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About the Guide

This manuscript provides guidance and documentation for users of the data for all survey components of the Study of Instructional Improvement (SII). This includes the School Characteristics Inventory (SCI) and other school level data, Teacher Questionnaire (TQ), School Leader Questionnaire (SLQ), Teacher Mathematics Logs, Teacher Language Arts Logs, Student Rating Form (SRF), Student Motivation Form (SMF) and Parent Questionnaire (PQ). Longitudinal student assessments were administered using the Woodcock Johnson-Revised test (Kindergarten only) and the TerraNova assessment for the subject domains of mathematics and reading/language arts.

This guide is intended to familiarize prospective users with all waves of the longitudinal study, which took place during the academic years of 2000-2001 through 2003-2004. We strongly caution the reader to pay close attention to the cohort design of the study. Although data was collected across four years, each cohort of students actually participated for a maximum of three years, across a staggered (or phased) collection cycle. Moreover, the phased collection also affects the number of participating schools in year one and year four of the study. The sample design and data collection cycles are detailed in Section 2 of this document. To alleviate confusion in merging longitudinal files from year to year, we have arranged the downloadable data files in order by student cohort and grade level.

The guide attempts to convey information about the purposes of the study and the range of research questions that may be addressed in secondary analysis. The document also describes the sample design, the data collection design and data processing, and provides an overview of the major survey components that compose the study. The actual survey instruments and raw data are publicly available for download through the SII website: www.sii.soe.umich.edu/ and the Inter-University Consortium for Policy and Social Research (ICPSR) website: http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/. The ICSR website includes the capacity to conduct basic online data analysis.
# Table of Contents

## Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acknowledgements</th>
<th>About the Guide</th>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
<th>Appendices List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Introduction to SII .......................................................... 1
   - About the Study ............................................................ 1
   - Self-Administered Questionnaire Components .................. 4
   - A Brief Portrait of the Intervention Programs .............. 5
   - Principal Investigators .............................................. 6

2. Sample and Study Design .................................................. 8
   - The Sample ................................................................... 8
   - Challenges in School Sample Selection ......................... 14
   - Propensity Score Stratification Methods ....................... 14
   - Data Collection Design ............................................ 15

3. Survey Components Overview ........................................... 17
   - Teacher Questionnaire .............................................. 17
   - School Leader Questionnaire .................................... 18
   - School Characteristics Inventory ................................. 19
   - Teacher Instructional Logs ....................................... 20
   - Parent Survey ........................................................ 21
   - Student Assessment ................................................ 22
   - Student Motivation Form/Student Rating Form ............... 24
## Appendices

- **Appendix A** – Survey Component Response Rates ................................................................. 26
- **Appendix B** – Teacher Questionnaire Cross-Reference List .......................................................... 27
- **Appendix C** – School Leader Questionnaire Cross-Reference List .................................................. 33
- **Appendix D** – School Characteristics Inventory Cross-Reference List ........................................ 41
Introduction to SII

About the Study

Reforms in the federal Title I program, as well as passage by Congress of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Act and Part F of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act, focused attention in the late 1990’s on what many analysts now call “whole-school” or “comprehensive” school reform. This emerging conception of school improvement stands in sharp contrast to previous initiatives, especially efforts that sought to improve instruction and student achievement in high-poverty schools through isolated activities such as the adoption of new curriculum materials, the provision of brief training to teachers, or the provision of compensatory instruction to low achieving students within schools. A great deal of evidence suggests that these isolated efforts did little to markedly improve instruction and student achievement in schools, especially high poverty schools. As a result, efforts at comprehensive school reform sought to address the problem of instructional improvement more broadly. Gone were attempts to focus change on isolated elements of schooling. Instead, efforts at comprehensive school reform sought to improve the instructional capacity of entire schools, and to do so in ways that involved systematically changing many different (and interconnected) elements of instruction and instructional capacity in schools and classrooms.

One interesting outcome of this movement was the emergence of a large number of comprehensive school reform (CSR) interventions. Around the year 2000, more than 200 such interventions were operating in the United States, interventions were adopted in more than 10,000 schools around the country. The emergence and widespread adoption of these interventions offered the education community an unprecedented opportunity to examine new conceptions of instructional improvement and to investigate empirically how these new conceptions were being put into practice. Unique opportunities for research were available because these school improvement interventions were based on a variety of designs for instructional improvement and because these designs were being put into practice in a wide range of school communities. Thus, perhaps more than ever, the education community was finally in a position to take a serious and sustained look at whole-school approaches to instructional improvement: to examine schools pursuing different, systemic designs for improving instruction and student achievement, to examine how implementation of these designs was affected by different patterns of external assistance, and to see how processes of instructional change unfolded in a variety of school, community, and policy environments.

Although comprehensive designs for instructional improvement appeared promising, high quality research on the problem of instructional improvement remains scarce. At the outset of the SII project, little was known about the alternative designs for whole-school initiatives, instructional improvement or about the various strategies that external agencies could use to promote substantial and sustainable instructional change. Also, few longitudinal studies tracing the implementation of alternative designs for instructional improvement in local schools existed and little research existed examining how implementation of these designs varied across different state and local policy environments. More importantly, few studies looked inside classrooms to probe the effects of interventions on the dynamics of teaching and learning in particular subject areas, or to understand what teachers need to learn in order to make changes in their practice.
Finally, there was a lack of solid empirical research on the effects that whole-school approaches to instructional improvement could have on student achievement, especially for students attending diverse schools, coming from different family backgrounds, and living in different kinds of communities.

