluation." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, 67:71-73.
- D'Amico, Joseph. "Using Effective Schools Studies to Create Effective Schools: No Recipes Yet." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:60-62.
- Donovan, David L. "Schools Do Make a Difference." Michigan School Board Journal, July-August, 1982, 29:8-11.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schools. St. Louis, Missouri: CEMREL, 1979.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:4-11.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. "School Effects and Teacher Effects." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:37-39.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. "Some Schools Work and More Can." Social Policy, March/April, 1979, 10:28-32.
- Educational Research Service. Effective Schools: A Summary of Research. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1983.
- Eubanks, Eugene E. and Daniel U. Levine. "A First Look at Effective Schools Projects in New York City and Milwaukee." Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1983, 64:697-702.
- Eubanks, Eugene E. and Daniel U. Levine. "Effective Inner-City Elementary Schools." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:21-23, 26-29.
- Evans, Robert W. "One State's Approach: Ohio's Effective School Program." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, 67:74-76.
- Farrar, Eleanor, Matthew B. Miles, and Barbara Neufeld. Effective Schools Programs in High Schools: Implications For Policy, Practice, and Research (Vol. III) Review of Effective Schools Programs Final Report. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington D.C., April, 1983.
- Finn, Chester E. Jr. "Toward Strategic Independence: Nine Commandments of Enhancing School Effectiveness." Phi

Delta Kappan, April, 1984, 65:518-524.

- Firestone, William A. and Robert E. Herriott. "Prescriptions for Effective Elementary Schools Don't Fit Secondary Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:51-53.
- Fredericksen, John R. and Ronald R. Edmonds. Identification of Instructionally Effective and Ineffective Schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.
- Fullan, Michael. "Change Processes and Strategies at the Local Level." The Elementary School Journal, January, 1985, 85:391-421.
- Gersten, Russell, Douglas Carnine, and Susan Green. "The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Second Look." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:47-50.
- Good, Thomas L. "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research." Educational Leadership, February, 1981, 38:415-422.
- Hawkins, Augustus F. "The Effective Schools Development Act of 1984." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:52-53.
- Huberman, A. Michael and Matthew B. Miles. Innovation Up Close How School Improvement Works. New York: Plenum Press, 1984.
- Howell, Bruce. "Profile of the Principalship." Educational Leadership, January, 1981, 38:333-336.
- Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, Dave Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns, Stephan Michelson. Inequality A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Kelley, Edgar A. "Auditing School Climate." Educational Leadership, December, 1981, 39:180-183.
- Kerman, Sam. "Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement." Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1979, 60:716-718.
- Levine, Daniel U. and Joyce Stark. "Instructional and Organizational Arrangements That Improve Achievement in Inner-City Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:41-46.

- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "A Response to D'Amico: Not a Recipe But a Framework." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:63.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "Characteristics of Effective Schools and Programs for Realizing Them." Citizen Action in Education, November, 1982, 9:1,10-11.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "Climate Characteristics in Instructionally Effective Schools." IMPACT on Instructional Improvement, New York State Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Summer, 1981, 16:26-31.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. Effective Schools Research and School Improvement Implications. Paper presented at the Invitational National Conference of Citizens Participation for School Improvement, St. Louis, March, 1982.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. "More Schools are Working, But Even More Can." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:46-48.
- Lezotte, Lawrence W. and Beverly Bancroft. "Growing Use of the Effective Schools Model for School Improvement." Educational Leadership, March, 1985, 42:23-27.
- Macchiarola, Frank J. "Advocacy by School Administrators." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:30-32.
- Mackenzie, Donald E. "Research for School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends." Educational Researcher, April, 1983, 12:5-17.
- MacPhail-Wilcox, Betty and Jim Guth. "Effectiveness Research and School Administration -- Both Sides of the Coin." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, 67:3-8.
- Madaus, George F., Peter W. Airasian, and Thomas Kellaghan. School Effectiveness A Reassessment of the Evidence. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980.
- Manasse, Lorri A. "Improving Conditions for Principal Effectiveness: Policy Implications of Research." The Elementary School Journal, January, 1985, 85:439-463.
- Mann, Dale. "The National Council for Effective Schools." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:49-51.

- McCormack-Larkin, Maureen. "Ingredients of a Successful School Effectiveness Project." Educational Leadership, March, 1985, 42:31-37.
- McCormack-Larkin, Maureen. "Second Opinion: A Response." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:73.
- McCormack-Larkin, Maureen and William J. Kritek. "Milwaukee's Project RISE." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:16-21.
- Middle Cities Association. 1985 Annual Report. Michigan State University, June, 1985.
- Miles, Matthew B., Eleanor Farrar, and Barbara Neufeld. Review of Effective Schools Program (Vol. II) The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs. Paper prepared for the National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington D.C., January, 1983.
- Miller, Lynne and Ann Lieberman. "School Leadership Between the Cracks." Educational Leadership, February, 1982, 39:362-367.
- Miller, Stephen A., Kathleen A. Sayre, and Deanna S. Tinsley. "Effective Schools and Educational Change: Implications for Teacher Educators." The Teacher Educator, Spring, 1984, 19:2-13.
- Miller, Stephen K. "School Learning Climate Improvement: A Case Study." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:36-37.
- Miller, Stephen K., Shelley R. Cohen, and Kathleen A. Sayre. "Significant Achievement Gains Using the Effective Schools Model." Educational Leadership, March, 1985, 42:38-43.
- Murphy, Joseph, Richard P. Mesa, and Phillip Hallinger. "Creating Effective School Districts: Lessons from Practice, Research, National Reports." American Education, July, 1984, 20:13-14.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Education, April, 1983.
- Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. "School Reform: The District Policy Implications of the Effective Schools Literature." The Elementary School Journal,

January, 1985, 85:353-389.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:64-69.

Ralph, John H., and James Fennessey. "Science or Reform: Some Questions About the Effective Schools Model." Phi Delta Kappan, June, 1983, 64:689-694.

Robinson, Glen E. Effective Schools Research: A Guide To School Improvement. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, 1985.

Rubin, Ronald. "The School Effectiveness Movement: An Educator Asks, Effective For What?" Education Times, April 19, 1982, 2.

Rubin, Ronald. Letter to the Editor. Education Times, June 1, 1982.

Rutter, Michael, Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore, and Janet Ouston. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Sapone, Carmelo V. "A Research Review -- Perceptions on Characteristics of Effective Schools." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, 67:66-70.

Shoemaker, Joan and Hugh W. Fraser. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications From Studies Of Effective Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1981, 63:178-182.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. "School Effectiveness: A Bandwagon in Search of a Tune." Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring, 1985, 21:135-140.

Sizer, Theodore R. "Essential Schools: A First Look." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October, 1983, 67:33-38.

Sparks, Georgea, Marsha Nowakowski, Burnis Hall, Rudi Alec, and Joseph Imrick, "School Improvement Through Staff Development." Educational Leadership, March, 1985, 42:59-61.

Sweeney, James. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership, February, 1982, 39:346-352.