To meet the growing need for high-quality research on whole-school approaches to instructional improvement, researchers at the University of Michigan School of Education, in cooperation with the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), conducted a large-scale, mixed method, longitudinal *Study of Instructional Improvement* to investigate the design, implementation, and effects on student achievement of three of the most widely-adopted whole-school school reform programs in the United States: the Accelerated Schools, America’s Choice, and Success for All. Each of these school reform programs sought to make “comprehensive” changes in the instructional capacity of schools, and each was being implemented in schools in diverse social environments. Each program, however, also pursued a different design for instructional improvement, and each developed particular strategies for assisting schools in the change process. In order to better understand the process of whole-school reform, SII developed a program of research to examine how these interventions operated and to investigate their impact on schools' instructional practice and student achievement in reading and mathematics. The research program had three components:

- A longitudinal survey of 115 schools (roughly 30 schools each implementing one of the three interventions under study, plus 26 matched control schools);
- Case studies of the three interventions under study; and
- Detailed case studies of nine schools implementing the interventions under study (plus 3 matched control schools).

Each of these research components is leading to separate reports and findings, although SII undertook these studies as an integrated *program* of research that examined issues related to whole-school, instructional improvement from multiple analytic and methodological perspectives. Across all components of the SII study, the research examined alternative designs for instructional improvement, alternative strategies for putting these designs into practice in local schools, and the extent to which alternative designs and support strategies promote substantial changes in instructional capacity and student achievement in reading and mathematics.

All of this work had two main purposes. First, we wanted to know the circumstances under which different intervention *designs* and *strategies* could be expected to produce changes in particular elements of instructional capacity in schools; and second, we wanted to know which elements of instructional capacity, when present in schools, worked to produce higher levels of student achievement in reading or mathematics. Answers to these questions, we argue, provide powerful knowledge about how to successfully intervene in schools to promote instructional improvement.

This manual and the accompanying downloadable data and instruments, focus on the longitudinal survey of schools. SII gathered data from parents, students, teachers, and school leaders in 115 high-poverty elementary schools located in 45 school districts in 17 states across
the country. SII gathered extensive data on factors affecting the academic and social development of young children attending schools participating in externally adopted intervention programs. In size and scope, this multi-component research program is the most detailed study of instruction and instructional improvement in elementary schools currently available. Data collection for SII was completed in late spring of 2004 and since that time, activities have shifted from data collection to data analysis and dissemination. (Note: The primary media for reporting on the case studies of schools and case studies of intervention programs will be published manuscripts currently in preparation or press.)

This large-scale, longitudinal, multi-survey study of schools was intended to track the course of schools' engagement in comprehensive approaches to instructional improvement and to investigate the conditions under which this led to substantive changes in instructional practices and student achievement in reading and mathematics. The study design called for each school to participate in the study for a period of three years, although some schools voluntarily provided a fourth year of teacher, leader, and school-level information (no additional student-level data). Data were collected during the 2000-2001 through 2003-2004 academic years. During this time period, survey researchers administered questionnaires to teachers and school leaders on an annual basis in order to chart broad, organization wide changes in instructional capacity in these schools, including professionals' learning opportunities, the nature and focus of collegial interactions, and patterns of instructional practice. SII researchers also used a variety of other, more targeted data collection strategies to carefully chart the instructional experiences and academic learning of two cohorts of students (a cohort passing through grades K to 2, and a cohort passing through grades 3 to 5) in these schools. One important and innovative strategy for gathering information about instruction involved the use of language arts and mathematics instructional logs (available here) that teachers of cohort students completed on a daily basis (for selected students) in order to map the academic experiences of students as they pass through schools. Another strategy involved the use of twice-annual assessments to record students’ growth in academic achievement in both reading and mathematics.

In addition, survey researchers conducted interviews, primarily a telephone protocol with a parent or guardian of each cohort student in order to gather information on students’ family background and on students’ home and community environments. Researchers also gathered data from school leaders and others about the policy environments in which schools are located. These survey data can be used to address research questions in at least two analytic domains:

- One domain concerns patterns of change in schools participating in “whole-school” instructional improvement initiatives. Here, survey researchers can study: (1) the extent to which schools participating in different interventions develop different patterns of instructional capacity; (2) the consistency with which such patterns emerge among schools pursuing the same intervention; and (3) the extent to which patterns of change in instructional capacity are explained by features of intervention designs and support strategies, state and local policy environments, or initial conditions in schools adopting particular reform models.
- A second research domain concerns the extent to which schools’ participation in “whole-school” improvement produces changes that make a difference to student achievement in reading and mathematics. Here, survey researchers can carefully chart what students are
taught in these two core school subjects and what they learn in these subjects, when such teaching and learning occurs, and how patterns of academic achievement in these subjects are affected by particular elements of instructional capacity in schools.

Self-Administered Questionnaire Components

In brief, the study involves multiple components and data collection instruments. The self-administered questionnaire (SAQ) components are described below:

• School Characteristics Inventory (SCI). The School Characteristics Inventory gathered school administrative data as well as information about the state, district and local environment in which the school improvement programs were enacted. This questionnaire booklet was completed by the principal or the principal’s designate. SII supplements the available school level information with data integrated from the Common Core Data (CCD), the Quality Education Database (QED) and CensusTract.

• School Leader Questionnaire (SLQ). The School Leader Questionnaire gathered information on the domains of the school improvement effort as well as the enactment process and the state, district and local environments. This questionnaire booklet was completed by the school principal and others with administrative responsibilities at the school, including school improvement personnel.

• Teacher Questionnaire (TQ). The Teacher Questionnaire gathered information about instruction, the school improvement enactment process, and the school environment. This questionnaire booklet was completed by all teachers at each school.

• Teacher Logs (LOGS). Extensive data on the instruction received by the sampled students was collected through the use of an instructional log (mathematics and language arts) frequently administered to teachers of participating students.

• Student Rating Form (SRF). Teachers were asked to complete a Student Rating Form for each student for whom they fill out an instructional log. The SRF instrument gathers information on a student’s academic engagement, approaches to learning, and problem behaviors (if any). The form also contains several Yes/No questions about the student’s participation in Title 1 programs and other school services.

• Student Motivation Form (SMF). Each spring, the students were administered the Student Motivation Form, socio-emotional instrument that asks students to report on their feelings toward reading and mathematics. The SMF was administered individually to kindergarten through 2nd graders and in small groups to 3rd through 5th graders.

• Student Academic Assessments. Bi-annual assessments of students’ achievement were conducted using CTB McGraw Hill’s TerraNova. The Woodcock Johnson-Revised test was used to measure the achievement status of entering kindergarten students.
A Brief Portrait of the Intervention Programs

The Accelerated Schools Project

The Accelerated Schools Project (ASP) was launched at Stanford University in 1986 by Dr. Henry Levin. The Accelerated Schools movement had reached about 1000 (by design, the number is now less) elementary and middle schools in most states and some international sites. It is organized into regional centers across the nation. At the time of our study, ASP’s approach to working with schools revolved around promoting a normative commitment among school leaders and faculty to the program’s abstract vision or ideal of “powerful learning” for all students. From the onset of working with schools, ASP facilitators used the staff development process to emphasize the program’s commitment to this abstract construct, and to define powerful learning as constructivist in nature, with an emphasis on authentic, learner-centered, and interactive forms of instruction. However, ASP was not prescriptive in nature. For example, it did not target particular school subjects for improvement, nor did it provide teachers with a great deal of explicit guidance about curriculum objectives or teaching strategies. Instead, ASP facilitators helped schools use a systematic process of organizational development to design a unique path toward powerful learning and to adopt locally-appropriate forms of instructional practice consistent with this approach. In this sense, ASP had a design best labeled as “adaptive” in form.

During the time period we studied ASP, the program’s goals for change were general in form—aiming at broad changes across the board rather than targeting specific areas of the curriculum for change. The kinds of changes teachers were expected to make as a result of participating in ASP were not formally specified, and instead, each school (and each teacher within a school) was asked to “discover” the most appropriate means to producing powerful learning within his or her own particular context. For these reasons, schools and teachers had a great deal of autonomy in the ASP system, with the result that there was no definable metric of implementation fidelity, either from external program facilitators, or from internal leaders.

America’s Choice

Marc S. Tucker, President of the National Center for Education and the Economy (NCEE), serves as the founder/leader of the America’s Choice (AC) program. The AC program had its origins in the standards-based reform movement, and as a result, the program was built around some definite ideas about the curricular content and methods of teaching it wanted to occur inside classrooms, especially in the area of language arts. At the time of our study, for example, AC typically began its work in local schools by focusing on the school’s writing program (moving only later to changes in reading and mathematics programs). Moreover, AC typically provided teachers with a great deal of instructional guidance. For example, teachers in AC schools received a curriculum guide, were taught a set of recommended instructional routines for teaching writing (called “writers’ workshop”), and worked with locally-appointed AC coaches and facilitators to develop “core writing assignments” and clear scoring “rubrics” for judging students’ written work. Thus, in the area of writing instruction at least, AC was trying to
Implement a well-specified, standards-based curriculum grounded in professional consensus about what constitutes a desirable instructional program. AC also expected schools that adopted the program to create two new leadership positions—a design coach and a literacy coordinator. Design coaches were expected to help principals implement the program, while AC literacy coordinators were expected to work with classroom teachers. Previous research showed that levels of instructional leadership were highest in the AC schools in our study sample (see, Camburn, Rowan, and Taylor, 2003). Subsequently, it is not surprising to find that staff in AC schools reported their school improvement plans as clear and well-specified. Moreover, as a result of extensive coaching, AC schools tended to be characterized by strong instructional leadership. In our research, the presence of strong instructional leadership—coupled with a well-specified instructional design—produced distinctive instructional practices in AC schools.

**Success for All**

*Success for All* (SFA) was founded by Dr. Robert Slavin and Dr. Nancy Madden in 1987. It has strong ties to John Hopkins University and is currently operated out of Baltimore, MD. Of the three programs under study, SFA gave schools the clearest and most highly-specified plan for instructional improvement by producing a set of highly-specified instructional routines for the teaching of reading. In particular, the SFA program was built around a clear and well-defined reading curriculum that provided teachers with a weekly lesson sequence, and each lesson in this sequence was designed around a “script” intended to guide teaching activities through a 90-minute reading period. In grades K-2, moreover, these scripts were accompanied by program-provided curricular materials for use throughout the school.

SFA schools also were more centrally managed than other schools in our study. For example, schools implementing SFA were expected to appoint a full-time literacy coordinator, and this staff member was given substantial responsibility for school-wide coordination of the reading program, including the task of constituting reading groups and making teaching assignments to these groups on a school-wide basis every eight weeks. In addition, instructional leaders in SFA schools and SFA linking agents were asked to supervise implementation of SFA instructional routines. In prior research, levels of instructional leadership were found to be as high in SFA schools as in AC schools, and much higher than levels of instructional leadership found in ASP schools (see, Camburn, Rowan, and Taylor, 2003). Staff in SFA schools saw school improvement plans as highly specified and as focused squarely on a particular instructional target (reading). This emphasis on faithful implementation of instructional routines produced a distinctive pattern of teaching practices that was generally faithful to the program’s instructional design.