Tomlinson, Tommy M. "Book Review of Creating Effective

- Schools." Educational Leadership, December, 1982, 40:72-73.
- Tomlinson, Tommy, M. "Effective Schools: Mirror or Mirage." Today's Education, April/May, 1981, 70:48G-50G.
- VerSteeg, Linda, Lynn Benore, Mary Anne Marshall, and C. Robert Muth. Improvement Planning in Elementary Schools. Michigan State University: Middle Cities Association, 1985.
- Viteritti, Joseph P. "Agenda Setting: When Politics and Pedagogy Meet." Social Policy, Fall, 1984, 15:2-5.
- Walters, Barbara. "One Principal, Two 'Principals' Principals' Named By School Board." Kalamazoo, MI. Gazette, August 9, 1985, B1.
- Weber, George. "Inter-City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools." Washington D.C.: Council For Basic Education, 1971.
- Wood, Fred H., Robert Freeland, and John Szabo. "School Improvement Is More than School Improvement." Educational Leadership, March, 1985, 42:63-66.

**APPENDIX A**  
**Correspondence**



Reprinted with  
permission

517 Erickson Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034  
(517) 355-1720

*President:*  
Richard Klahn, Marquette

*Directors:*  
Odell Nails, Pontiac  
William Pearson, Jackson

*Executive Director*  
C. Robert Muth

### INFORMATION ONLY COPY

October 21, 1986

MEMO TO: Principals of Schools Participating in the MCA/Kellogg Project on Educational Leadership

FROM: C. Robert Muth, Executive Director  
Lawrence Lezotte, Project Director

SUBJECT: Research Studies Related to the Project

Over the past three years your school has been involved in a major program of school improvement based on effective schools and effective teaching research. This project, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and administered by the Middle Cities Association, has been one of the largest programs combining these two important research bases in the country. The inclusion of principals and teachers from approximately eighty schools in this Kellogg project, as well as sixty-six schools in another related project administered by Middle Cities over a two to three year program represents a very intensive approach to elementary school leadership and school improvement.

During the course of the project each principal was responsible for fulfilling certain requirements related to school improvement. Most often this took the form of some document or product associated with the school improvement process used in this project. Thus the project staff asked that such things as the following be sent to the Middle Cities office: lists of improvement team members, school mission statements, disaggregated analyses of student achievement, Connecticut School Interview needs assessments, and school improvement plans. When you entered the project the project staff asked you to submit the above data with assurances that data collected by our office would not be released on an individual school basis to others without your consent. All reporting by Middle Cities has been by groups of schools.

---

#### Member Districts

Albion Public Schools  
Ann Arbor Public Schools  
Battle Creek Public Schools  
Bay City Public Schools  
Beecher Community Schools  
Benton Harbor Area Schools  
Buena Vista School District  
Flint Community Schools  
Grand Rapids Public Schools

Highland Park Public Schools  
Jackson Public Schools  
Kalamazoo Public Schools  
Lansing School District  
Marquette Public Schools  
Midland Public Schools  
Monroe Public Schools  
Muskegon Public Schools  
Muskegon Heights Public Schools

Niles Community Schools  
Plymouth-Canton Community Schools  
Pontiac School District  
Port Huron Area School District  
Saginaw School District  
Southfield Public Schools  
Traverse City Area Public Schools  
Willow Run Community Schools  
Ypsilanti Public Schools



We believe that much has been learned by both project staff and participants over the last three years that can be of significant value to other educators. Perhaps one of the most important aspects of the program has been the promotion of research-based improvement efforts both at the classroom (effective teaching) and at the school (effective schools) level. The development of that strong research base came about because teachers and administrators around the country allowed researchers to learn from them. There is more that can be learned through on-going research into various aspects of this Kellogg project.

The Middle Cities Association encourages your involvement in and cooperation with research activities designed to help educators benefit from your experiences throughout the project. To that end we are requesting that you permit Middle Cities to release project data which exists for your building (such as that cited above) to individuals who are conducting their research under the auspices of Michigan State University. Prior to conducting the research each researcher will be required to send each building administrator a letter describing the nature of the proposed research and requesting access to data on his/her building held by Middle Cities. Each researcher will be required to maintain confidentiality in use of the data and must conduct his/her research under the guidelines established by the University. Under those guidelines, reporting of the research will be done by groups of schools and/or by designations of School A, School B, etc. . . .

Please return the enclosed consent form indicating whether you would allow researchers from outside the Middle Cities project staff access to information sent in by your school and on file at the Middle Cities office. We ask that you return this consent form by October 31 so that researchers can proceed.

cc: Superintendents

enclosure

CRM/LL/LAB:kap

## RELEASE OF KELLOGG PROJECT INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL DATA

PRINCIPAL'S SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL: \_\_\_\_\_

DISTRICT: \_\_\_\_\_

Yes, I agree to the release of specific school data collected by Middle Cities Association which is related to my building's involvement in the MCA/Kellogg Project on Educational Leadership. The data will be released on a case by case basis: that is, the researcher prior to conducting the research will notify the building administrator in writing of the nature of the research and the type of information for which he/she is seeking access from Middle Cities.

No, I do not wish to have specific project data for the building of which I am administrator to be released by Middle Cities to any researchers from outside the project staff.

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM NO LATER THAN OCTOBER 31, 1986 TO:

Lynn Benore, Project Coordinator  
Middle Cities Association  
517 Erickson Hall  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1034

**INFORMATION ONLY COPY**

May 18, 1987

Dear Principal:

This is a follow-up to the letter you received from Dr. C. Robert Muth and Dr. Lawrence Lezotte dated October 21, 1986 relative to your participation in research studies associated with your school's involvement in the Middle Cities Association/Kellogg Project on Educational Leadership. I am a fellow school principal and am preparing to conduct a research project under the auspices of the Middle Cities Association and Michigan State University. Your positive response to the letter from Drs. Muth and Lezotte is sincerely appreciated, and what follows is a notification of the type of information for which I am seeking access from the Middle Cities Association.

The specific data in question are the results from the Pre and Post Connecticut Survey and the 4th Grade MEAP results from 1982 through 1986. It is also possible that you and other personnel within your school and district will be contacted at a later date for an on-site interview. If permission is granted, the information extracted from these sources will be maintained in strict confidence. No reference will be made to names of schools or school districts, rather schools will be referred to as "School A," "School B," etc.

The research project will focus on those schools that participated in the educational leadership training program and will attempt to analyze the varying degrees of implementation existing in the schools at this time. Potentially the results will be useful to participating schools such as yours, and the Middle Cities Association staff in their planning for future training programs. The results of the research will be made available upon request.

May 18, 1987

Page 2

The project will be supervised by Professors Brookover, Lezotte, Muth, and Romano of Michigan State University and will be conducted in accord with standards established by the university. If you have any questions about the use of the data or the research project in general, please feel free to contact me, Dave Chapin, at 517-835-1981 or 517-835-3593.

I am hopeful you will be receptive to the project. Please indicate your intent on the enclosed form and return in the stamped envelope prior to June 5, 1987.