**Principal Investigators**

**Deborah Loewenberg Ball** is the Dean of the School of Education at the University of Michigan. With elementary mathematics as the main context, her research has focused on the challenges of teaching for understanding and on efforts to support such teaching through policy, reform initiatives, and teacher education. Her publications include articles on teacher learning and teacher evaluation; the role of subject matter knowledge in teaching and learning to teach;
challenges embedded in trying to teach for understanding; and relations of policy and practice in instructional reform.

David K. Cohen is John Dewey Collegiate Professor of Education, and professor of public policy at the University of Michigan. In addition to his current work on educational policy and the relationships between policy and practice, his previous research includes studies on the effects of schooling; efforts to reform teaching; evaluations of educational experiments and large-scale intervention programs; and relations between research and policy.

Brian Rowan is the Burke A. Hinsdale Collegiate Professor in Education and Research Professor at the Institute for Social Research, the University of Michigan. Rowan’s scholarly interests lie at the intersection of organization theory and school effects research. He has written on education as an institution, on the nature of school organization, leadership, and instructional practice, and on the effects of these factors on student achievement. Since 1998, Rowan has been Study Director for A Study of Instructional Improvement. As part of that research, he has explored issues related to the measurement of instruction and teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge, the development of new approaches to causal inference in research on teaching, on the use of large-scale surveys in the study of school, classroom, and teacher effects on students’ achievement, and on the analysis of trends in the school improvement industry.
Sample and Study Design

The Sample

The Study of Instructional Improvement sought to recruit 120 schools into the study: 30 schools from each of the three school reform programs (SFA, AC, & ASP) as well as an additional sample of 30 control schools. To obtain a sample of schools, SII used a variety of data, including complete lists of schools participating in each of the CSR programs under study as of the 2000-2001 school year. Additional data on schools from this list and potential “control group” schools was then obtained through the Quality Education Data (QED) database, a commercially available database. This database was used as the primary source for the identification of control schools in the study population. QED data for both treatment and control schools were also matched to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core Database (CCD) for district level data, the 1990 Census for socio-economic data, and to school listings provided by school reform programs to identify the student population.

Schools were selected for the study in four steps. First, a list was compiled of all U.S. public elementary schools that had begun their affiliation with ASP, AC, or SFA in the 1998-1999, 1999-2000, or 2000-2001 school years. Initial inspection of this list indicated that schools participating in these programs were widely dispersed across the country. For cost purposes, it was necessary to identify geographic regions around the country which contained concentrations of schools in the three programs, thus minimizing data collection travel.

In the second step, a set of 17 geographic regions was selected from which to sample schools. Regions were selected using ArcView®, a geographic information systems (GIS) program, to plot intervention schools on maps. Geographic regions were identified by drawing one hundred mile radii around zip codes containing program schools and by visually inspecting maps on which these radii and the program schools contained within them were plotted (most of the study regions roughly correspond with U.S. Census Bureau standard metropolitan statistical areas).

In the third step, intervention schools from the 17 geographical regions were selected. We attempted to balance the samples of schools from the intervention programs in two ways. First, an attempt was made to equalize the samples with respect to the length of time sample schools had been affiliated with the three programs. The study targeted equal numbers of schools from each program for each initial year of program affiliation, 1998-99, 1999-00 and 2000-01. An attempt was also made to “equate” selected schools from the three programs with respect to socioeconomic disadvantage. This was done by first classifying schools on a three-point index of socioeconomic disadvantage (described below), and then targeting equal numbers of schools from each program from each category of the index.

In the final step, a set of “comparison” schools was chosen from within the 17 geographical regions. In addition to coming from the same geographical areas as selected intervention program schools, comparison schools were also selected so that their distribution on the three-point disadvantage index matched that of selected intervention program schools. Our sampling efforts yielded 115 schools located in 45 different school districts, in 15 different states, and in
17 different metropolitan areas. Overall, 31 AC schools, 30 SFA schools, 28 ASP schools, and 26 Comparison schools participated. The schools were chosen to balance the sample, as much as possible, in terms of geographic location, school demographic characteristics, and years working with the CSR program, as well as to achieve a representative sample of schools participating in each CSR program. By design, however, the final sample over-represented schools in the highest quartile of socio-economically disadvantaged schools in order to study instructional improvement in high-poverty settings.