Sincerely,

David B. Chapin

STATEMENT OF INTENT

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes, I consent to the release of data detailed in the accompanying letter. I understand the data will be used for research purposes and will remain confidential; that is, schools will be referred to as "School A," "School B," etc.

\_\_\_\_\_ No, I do not consent to the release of data detailed in the accompanying letter.

Principal's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

District: \_\_\_\_\_

February 2, 1988

Dear Principal:

During the 1986-87 school year you responded in the affirmative to the idea of research being conducted in relationship to your school's involvement in the Middle Cities Association/Kellogg Project on Educational Leadership. Your positive response has been greatly appreciated.

The final step in the research project involves an on-site interview. Your school is one of a small group of schools selected for an interview and visitation. Hopefully you will be able to comply with this final request. I will be contacting you in the near future, via telephone, to discuss this possibility with you.

As you may recall, this project is supported by the Middle Cities Association and is being conducted in accord with the standards established by Michigan State University. Potentially the results will be useful to participating schools such as yours, and the Middle Cities Association staff in their planning for future training programs. The results are being maintained in confidence. No reference is being made to the names of schools or school districts, rather schools are being referred to as "School A," "School B," etc. The results of the research will be made available upon request.

I will be in touch soon.

Sincerely,

David B. Chapin

March 11, 1988

Dear Principal:

I am looking forward to our visit on Monday, March 21. I plan on arriving at 8:00 A.M. at \_\_\_\_\_ School. The basic intent of the on-site visitation will be to ascertain your perceptions as they relate to the Middle Cities Educational Leadership Training Program and the impact of the program on your school.

The conversations with you and your staff members will probably last from 30 to 90 minutes each. If you, or your staff members, are willing to share materials such as a philosophy statement, goals, newsletters, handbooks, test score analyses, survey data, etc. then that, too, would be greatly appreciated.

The on-site visitation is the final step in a research project being conducted in accord with standards established by Michigan State University. Potentially the results of the research will be useful to participating schools such as yours, and the Middle Cities Association staff in their planning for future training programs. The results are being maintained in confidence. No reference is being made to the names of schools or school districts, rather schools are being referred to as "School A," "School B," etc.

Your help with the research is sincerely appreciated.

Sincerely,

David B. Chapin

cc: 4th Grade Teachers (2)  
Director of Elementary Curriculum

April 21, 1988

Dear Principal:

A word of thanks is in order for your recent assistance with my dissertation at Michigan State University. I truly enjoyed our conversation regarding school improvement, effective instruction, and the \_\_\_\_\_ Public Schools. You had a great deal to offer, and I am grateful for your willingness to share your time.

If I can ever be of assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

David B. Chapin



**APPENDIX B**

**Connecticut School Interview**

Reprinted with  
permission.

ADOPTED FROM

# THE CONNECTICUT SCHOOL INTERVIEW

REVISED SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS  
QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

• ELEMENTARY •

prepared by

Lawrence Lezotte and Ronald Edmonds

April 1983

originally developed by

Robert M. Villanova  
Principal Author

Connecticut State Department of Education

INFORMATION FOR THE RESPONDENT

1. Information from this survey will be reported back to the school improvement leadership team from your school in summary form. The collective perceptions of all of the people being interviewed will be used to construct a School Profile. Your confidentiality is assured through this process. Names are not recorded and the School Profile will reflect the group's perception.
2. Questions have been designed to measure "school effects" and you will be asked to generalize about your school. Where this is not possible, you are encouraged to respond from your own experience with additional comments in the space provided.
3. Read each question exactly as it is written. We are interested in your perceptions and interpretations.
4. At the end of the questions you will have the opportunity to respond to general, open-ended questions that will permit you to address any areas of individual concern or interest that were not included in the questionnaire.
5. Please make an attempt to respond to each question. In advance we thank you for your willingness to participate in this aspect of the school improvement project.

1. Is this a safe and secure place to work?

<p>1 The school is not physically secure. Fear and concern for physical safety are constantly present.</p>	<p>2 There is a general feeling of insecurity. It is not safe to be alone in the building and numerous incidents occur.</p>	<p>3 The school is secure from outside interference. However, there are some internal student related problems.</p>	<p>4 Adults and students generally feel secure. However, there are some internal student related problems.</p>	<p>5 This is a secure building. Students and staff do not view security as an issue.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	---	---	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

2. Describe the disciplinary climate in this school.

<p>1 The climate is very chaotic. There is a sense of disorder and frequent disruption of school events and class instruction.</p>	<p>2 There is a degree of controlled order. Frequent discipline problems occur and classes are often interrupted.</p>	<p>3 There is general order in the school. Serious discipline problems are related to a small percentage of students.</p>	<p>4 School and class behavior are generally acceptable. Classroom interruptions and school discipline problems are infrequent and dealt with consistently.</p>	<p>5 Discipline is not an issue. School behavior is generally positive and students abide by school rules.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	---	---	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

3. Who assumes responsibility for discipline in this school?

<p>1 It is difficult to tell. No one is really responsible.</p>	<p>2 There is not a coordinated effort. Teachers handle discipline without support or assistance from the administration.</p>	<p>3 Teachers handle most discipline. The administration is generally supportive.</p>	<p>4 The teaching staff and principal share responsibility. Consistency and cooperation are present.</p>	<p>5 Students, staff, administration and parents demonstrate acceptance and share responsibility for discipline and school behavior.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	---	---	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

4. Describe the general condition of the physical plant and up keep of the school.

<p>1 The condition of the physical plant is very poor. There is poor light, poor heating, unsafe class areas and/or playground, peeling paint, etc.</p>	<p>2 The school is generally not safe and clean. Some repairs are needed throughout the building.</p>	<p>3 The school is generally safe and clean. The physical plant is neutral and does not interfere with the school program.</p>	<p>4 The school building is clean, orderly, and well taken care of by staff and students.</p>	<p>5 The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable. It is a source of school pride.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	---	--	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

5. Describe the learning atmosphere in this school as characterized by student attitudes toward learning.
- |  |  |  |  |  |                |            |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------------|
| 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6              | 7          |
| Students are generally not motivated and show no interest in learning. | The atmosphere is not conducive to learning. | Most students complete school tasks as required; students are generally receptive, but there is <u>little</u> enthusiasm for learning. | Students are generally positive about school and learning. | Most students are eager and enthusiastic about school and learning. A positive feeling permeates the school. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
6. Is there a written statement of purpose for this school that guides the instructional program? (If yes, please describe.)
- |  |   |  |   |   |                |            |
|--|---|--|---|---|----------------|------------|
| 1  | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6              | 7          |
| There is no agreed upon, written statement of purpose. | A written statement exists, but it has little influence on the instructional program. | A statement does exist. A few general instructional decisions are guided by this statement | A statement of purpose has been developed by the faculty and administration of this school. Many instructional decisions are related to this statement. | The statement of purpose or mission is behind <u>most</u> important school decisions. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
7. In this school do the various curricular areas (e.g., math) have a set of written, sequential objectives through all grades?
- |   |  |  |  |   |                |            |
|---|--|--|--|---|----------------|------------|
| 1   | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6              | 7          |
| There is <u>not</u> a set of sequential objectives. | There are a number of basal series in use and each has its own objectives. Basal series provide a general framework for instruction. | Objectives are identified as part of one basal series. The basal provides a general framework. | Specific objectives exist. Objectives are more than a general framework. | Specific objectives exist through all grades. The program is based on these objectives. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
8. To what extent do teachers use these stated instructional objectives to guide their instruction?
- |  |  |  |  |  |                |            |
|--|--|--|--|--|----------------|------------|
| 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6              | 7          |
| Instruction is not guided by objectives. It is guided by various materials used. | Curriculum guides and basal texts provide a general framework for classroom instruction. | Identified objectives guide some instruction. There is much variation throughout the school. | Identified objectives guide <u>most</u> classroom instruction. | School-wide objectives are the focal point of instruction. Materials and instruction are directed at these objectives. | Not Applicable | Don't know |