The study attempted to recruit schools relatively well “matched” in terms of poverty level, based on census track information. The poverty level within a given census track was determined largely by the community disadvantage index (CDI). The CDI describes the 1990 census tract in which a school was located in terms of the proportion of individuals with less than a high school education, the proportion of working-age adults who are unemployed, the median household income, and the proportions of households with income below the poverty line, receiving public assistance income, and containing children that are headed by a single parent. You may view Table 1, which shows the averages for intervention and comparison schools on a number of neighborhood and school demographic variables. The table shows that on average, the AC and SFA schools selected for study were somewhat higher on the community disadvantage index, percent of students receiving free lunch, percent of minority pupils enrolled (particularly, African American), percent of students from single parent homes, and student likelihood of living in a household that received public assistance (within the last 12 months).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Schools by CSR Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students in School (N=28) 485 563 465 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Students in State (N=31) 535,798 719,948 690,486 746,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Disadvantage Index (N=30) .26 .64 .10 .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Households in Poverty (N=26) .14 .19 .23 .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Unemployed in Community (N=28) .09 .09 .12 .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Households Receiving Assistance (N=31) .09 .14 .19 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student/Family Background-Proportion Students:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (N=30) .36 .12 .19 .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (N=31) .42 .69 .52 .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (N=30) .19 .11 .20 .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (N=28) .03 .08 .09 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American (N=26) .00 .01 .01 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch (N=28) .62 .75 .74 .64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Single Parent Homes (N=31) .37 .49 .46 .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born to Teen Mother (N=26) .22 .22 .20 .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Receiving AFDC (N=28) .08 .14 .15 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Treatment Aggregate Achievement (N=31) 97.68 102.32 94.15 103.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodcock-Johnson Language Arts – Entering Kindergartners (N=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.68 102.32 94.15 103.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the result of this school selection method and the most salient outcome is that 56 of the 114 schools sampled fall under the high poverty level category. We also see that the majority of the schools in AC, SFA, and the comparison schools fall under the high and medium categories. SFA has the highest number of high poverty schools at 18, while AC was composed of 16 such school sites and the comparison schools featured 12. Overall, then, we argue that SFA, AC, and the comparison schools are relatively well-matched in terms of poverty. Table 2 shows that ASP had proportionally more lower (10) and medium (8) poverty-level schools, but still had a substantial number of high poverty schools with 10 such sites. As a result, we still argue that the sampled ASP schools “match” the other high poverty schools in the study.

Table 2. Sample Stratification: Year 2 Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Overall, about half of the schools in the sample (56 of 114) are in the highest poverty level.
2. In general, SFA, AC, and Comparison schools are well-matched in terms of poverty. ASP has proportionally more lower and medium poverty schools.
3. Schools are not well-matched in terms of years since joining the program. SFA has the most “mature” schools in terms of implementation experience; AC has the fewest “mature” schools.
The delineation of schools based on the socioeconomic disadvantage index was composed of both community factors and aggregate school information. However, this method does not necessarily take into account the possibility that school attendance zones are not precisely matched to census tracts. In other words, it is possible that children attending a particular school may be from families that are more or less wealthy than would be predicted from the census tract where a given school is located. To investigate this possibility we developed a cross tabulation of schools’ ordinal community disadvantage index by percentile of school SES. Within a census tract, the community disadvantage index is based on proportion of high school dropouts, proportion of unemployed adults, the median household income, proportion of households below the poverty line, proportion receiving public assistance income, and proportion of single parent households. SES percentile is a school aggregate measure based on a socioeconomic composite developed from Parent Survey reports. The composite includes total family income, mother’s educational attainment, mother’s occupational prestige score, father’s educational attainment, and father’s occupational prestige score. The percentile rank is based on the SII sample and is not nationally representative.

On Table 3, ordinal community disadvantage index (CDI) is arranged so that the highest level of CDI = 5 and the lowest level = 0. The SES percentile is ordered so that the highest SES aggregate composite = 3 and the lowest SES levels = 1. The data shows that 32 schools of the 56 schools we describe as high poverty based on census tract information, also occupy the lowest percentile of school SES. We also see that 18 of these schools in the highest CDI are in the middle SES percentile, but what is most surprising is that 6 of the schools are in the highest SES percentile. Further, 10 schools in the middle to low SES percentiles are located in census tract areas where there CDI is low. In other words, children from less wealthy backgrounds are attending schools in areas the census considers not high in community poverty. In both instances, a possible explanation is that attendance zones are designed with the goal of promoting diversity, where students attend schools in areas that do not necessarily coincide with their socioeconomic backgrounds. It is also possible that the use of 1990 census data was not contemporary with demographic shifts occurring within some neighborhoods. It should be noted that the use of 1990 census data was necessary as 2000 census information was not yet available at the time of school sampling and recruitment for the study.
Table 3. Ordinal Community Disadvantage Index Compared to School Average SES Percentiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinal CDI - School Tracts * SES Percentiles (NSES)</th>
<th>Nses_mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordcdi: Ordinal CDI - School Tracts</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Nses_mean</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Nses_mean</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Nses_mean</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Nses_mean</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within Nses_mean</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reader may also view Table 4, to see how the SII sample compared to the nationally representative sample of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS). The data show that the SII sample included a substantially higher percentage of African-American children (49.8%) compared to ECLS (15.7%). The largest demographic group in the ECLS sample is White elementary-aged children (57.3%), while the SII sample includes less than half that percentage (23.1%) of Whites. Table 2 also shows that the SII sample included a higher percentage of children whose mothers did not complete high school (22.9% vs. 15.1%). Moreover, 21.7% of mothers in the ECLS sample reported obtaining a bachelor’s degree or higher, while only 9.9% of mothers in the SII sample obtained a comparable level of education. Table 2 also shows differences in family structure between the ECLS and SII sample. In ECLS, 64.3% of respondents indicated that both a mother and a father were present in the household, while only 40.8% of SII parents reported this traditional structure. Moreover, the SII parent survey respondents indicated that 41.9% of the sampled children come from single mother households, while only 21.3% of the ECLS children lived in this household arrangement. Disparities between the SII and ECLS samples are also evident in reported total family income. In every income category ranging from $0 to $39,999, the SII students were represented in somewhat larger percentages compared to the ECLS sampled students. And in the higher income categories ranging from $40,000 through $200,000+, the SII students were represented in consistently lower percentages compared to the ECLS student sample. The SII family background information on Table 4 comes mostly from the Parent Questionnaire data which was gathered using the Parent Survey protocol.
Table 4. SII/ECLS Sample Demographic Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>SII</th>
<th>ECLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=6,733)</td>
<td>(weighted n=3,865,797)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete high school</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or vocational school</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or other advanced degree</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father Present in Household</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Mother Household</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenage Mother</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reported Total Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDER $5,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $34,999</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Received Public Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFDC/TANF received in last 12 months</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodstamps received in last 12 months</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges in School Sample Selection

1. Intervention Program Lists- SII staff had difficulty in acquiring accurate lists of participating schools from all intervention programs in a timely manner. In one instance, SII staff had to work with the twelve regional offices for one intervention program to acquire individual lists.

2. Implementation Status- The interventions’ lists included schools that were not actively implementing the intervention, thus reducing the number of eligible schools contained on the lists. For instance, some lists included schools that had paid the participation fee to the intervention but did not attend training workshops and were not implementing the program.

3. Geographic Regions- SII staff originally envisioned creating 6 to 8 research sites across the country, to conserve money and reduce administrative effort. These “geo” regions were to be in areas where at least two of the four intervention programs had a concentration of schools. Only schools from these designated geo areas would be recruited for the study to maximize efficiency. Once the sampling began, it became apparent that the geo regions would have to be expanded to 12 to 15 in order to achieve the desired sample size. Making necessary modifications to sampling procedures delayed the beginning of recruitment.

4. Pre-existing Differences in Intervention Schools- SII staff defined the sample criteria to include 1) designated geographic regions, 2) metropolitan location, 3) grade span of K-5, 4) year school affiliated with the intervention, and 5) community disadvantage. Once these criteria were applied to the list of schools from each program, it became apparent that it would be difficult to achieve a comparable sample across all programs because of differences in the programs’ size, age, growth patterns, and differences in the socioeconomic conditions of the communities with which the different interventions work.

5. Consultation with Intervention Staff- From the inception of SII, staff committed to work collaboratively with each intervention program to ensure they understood the study’s purpose and design, and the implications for schools participating in the study. This guiding principle resulted in a step-by-step consultation process with key leaders from each intervention program. The process has been valuable in achieving access to research sites, but very time consuming.

Propensity Score Stratification Methods

Although SII was designed as a quasi-experiment with three “treatment” groups (one for each CSR program) and a matched control group, previously presented Table 1 showed that, after the SII sample was constructed, subsamples of treatment and comparison schools were not perfectly matched. For this reason, we recommend that statistical analyses oriented to establishing the effects of “treatment” (CSR) participation on outcomes using “control” schools as the counterfactual be conducted using some form of propensity score matching. An excellent discussion of this approach to causal analysis can be found in Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983).

In SII, a multi-step process was used to develop a propensity score model for these kinds of data analyses. An example of that approach is provided on the SII website and comes from our analyses of CSR program effects on student achievement. The data file used to conduct the propensity score analysis can also be found for download. Readers wishing to conduct secondary analyses of SII data are welcome to use this data file and the propensity scores contained in it to
conduct such analyses. There is a brief description of the work below with a more detailed explanation provided on the SII website.

The school-level file contains the 40 covariates used to create propensity scores and demonstrate balance across our matched schools. In order to create the propensity scores we used Penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimation (PMLE). We first ran an ordinary logistic regression with all 40 covariates entered as predictors. Using the Design library in the statistical program R (Alzola and Harrell, 2006) we were able to assess the degree of over-optimism in the model and a suggested penalty factor was supplied by the program. We then applied the penalty factor to a subsequent regression in order to obtain the propensity score. The propensity score obtained through these procedures is provided for each set of CSR schools versus the set of comparison schools only and versus all other schools in SII. For many reasons the latter comparison provided a better match set of schools.

Subsequently the propensity scores were used to match schools using the Optmatch program in R (Hansen, 2006). Matches were conducted so that each treatment school was matched with at least one other comparison school and no schools were excluded from the analysis. The methods employed then proceeded to check whether each of our matching procedures produced balance across all of the covariates. We first examined balance across the matched sets of schools provided by the Optmatch program. Because a great number of different matches were generated using this procedure, we then combined matched sets to create a reduced number of strata, preserving balance between treated and untreated schools within strata. We created dummy variables for each stratum to be entered into our parametric models. We ran models both ways – using the full set of matches and the reduced number of strata. Both analyses produced nearly identical results, so in all cases we present the results from the strata models since they represent the most parsimonious models.

Data Collection Design

Readers will note that SII is described as a four-year study, but that two separate student cohorts (K-2nd, 3rd-5th) are followed longitudinally over three-year periods. This is due to the “phased” or staggered collection design illustrated on Table 5. The reader should also note that the SII database designates the K-2nd cohort as Cohort A, while the 3rd-5th grade cohort is designated as Cohort B. Each cohort included eight randomly selected students. If a participating student moved from a school, each was replaced with a student that recently moved into the school.

Table 5. Phased Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2000-01</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B 2000</td>
<td>B 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B 2000</td>
<td>B 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B 2000</td>
<td>B 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A 2000</td>
<td>A 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A 2000</td>
<td>A 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>A 2000</td>
<td>A 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase one of SII began in AY 2000-2001 with the entry of 53 elementary schools into the study; phase two added about 62 more elementary schools in AY 2001-2002. So, about half of each student cohort (A2000 & B2000) began the study during the 2000-2001 academic year, while the remainder of participating cohort students (A2001 & B2001) began the study during the 2001-2002 school year. Students enrolled in phase one schools completed their three-year participation cycle at the conclusion of the 2002-2003 school year, while students enrolled in phase 2 completed the study in the spring of the 2003-2004 school year.