9. Are there explicit skills that all students are expected to master at each grade level?

<p>1 There is not a set of skills to be mastered at each grade level.</p>	<p>2 Students are expected to master skills in the grade level materials they are using. Many students are not working on skills at their grade level.</p>	<p>3 Students are presented skills as they are ready. Grade level skills are general goal.</p>	<p>4 Grade level skills are identified and most students are expected to master these skills.</p>	<p>5 An identified set of objectives or skills that all students must master exists at each grade level.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	--	--	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

10. In the area of language arts (listening, speaking, writing) is there a set of written, sequential objectives in this school up through all grade

<p>1 There is not a set of</p>	<p>2 There are a number of basal series in use and each has its own objectives. Basal series provide a general framework for instruction.</p>	<p>3 Objectives are identified as part of one basal series. The basal provides a general framework.</p>	<p>4 Specific objectives exist. Objectives are more than a general framework.</p>	<p>5 Specific objectives exist through all grades. The program is based on these objectives.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
------------------------------------	---	---	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

11. To what extent do teachers use these objectives in language arts to guide their instruction?

<p>1 Instruction is not guided by objectives. It is guided by various materials used.</p>	<p>2 Curriculum guides and basal texts provide a general framework for classroom instruction.</p>	<p>3 Identified objectives guide some instruction. There is much variation throughout the school.</p>	<p>4 Identified objectives guide most classroom instruction.</p>	<p>5 School-wide objectives are the focal point of instruction. Materials and instruction are directed at these objectives.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	---	---	--	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------

12. In language arts is there a set of skills that all students are expected to master at each grade level?

<p>1 There is not a set of skills to be mastered at each grade level.</p>	<p>2 Students are expected to master skills in the grade level materials they are using. Many students are not working on skills at their grade level.</p>	<p>3 Students are presented skills as they are ready. Grade level skills are general goal.</p>	<p>4 Grade level skills are identified and most students are expected to master these skills.</p>	<p>5 An identified set of objectives or skills that all students must master exist at each grade level.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	--	--	---	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------

13. In the area of Mathematics is there a set of written, sequential objectives in this school up through all grades?
- |   |   |   |  |  |                         |                     |
|---|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 There is not a set of sequential objectives.</p> | <p>2 There are a number of basal series in use and each has its own objectives. Basal series provide a general framework for instruction.</p> | <p>3 Objectives are identified as part of one basal series. The basal provides a general framework.</p> | <p>4 Specific objectives exist. Objectives are <u>more</u> than a general framework.</p> | <p>5 Specific objectives exist through all grades. The program is based on these objectives.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
14. To what extent do teachers use these objectives in Mathematics to guide their instruction?
- |  |   |   |  |   |                         |                     |
|--|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 Instruction is <u>not</u> guided by objectives. It is guided by various materials used.</p> | <p>2 Curriculum guides and basal texts provide a general framework for classroom instruction.</p> | <p>3 Identified objectives guide some instruction. There is much variation throughout the school.</p> | <p>4 Identified objectives guide most classroom instruction. Materials and instruction are directed at these objectives.</p> | <p>5 School-wide objectives are the focal point of instruction.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
15. In Mathematics is there a set of skills that all students are expected to master at each grade level?
- |   |  |  |   |  |                         |                     |
|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 There is not a set of skills to be mastered at each grade level.</p> | <p>2 Students are expected to master skills in the grade level materials they are using. Many students are not working on skills at their grade level.</p> | <p>3 Students are presented skills as they are ready. Grade level skills are general goal.</p> | <p>4 Grade level skills are identified and most students are expected to master these skills.</p> | <p>5 An identified set of objectives or skills that all students must master exist <u>at each grade level.</u></p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
16. Do teachers in this school have materials, supplies, and equipment that are needed to carry out this school's instructional objectives?
- |  |  |   |  |   |                         |                     |
|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 Materials are not available. The instructional program is significantly affected.</p> | <p>2 Improvement is needed. Some materials are regularly not available. The instructional program could improve with additional materials.</p> | <p>3 The materials needed for basic skill instruction usually are available. There are adequate materials to meet objectives.</p> | <p>4 The materials needed most often are available or they are a high priority and are expected to become available.</p> | <p>5 All materials necessary for instruction in basic skills are available.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|

17. Describe instructional leadership in this school.

<p>1 There is no centralized leadership for instruction. Teachers deal with instructional matters independently.</p>	<p>2 Occasionally, various people provide limited leadership. There is not an identifiable or consistent leader.</p>	<p>3 Instructional leadership is limited and is not a factor in the school. The principal is <u>generally</u> the <u>instructional</u> leader.</p>	<p>4 The principal provides a degree of instructional leadership through coordination and delegation. The principal is the instructional leader.</p>	<p>5 There is very clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal. Teachers turn to the principal with instructional concerns.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

18. To what extent does the principal promote the discussion of instructional improvement?

<p>1 There is no real communication among teachers regarding the instructional program. The principal does not promote discussion of instructional improvement.</p>	<p>2 Discussion occasionally is initiated by the principal, but it is <u>not regular or planned.</u></p>	<p>3 The principal or a committee initiated by the principal occasionally will plan formal or informal meetings to discuss instructional improvement.</p>	<p>4 There are meetings with teachers to discuss instruction. The principal is active in these meetings.</p>	<p>5 There are frequent formal and informal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement led by the principal. This is a high priority area for the principal.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	--	---	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

19. To what extent does the teacher leader (i.e. Reading coordinator, etc.) promote discussion of instructional improvement?