Meanwhile, school-level data (School Characteristics Inventory) were collected for each site across all four years of the study. Also, many school leaders provided an additional year of School Leader Questionnaire participation, as did many teachers (Teacher Questionnaire). This situation, coupled with the phased-design of the study, had the potential to cause confusion for researchers attempting to merge SII data files for longitudinal study. To relieve the potential misalignment of files, the SII files have been merged to logically reflect chronological participation of students across a three-year period. This pertains to the assessment data, teacher log files, the Student Rating Form (SRF) and Student Motivation Form (SMF). However, each of these files contains a variable flag named “Year” to indicate the exact school calendar year in which data were collected. Similarly, the school, leader, and teacher survey data files contain this same flag to guide attempts to match (or merge) files by data collection year.
Survey Components Overview

Teacher Questionnaire

The Teacher Questionnaire (TQ) was a 28-page booklet and respondents were expected to take approximately one hour to complete it. Questions were primarily closed-ended. The TQ asked questions about the teacher’s perspective of the school and its faculty. In addition, teachers who taught language arts or math as part of their assignment were asked to complete language arts and/or math sections, respectively. The subject sections asked questions about teaching practices and priorities, as well as pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) questions. Teachers were also asked questions about their experiences with school improvement efforts, professional development opportunities, demographic information, and their professional background.

Over the course of four years, data was gathered from over 5,300 teachers. Appendix A shows that the lowest response rate (63%) among eligible teacher participants occurred in first year of the study, and that the rate steadily increased to 86% by the final year of survey administration. These response rates represent administrative estimates and may include successful contacts made with individuals declining study participation. And these general response rates are not individual item response rates. For instance, users of the pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) items will notice a lower rate of item response among respondents eligible to complete the mathematics and/or language arts survey sections.

The pedagogical content knowledge measures allowed SII to investigate the effects of teachers' knowledge on student achievement, and to understand how implementation of whole school reform programs is mediated by teachers' content knowledge. While many potential methods for exploring and measuring teachers' content knowledge exist (i.e., interviews, observations, structured tasks), we elected to focus our efforts on developing survey measures because of the large number of teachers (over 5000) participating in SII. In mathematics, items have been developed that can be used to measure teachers' mathematical content knowledge for teaching in: (1) Number and operations; (2) Patterns, functions, and algebra; and (3) Geometry. Items in each category capture whether teachers can not only answer the mathematics problems they assign students, but also how teachers solve the special mathematical tasks that arise in teaching, including evaluating unusual solution methods, using mathematical definitions, representing mathematical content to students, and identifying adequate mathematical explanations. Using the SII teacher content knowledge in mathematics items, Hill, Rowan and Ball (2005) found a positive effect of teacher mathematical knowledge on first and third graders’ gain scores. Readers wanting to learn more about the development and scaling properties of the mathematics knowledge measures should consult the article by Hill, Schilling and Ball (2004).


Item development in language arts was guided by three distinctions in content knowledge for teaching reading: (1) knowledge of content, (2) knowledge of students and content, and (3) knowledge of teaching and content. The primary difference between items in each of these categories is in how content knowledge is used in teaching reading. The knowledge of content domain came closest to measuring teachers’ common knowledge of the subject. Answering items that focused on knowledge of content and students required respondents to use their knowledge of reading to understand the range of student products encountered teaching the subject. Items on knowledge of teaching and content required respondents to use knowledge of reading to decide between different teaching actions. In addition to distinctions in the types of content knowledge for teaching noted above, items were also measuring content topic knowledge in (1) comprehension and (2) word analysis. Within comprehension, the range items included: morphology, vocabulary, comprehension strategies and questions, genre, fluency, and other topics related to comprehending the meaning of words and text. Word analysis included: phonemic awareness, letter sound relationships, word frequency, and other topics related to the reading and decoding of words and their print and sound elements. Readers should consult an article on the development and measurement properties of teacher content knowledge scales by Phelps and Schilling (2004).


Although most sections of the TQ are longitudinally designed and contain precisely the same items year-to-year, some minor adjustments were made and the PCK items changed during each administration to develop the battery of items necessary for scaling work. This created a situation in which variable positions (and variable names) changed year-to-year to accommodate these unavoidable shifts. Appendix B provides a variable cross-reference list to help readers track question items across data files for each TQ administration. Appendix B will also provide readers with an overview of the PCK items in both reading and mathematics, but we strongly encourage interested individuals to consult the actual survey instruments available for download at the SII website.

**School Leader Questionnaire**

The School Leader Questionnaire (SLQ) was a 20-page booklet. School leaders were expected to take approximately 45 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The school leaders surveyed included principals, assistant principals, subject area coaches, and program coordinators. This group included teachers serving in leadership or program coordination roles. The SLQ was designed to capture information about the school and instructional improvement programs adopted by the participating sites. Questions asked about the programs the school was participating in, formal leadership roles of the respondent, respondent priorities, as well as the respondent’s assessment of the availability of resources, satisfaction levels among students and staff, and school priorities. School leaders were also asked to evaluate the state of the language arts and math programs in the school. This first set of domains encompasses how principals understand their role, what responsibilities fall to their charge, how they prioritize these responsibilities, and what they actually do (i.e. what their practice is). Additionally, leaders were
asked questions about their demographic background, professional development opportunities directly related to intervention programs, and prior academic preparation.