<p>1 There is no real communication among teachers regarding the instructional program. The teacher leader does not promote discussion of instructional improvement.</p>	<p>2 Discussion occasionally is initiated by the teacher leader, but it is <u>not regular or planned.</u></p>	<p>3 The teacher leader or a committee initiated by the teacher leader occasionally will plan formal meetings to discuss instructional improvement.</p>	<p>4 There are meetings with teachers to discuss instruction. The teacher leader is active in these meetings.</p>	<p>5 There are frequent formal and informal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement led by the teacher leader. This is a high priority area for the teacher leader.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	---	---	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------



20. How often does the principal make formal classroom observations of you?
- |                      |              |               |                    |                            |                |            |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| 1                    | 2            | 3             | 4                  | 5                          | 6              | 7          |
| Once every two years | Once a year. | Twice a year. | Three times a year | Four times a year or more. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
21. How often does the teacher leader (i.e. Math Coordinator) make formal classroom observations of you?
- |                               |              |               |                    |                            |                |            |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| 1                             | 2            | 3             | 4                  | 5                          | 6              | 7          |
| Once every two years or less. | Once a year. | Twice a year. | Three times a year | Four times a year or more. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
22. Describe the process of a typical formal classroom observation in this school.
- |   |   |  |   |   |                |            |
|---|---|--|---|---|----------------|------------|
| 1   | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5   | 6              | 7          |
| There is no typical pattern. The principal stops in to observe classrooms and may follow up informally. | The principal generally informs teachers before an observation. A lesson is observed and feedback in some form <u>may be given.</u> | The principal and teacher <u>may</u> arrange for an observation time. Post-conferences follow <u>each</u> observation. | The principal and teacher arrange a time for observations. Post-conferences follow <u>each</u> observation. | The principal and teacher plan the focus of each observation at a pre-conference. An observation always is followed by a post-conference. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
23. How often does the principal engage in a post-observation conference with you?
- |                       |              |               |                     |                            |                |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| 1                     | 2            | 3             | 4                   | 5                          | 6              | 7          |
| Once every two years. | Once a year. | Twice a year. | Three times a year. | Four times a year or more. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
24. How often does the teacher leader (i.e. Reading coordinator, etc.) engage in a post-observation conference with you?
- |                       |              |               |                     |                            |                |            |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|------------|
| 1                     | 2            | 3             | 4                   | 5                          | 6              | 7          |
| Once every two years. | Once a year. | Twice a year. | Three times a year. | Four times a year or more. | Not Applicable | Don't know |

25. What type of feedback or information does the principal provide after a classroom observation?
- |   |  |  |  |   |                             |                         |
|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>There is little or no feedback after an observation.</p> | <p>2<br/>There is general feedback through discussion or a note. Feedback often does not focus on instruction.</p> | <p>3<br/>The post-observation usually focuses on instruction in a general sense.</p> | <p>4<br/>The feedback is primarily on instruction. Strengths and areas for improvement are generally discussed or presented.</p> | <p>5<br/>The main emphasis is on instruction. The feedback usually involves the focus determined in the pre-observation conference.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
26. What type of feedback or information does the teacher leader (i.e. Math coordinator) provide after a classroom observation?
- |   |  |  |  |   |                             |                         |
|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>There is little or no feedback after an observation.</p> | <p>2<br/>There is general feedback through discussion or a note. Feedback often does not focus on instruction.</p> | <p>3<br/>The post-observation usually focuses on instruction in a general sense.</p> | <p>4<br/>The feedback is primarily on instruction. Strengths and areas for improvement are generally discussed or presented.</p> | <p>5<br/>The main emphasis is on instruction. The feedback usually involves the focus determined in the pre-observation conference.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
27. Is the principal seen around the school? Where? How often?
- |  |  |  |   |  |                             |                         |
|--|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>The principal is not visible around the school.</p> | <p>2<br/>The principal can most often be found in the office. He/she is seen infrequently around the school.</p> | <p>3<br/>The principal is occasionally seen around the school.</p> | <p>4<br/>The principal is frequently and regularly visible at specific locations in the school (i.e., cafeterias, playground, office)</p> | <p>5<br/>The principal is highly visible around the school. The principal makes many informal contacts with students and teachers.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
28. Describe the school's requirements or policies concerning lesson plans.
- |  |  |   |   |   |                             |                         |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>The school does not require or monitor instructional plans.</p> | <p>2<br/>The school expects planning to exist, but seldom collects or reviews plans.</p> | <p>3<br/>The school requires planning and occasionally reviews these plans.</p> | <p>4<br/>The school requires plans, reviews them regularly and occasionally gives feedback.</p> | <p>5<br/>The school requires and reviews plans regularly. The school discusses plans with teachers in relation to instructional strategies.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

29. To what extent do you seek the help or advice of your principal in relation to instruction?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very seldom or never	Rarely	Occasionally, usually related to some special situation or circumstance.	There are discussions about instruction with the principal, but the principal is not an important instructional resource person.	Instructional advice is sought frequently from the principal. The principal is an important resource person for instruction.	Not Applicable	Don't know

30. To what extent do you seek the help or advice of your teacher leader (i.e. Reading Coordinator, etc.) in relation to instruction?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very seldom or never	Rarely	Occasionally, usually related to some special situation or circumstance.	There are discussions about instruction with the teacher leader, but the teacher leader is not an important instructional resource person.	Instructional advice is sought frequently from the teacher leader. The teacher leader is an important resource person for instruction.	Not Applicable	Don't know

31. How much weight does your principal place on the meaning and use of test results in instructional improvement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The principal discourages test scores analysis. There is a negative attitude toward standardized test results.	The principal is mildly interested or concerned with school test results. The principal may report the data, with no follow-up or interpretation.	The principal usually reports test results to the staff. There is little analysis or discussion of the data.	The principal views some results as somewhat meaningful and useful. The principal <u>regularly</u> reviews results with faculty to get a general picture of school achievement.	The principal places much emphasis on the meaning and use of test results for program improvement. The principal reviews and interprets test results with staff.	Not Applicable	Don't know

32. To what extent does the principal make teachers feel accountable for student achievement?

- |   |  |   |   |   |                             |                         |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>The principal does not discuss teacher performance in relation to student achievement.</p> | <p>2<br/>The principal occasionally emphasizes to all teachers their general responsibility for student achievement.</p> | <p>3<br/>The principal often discusses teacher performance in relation to student achievement. Some accountability is felt as a result.</p> | <p>4<br/>Individual teachers' responsibility for student achievement is a priority of the principal. Individual teachers feel generally accountable as a result of this emphasis.</p> | <p>5<br/>The principal frequently communicates to individual teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement. All teachers feel accountable for student achievement.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

33. To what extent does the principal promote or arrange staff development in relation to instructional improvement?

- |   |  |  |   |  |                             |                         |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>The principal does not promote or arrange staff development.</p> | <p>2<br/>The principal promotes programs mandated from above. The promoted programs usually are not related to instructional improvement for teachers in the school.</p> | <p>3<br/>The principal occasionally works with teachers in promoting specific activities to improve instruction in the school.</p> | <p>4<br/>The principal regularly arranges or promotes staff development activities for teachers in the school to improve instruction.</p> | <p>5<br/>The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the staff.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

34. To what extent does the teacher leader (i.e. Math coordinator, etc.) promote or arrange staff development in relation to instructional improvement?

- |  |   |   |  |   |                             |                         |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>The teacher leader does not promote or arrange staff development.</p> | <p>2<br/>The teacher leader promotes programs mandated from above. The promoted programs usually are not related to instructional improvement for teachers in the school.</p> | <p>3<br/>The teacher leader occasionally works with teachers in promoting specific activities to improve instruction in the school.</p> | <p>4<br/>The teacher leader regularly arranges or promotes staff development activities for teachers in the school to improve instruction.</p> | <p>5<br/>The teacher leader is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the staff.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

35. To what degree does the principal arrange for coordination of the instructional program within and between grades?

- |  |   |  |   |   |                             |                         |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>There is very little or no coordination. The principal is not involved.</p> | <p>2<br/>There is some coordination within and/or between grades, but not necessarily as a result of the principal.</p> | <p>3<br/>The principal has arranged or allowed essential coordination between and within grades. There is some general coordination, but it is very loose.</p> | <p>4<br/>The principal has arranged for coordination between and among grades. The instructional program is coordinated overall, but the principal is not active in coordination.</p> | <p>5<br/>The principal and teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades. The program is organized and well coordinated.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

36. To what degree does the teacher leader (reading coordinator, etc.) arrange for coordination of the instructional program within and between grades?

- |   |  |  |   |  |                             |                         |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>There is very little or no coordination. The teacher leader is not involved.</p> | <p>2<br/>There is some coordination within and/or between grades, but not necessarily as a result of the teacher leader.</p> | <p>3<br/>The teacher leader has arranged or allowed essential coordination between grades. There is some general coordination, but it is very loose.</p> | <p>4<br/>The teacher leader has arranged for coordination between and among grades. The instructional program is coordinated overall, but the teacher leader is not active in coordination.</p> | <p>5<br/>The teacher leader and teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades. The program is organized and well coordinated.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

37. To what extent do faculty meetings deal with instructional concerns?

- |   |   |   |   |  |                             |                         |
|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>1<br/>Faculty meetings seldom if ever involve instructional matters.</p> | <p>2<br/>General instructional matters will surface occasionally at faculty meetings. Instructional matters are not the usual or planned focus.</p> | <p>3<br/>Instructional issues or activities occasionally are included as part of the faculty meeting agenda. These issues seldom are dealt with in depth.</p> | <p>4<br/>Instructional issues are often the focus of discussions generated by the principal at faculty meetings. They are often part of the planned agenda.</p> | <p>5<br/>Instructional issues are the primary focus of each faculty meeting. The principal consistently brings, or encourages others to bring, instructional issues to the faculty for discussion.</p> | <p>6<br/>Not Applicable</p> | <p>7<br/>Don't know</p> |
|---|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

38. Typically, what percentage of students are expected to master basic skills at each grade level?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0 - 30%	31 - 50%	51 - 75%	76 - 89 %	90 - 100%	Not Applicable	Don't know

39. What do teachers in this school believe is their responsibility in relation to student achievement in the basic skills?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There is no specific responsibility. Teachers present the content.	Teachers are responsible for normal curve distribution of achievement according to student ability.	Teachers are responsible for all students to master basic skills according to individual levels of expectancy.	Teachers are responsible for <u>most</u> students to master basic skills at their grade level.	Teachers are responsible for all students to master all basic skills at their grade level.	Not Applicable	Don't know

40. In this school what do teachers typically believe is the relationship between students' home background (socio-economic status) and student achievement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Home background factors are thought to be prime determinates of student achievement. The school cannot overcome these factors.	Home background significantly affects student achievement. The school does have some impact on achievement for some students.	Home background influences student achievement. The school program does reduce the relationship to some extent for <u>most</u> students.	The instructional program results in <u>most</u> students mastering <u>most</u> skills regardless of home background factors.	There is no significant relationship referred to or accepted in this school. All students in this school can master basic skills as direct result of the instructional program.	Not Applicable	Don't know

41. In general, how would you describe the expectations of teachers in this school regarding student achievement?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Expectations are generally low throughout the school.	Expectations are described as "realistic" based on student characteristics. Low expectations for some students are implied.	Some teachers have high expectations. Many have moderate expectations.	High expectations on the part of <u>most</u> teachers, but moderate or low on the part of some teachers.	High expectations on the part of nearly <u>all</u> teachers for <u>all</u> students.	Not Applicable	Don't know

42. To what extent is the number of low-income children retained in grades different from the number of other children retained in grades in this school?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low income children are retained almost exclusively or no student is ever retained.	Many more low-income children are retained than other children. This is <u>not</u> an area of concern.	More low-income children are now retained but there has been improvement.	Approximately proportional numbers of students are retained. There is a focused effort in this area.	Students not mastering basic skills are retained and the number of low-income children is <u>proportionately equivalent</u> to other children retained.	Not Applicable	Don't know	

43. What percentage of students in this school can be expected to complete high school?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0 - 50%	51-75%	76-85%	86-95%	96-100%	Not Applicable	Don't know	

44. Do low achieving students in this school present more discipline problems than other students?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most discipline problems are caused by low-achieving students.	Low-achieving students present frequent discipline problems.	Low-achieving students cause slightly more discipline problems than other students.	Discipline problems are spread across all categories of students.	Discipline is not a problem. There is no relationship between discipline problems and student achievement.	Not Applicable	Don't know	

45. Do low-achieving students answer questions as often as other students in your classroom during large group instruction?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Low-achieving students rarely answer questions. Teacher implies that this is acceptable.	Low-achieving students answer less often. These students are occasionally called on to answer.	Low-achieving students answer less often than others, but the teacher <u>regularly</u> calls on them.	Most students respond to teacher questions. There is a roughly equal response pattern as a result of the teacher's plan.	All students have approximately the same number of response opportunities arranged by the teacher.	Not Applicable	Don't know	

46. How do you group for Mathematics instruction in your classroom?

<p>1 There is a homogeneous grouping for instruction. In effect, long term ability grouping (i.e., tracking).</p>	<p>2 There are two homogeneous ability groups. Instruction is separate and different for each group.</p>	<p>3 There are high, middle and low homogeneous groups. Instruction is separate for each group.</p>	<p>4 There is some large group instruction to all students, but there is frequent small group homogeneous instruction as a follow-up.</p>	<p>5 Most initial instruction is to large, heterogeneous classroom group. Follow-up instruction is to ad hoc skill groups.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	--	---	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

47. How do you group for Reading instruction in your classroom?

<p>1 There is homogeneous grouping for instruction. In effect, long term ability grouping (i.e., tracking).</p>	<p>2 There are two homogeneous ability groups. Instruction is separate and different for each group.</p>	<p>3 There are high, middle and low homogeneous groups. Instruction is separate for each group.</p>	<p>4 There is some large group instruction to all students, but there is frequent small group homogeneous instruction as a follow-up.</p>	<p>5 Most initial instruction is to a large, heterogeneous classroom group. Follow-up instruction is to ad hoc skill groups.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	--	---	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

48. How much time is spent in your classroom on Reading/Language Arts each day?

<p>1 1 hour or less</p>	<p>2 1 - 1' 20"</p>	<p>3 1' 21" - 1' 40"</p>	<p>4 1' 41" - 2'</p>	<p>5 more than 2 hours</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
-----------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------

49. How much time is spent in your classroom on Mathematics each day?

<p>1 25" or less</p>	<p>2 26" - 34"</p>	<p>3 35" - 45"</p>	<p>4 46" - 52"</p>	<p>5 53" or more</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------



50. Describe how time allotments in basic skill areas are determined in this school.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Individual teachers determine their own schedules.	General guidelines are handed down by the administration. Teachers develop schedules in <u>partial</u> compliance.	The principal develops a general schedule. Recommended time allotments are <u>generally</u> followed.	The principal and teachers agree on allocated times. Schedules are reviewed, monitored and/or adjusted if necessary.	Allocated time in each basic skill area is set with or by the principal. Teachers and principal value and monitor these time allotments.	Not Applicable	Don't know

51. During scheduled time for basic skills instruction how often do outside interruptions interfere with classroom instruction?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are frequent interruptions (i.e., visitors, bulletins, announcements, assemblies, etc.). Interruptions significantly interfere with instruction.	There are assemblies, shortened classes, long announcements, etc. These interruptions could be avoided.	There are regular but not frequent interruptions on a planned basis, e.g., monthly assemblies.	Basic skill instructional time occasionally is interrupted with advance notice. Whenever possible, interruptions are planned during non-basic skill time.	Basic skill instructional time is rarely interrupted. Time is protected by administration and teachers.	Not Applicable	Don't know

52. To what extent do pull out program activities in which students must leave their regular class for instruction interfere or support basic skill instruction in this school?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pull out programs consistently disrupt and interfere with basic skill instruction.	Pull out programs occasionally interfere with basic skill instruction for certain students.	Pull out programs do not affect basic skill instruction in a consistent manner. Some programs interfere and some supplement.	Pull out programs generally supplement class instruction. There is a minimal negative effect on basic skill instruction.	Pull out programs enhance and supplement basic skill instruction.	Not Applicable	Don't know

53. To what extent do students disrupt instruction during classes in this school?

<p>1 Classroom discipline is a problem. There are constant student interruptions that disrupt instruction.</p>	<p>2 Class disruptions occur regularly and often interrupt class instruction.</p>	<p>3 There are occasional class disruptions by students. They are not generally significant in disrupting instruction.</p>	<p>4 There are few disciplinary disruptions. Most behavior is task appropriate.</p>	<p>5 There are very few students disruptions. Class atmosphere is very conducive to learning for all.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	---	--	---	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------

54. What percentage of the time that is scheduled for basic skill instruction are students assigned independent seat work?

<p>1 90% or more</p>	<p>2 89 - 75%</p>	<p>3 74 - 50%</p>	<p>4 49 - 30%</p>	<p>5 29% or less</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------

55. Following instruction, how do students typically perform on assigned practice work?

<p>1 There is no consistent pattern. Many students always get a high percentage <u>incorrect</u>.</p>	<p>2 Most students complete assignments that are approximately 50% correct.</p>	<p>3 Generally, students have 50-75% of a practice assignment completed correctly.</p>	<p>4 Students have 75 - 85% of practice assignments correct. This is the expectation when work is assigned by teacher.</p>	<p>5 Students <u>regularly</u> have more than 85% correct on practice assignments. This is expected.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	---	--	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

56. Describe instruction as it typically occurs in your class.

<p>1 Lessons are largely unstructured. Students select and determine instruction sequence and the teacher guides when needed.</p>	<p>2 There is much independent student work. The teacher usually makes a short presentation to each group or works only with individual students.</p>	<p>3 There is a combination of large group and small group work. Instruction is organized around teacher presentations and student practice after presentation.</p>	<p>4 The teacher presents the lesson and there is usually some student practice with occasional corrective feedback during practice.</p>	<p>5 Instructional events follow the general format: presentation, practice, feedback, performance.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
---	---	---	--	---	-----------------------------	-------------------------

57. Describe the standardized testing program in this school.
- |   |   |   |  |  |                         |                     |
|---|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 There is no school-wide testing program.</p> | <p>2 Standardized tests are administered, but a description of the testing program cannot be given.</p> | <p>3 Standardized tests are administered. The program is not systematic and has frequently changed.</p> | <p>4 There is annual standardized testing in alternate grades.</p> | <p>5 There is annual standardized testing at each grade level.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------------|
58. Describe the use of standardized test results in this school.
- |  |   |  |  |   |                         |                     |
|--|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 Test information is not used or there are no tests.</p> | <p>2 Annual tests are used to evaluate the school program in a very general way. Review of results is not systematic or specific.</p> | <p>3 Annual test results are used for program evaluation. Results are systematically reviewed by the principal and teachers.</p> | <p>4 Annual test results are an important part of program evaluation. Results are systematically reviewed by the principal and teachers.</p> | <p>5 Annual test results are systematically used to evaluate the program objectives. Teachers and principals thoroughly review and analyze results for program modifications.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|--|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
59. To what extent do the standardized tests measure the basic skills curriculum priorities of this school?
- |   |   |  |  |   |                         |                     |
|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <p>1 There is little or no relationship between the standardized testing program and the basic skills curriculum.</p> | <p>2 There is minimal overlap between standardized tests and basic skills curriculum.</p> | <p>3 There is a moderate match between standardized testing and basic skills curriculum.</p> | <p>4 The standardized testing program in most cases matches the basic skills curriculum.</p> | <p>5 The standardized testing program is a very accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in this school.</p> | <p>6 Not Applicable</p> | <p>7 Don't know</p> |
|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------|---------------------|

60. How frequently do you assess the progress of your students in basic skills?

1	There is no systematic assessment.	2	A general skill assessment is done at each marking period.	3	Approximately every two months there is some formalized skill testing in basic skill areas.	4	There is monthly skill assessment in the basic skill areas.	5	Skill testing follows each instructional unit. Frequent and systematic skill testing takes place.	6	Not Applicable	7	Don't know
---	------------------------------------	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------	---	------------

61. How do you assess student progress in basic skills?

1	There is no systematic assessment.	2	Progress is checked informally. Correcting students' daily work is the usual method.	3	Chapter or unit tests are used occasionally to check skill progress.	4	Criterion-referenced testing, chapter and unit tests are <u>regularly</u> administered to check student progress.	5	Multiple assessment methods are used systematically to check student progress. These include CRT's, mastery check lists, student work samples, chapter and unit tests, etc.	6	Not Applicable	7	Don't know
---	------------------------------------	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	---	---	----------------	---	------------

62. How do you use the information obtained from basic skills testing in your classroom?

1	Information is used primarily to give students grades.	2	Information is used for grading and making groups.	3	Information is used for grading and to plan general classroom lessons.	4	Information is used to plan lessons for classroom groups and to give feedback. Instruction is somewhat modified based on results.	5	Information is used to give specific student feedback and to diagnose and prescribe appropriate instruction.	6	Not Applicable	7	Don't know
---	--	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	--	---	----------------	---	------------

63. Is there a criterion-referenced testing program in basic skill areas in this school?

- |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |                |   |            |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|
| 1 | There is no criterion-referenced testing. | 2 | There is some CRT use in one or two grades or classrooms. It is not a systematic program. | 3 | CRTs are used in one basic skill area throughout the school. | 4 | There are CRT programs in two basic skill areas in use throughout the school. | 5 | Criterion-referenced tests are used in <u>all</u> basic skill areas throughout the school. | 6 | Not Applicable | 7 | Don't know |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|

64. If "yes", how do you use the results of criterion-referenced testing?

- |   |                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |                |   |            |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|
| 1 | There are no CRTs. | 2 | Criterion-referenced testing is not used in a systematic way. Mastery is inconsistently checked and recorded. | 3 | CRTs are used to check for mastery after instruction. | 4 | CRTs are used to check for student mastery and to plan the next instructional sequence for the group. | 5 | CRTs are used to give specific student feedback and to diagnose and prescribe appropriate instruction for ad hoc skill grouping. | 6 | Not Applicable | 7 | Don't know |
|---|--------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|

65. Describe the parent organization of this school.

- |   |                                |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |                |   |            |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|
| 1 | No parent organization exists. | 2 | A parent organization exists. It involves a few parents and is largely inactive. | 3 | There is a parent organization. It involves a small percentage of parents and is mostly social. | 4 | There is an active parent organization. Many parents are involved. Activities <u>may</u> include fund-raising, sponsoring school programs, etc. | 5 | There is an active parent-school group involving a high percentage of parents. The group actively supports the school's instructional program. | 6 | Not Applicable | 7 | Don't know |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|----------------|---|------------|

66. To what extent are parents involved in the school?

<p>1 There is very little involvement of any kind.</p>	<p>2 There is occasional parent involvement at planned school functions and after specific teacher requests.</p>	<p>3 Parents are involved in the formal organization, open-houses and school programs.</p>	<p>4 There is an active parent group. There is general support, but limited direct involvement from parents.</p>	<p>5 Parents are directly involved in supporting the school program. <u>Most</u> parents are involved in a home and school support effort that promotes student achievement.</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

67. What percentage of your students' parents attend the scheduled parent-teacher conferences?

<p>1 0 - 25%</p>	<p>2 26 - 50%</p>	<p>3 51 - 75%</p>	<p>4 76 - 90%</p>	<p>5 91 - 100%</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------

68. Describe the ways in which parents and teachers communicate in this school.

<p>1 There is little or no parent teacher communication.</p>	<p>2 The primary communication is through the report card sent home each marking period. There is very little direct communication.</p>	<p>3 Communication is primarily at scheduled conferences, meetings and through occasional notes sent home.</p>	<p>4 There is formal and informal communication. Conferences and phone calls for specific reasons are initiated by teachers and parents.</p>	<p>5 Multiple communication techniques are used by parents and teachers (e.g. home visits, class newsletters, phone calls, school visits, regular notes, etc.)</p>	<p>6 Not Applicable</p>	<p>7 Don't know</p>
--	---	--	--	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------

69. Beyond formal school initiated conferences, what proportion of the teacher contacts do parents initiate?
- |   |                                    |                                  |                                   |                                  |                |            |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| 1   | 2                                  | 3                                | 4                                 | 5                                | 6              | 7          |
| There are infrequent contacts and usually in crisis situations. | A few parents make a few contacts. | Some parents make many contacts. | Many parents make a few contacts. | Many parents make many contacts. | Not Applicable | Don't Know |
70. Describe this school's policy on homework.
- |                            |   |   |  |  |                |            |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|----------------|------------|
| 1                          | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5  | 6              | 7          |
| There is no school policy. | Homework is often assigned by individual teachers, but a school-wide system or policy does not exist. | A written policy does not exist but homework is regularly and systematically assigned by most teachers. | A written policy exists. Homework is regularly assigned to all students. | A written policy exists. Homework is regularly assigned. The policy is monitored by teachers and the administration. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
71. If applicable, what is the parents' role in the school homework policy?
- |   |   |  |  |  |                |            |
|---|---|--|--|--|----------------|------------|
| 1   | 2   | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6              | 7          |
| There is no school policy and there is no consistent parent role. | Parents are aware that most teachers assign homework. If asked, some parents may support efforts to monitor homework. | Parents are generally supportive of the teachers' efforts to insure homework is completed. | Parents have received the homework policy. Most parents understand and accept their role in monitoring homework. | Parents are very aware and supportive of the homework policy. Parents and teachers work together to encourage study at home. | Not Applicable | Don't know |
72. What percentage of students regularly come to school with assigned homework completed?
- |         |          |          |          |           |                |            |
|---------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| 1       | 2        | 3        | 4        | 5         | 6              | 7          |
| 0 - 25% | 26 - 50% | 51 - 75% | 76 - 90% | 91 - 100% | Not Applicable | Don't know |
73. How do you think parents would evaluate this school using the grading system, A, B, C, D, F?
- |   |   |   |   |   |                |            |
|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6              | 7          |
| F | D | C | B | A | Not Applicable | Don't know |

APPENDIX C

On-Site Interview Format



TAPE # \_\_\_\_\_

SIDE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

SCHOOL # \_\_\_\_\_

PRESENT POSITION OF PERSON BEING INTERVIEWED: \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION IN 1983-84: \_\_\_\_\_

LEAD TEACHER ? \_\_\_\_\_

## 1. INTRODUCE MYSELF

- A. School principal with Midland Public Schools
- B. Conducting a doctoral study in conjunction with Michigan State University

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

- A. Follow-up to Middle Cities/Kellogg Leadership Training Program.
- B. A small cross section of schools selected for an on-site interview
- C. Seeking to find out what has happened at your school since 1982-83, the varying degrees of implementation, the basic impact of the training program on your school, and the facilitators and hindrances in the implementation.
- D. All findings will remain confidential (this is school #1, etc.)
- E. The findings will be used to further effective schools research and to help in planning future leadership training programs
- F. Your cooperation is appreciated

## 3. DESCRIBE, FROM YOUR PERSPECTIVE, THE NATURE OF YOUR SCHOOL'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORT.

For examples: 1 mission statement, 2 school improvement team, 3 regular test score analysis, 4 needs assessment, 5 focus on teaching/learning process

4. WHAT IMPACT HAS THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT EFFORT HAD ON YOUR SCHOOL/IN YOUR CLASSROOM?

For examples: 1 monitoring pupil progress, 2 clear/focused goals, 3 home school relations, 4 safe/orderly climate, 5 instructional leadership, 6 high expectations, 7 time on task, 8 achievement/ teaching-learning, 9 attendance rate

5. WHAT FACTORS SERVED AS FACILITATORS/HINDRANCES IN THE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROCESS?

For examples: 1 resources - time and money, 2 incentives/-disincentives, 3 nature of school structure, 4 school priorities, 5 staff turnover, 6 prior projects, 7 leadership-school/administrative center.

6. DO YOU HAVE OTHER COMMENTS? THOUGHTS?

7. REMINDER: A. Collect documents which support comments/data  
B. 4th Friday data, 1987

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293005445469