We were particularly interested in the leadership roles administrators play. Some of the interventions specifically targeted leadership roles and responsibilities, creating new leadership roles, broadening who is responsible for school leadership, or specifying new leadership tasks and responsibilities for those in leadership positions. Our conception of leadership allowed for the possibility that leadership is distributed throughout the organization beyond the work of the school principal to other potential leaders in the school.

Over the course of the study, data was gathered from over 800 leaders. The survey response rate among school leaders was 75% at the first year of questionnaire administration and improved to 90% by the final year of the study. Although the domains of the study remained constant and most items remained the same year-to-year, SII staff made a few minor item adjustments, especially between the first and second survey administrations. As with the TQ, this had the effect of changing variable positions/names for some items. Appendix C provides a variable cross-reference list for the SLQ to assist interested users in tracking items for longitudinal use.

School Characteristics Inventory

The Study of Instructional Improvement used multiple sources to assemble school-level information. SII used the Quality Education Data (QED) database (a commercially available database) the NCES Common Core Database (CCD), the School Characteristics Inventory, and Parent Survey data responses aggregated to the school level. The School Characteristics Inventory (SCI) questionnaire booklet was completed by the school principal and/or others with knowledge about staffing, students, and school-wide programs. Data frequencies indicate that principals completed the SCI in the majority of participating schools. The School Characteristics Inventory was a 12-page booklet composed primarily of closed-ended and restricted choice (fill-in) questions. The SCI was designed to capture descriptive information about the school, including calendar year, enrollment, funding and programs, and student and staff demographics. Each school was given one SCI to complete. Response rates for the SCI range from a low of 68% in year one of the study increasing to 99% of eligible phase 2 schools in the last year of administration. Regrettably, it was not realized that three schools in the sample never provided a single, complete questionnaire during the time of the study.

SII researchers found that the most reliable and consistent sources of school information were derived from the QED and CCD databases and used this information to develop a school-level composite file that is available for download along with the SCI files. Generally, we recommend using the SII school composite data file for most research purposes. However, the SCI lists the range of other programs schools adopted and participated in during the time of the study, and that may be of interest to researchers (see, Appendix D). SII also invites interested readers to use the propensity stratification score file used in SII achievement outcome analyses. Much more information about the SII-produced propensity score development is available on the SII website.
Data on literacy and mathematics instruction were gathered from separate logs for Language Arts and Mathematics that were administered to all teachers of cohort students. In total, roughly 75,000 instructional logs were collected from about 1,900 classroom teachers in grades 1 through 5 over the course of the study. The log is a survey instrument containing roughly 100 items that teachers used to record information about a single day of instruction for a single student. The opening section of the log asked teachers to report on the amount of emphasis given to major topics. In language arts: (1) word analysis, (2) concepts of print, (3) comprehension, (4) reading fluency, (5) vocabulary, (6) writing, (7) grammar, (8) spelling, and (9) research strategies. In mathematics: (1) number concepts, (2) operations, (3) patterns, functions, or algebra, and (5) other mathematical content. If teachers checked a major emphasis topic for a student on a given day, they then completed additional items about the specific content that was taught in any checked domain, the methods used to teach that content, and the tasks and materials the focal student used that day. To assure that log reports were representative of days of the school year and all cohort students in a classroom, teachers were asked to participate in three extended logging periods spaced evenly over the academic year. During each logging period, teachers rotated daily log reports across the sample of cohort students in their class. If students changed teachers during the course of the year (as many SFA students did), their new teachers completed logs.

In the current data set, the average teacher completed 31 logs (s.d. = 25 logs), usually spread evenly across the school year. Although the completion of that many logs sounds onerous, logs were easily completed in about five minutes, usually at the end of the school day. Overall, 89% (response rate) of teachers who were asked to log did so, and they completed 90% of the logs they were administered. However, on some of the sampled days, teachers indicated that the school was not in session, target students were absent, assemblies or field trips were held, etc..., or there may be logical inconsistencies with teacher responses. For this reason, SII researchers developed what we call “gateway” variables to help researchers assess when specific topics were taught actually to target students. Table 1 shows the “gateway” variables available to assist in the data reduction process, leaving just logs with usable classroom information. The syntax coding used to create these gateways is available on the SII website.

Table 1. Language Arts Gateway Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rll4a</td>
<td>Comprehension Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4b</td>
<td>Writing Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4c</td>
<td>Word Analysis Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4d</td>
<td>Concepts of Print Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4e</td>
<td>Reading Fluency Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4f</td>
<td>Vocabulary Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4g</td>
<td>Grammar Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4h</td>
<td>Spelling Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rll4i</td>
<td>Research Strategies Gateway Item - Reversed Scored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compsum</td>
<td>Sum of the Marks in the Comprehension Section (A) of Log</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comp Variable Indicates if Log is Marked in the Comprehension Section (A)
write Variable Indicates if Log is Marked in the Writing Section (B)
wordsum Sum of the Marks in the Writing Section (B) of Log
word Variable Indicates if Log is Marked in the Word Analysis Section (C)
wordsum Sum of the Marks in the Word Analysis Section (C)
n_gw Number of Gateway Items Marked
probll4a Variable Indicates that Response to ll4a is Problematic
probll4b Variable Indicates that Response to ll4b is Problematic
probll4c Variable Indicates that Response to ll4c is Problematic
probll4d Variable Indicates that Response to ll4d is Problematic
probll4e Variable Indicates that Response to ll4e is Problematic
probll4f Variable Indicates that Response to ll4f is Problematic
probll4g Variable Indicates that Response to ll4g is Problematic
probll4h Variable Indicates that Response to ll4h is Problematic
probll4i Variable Indicates that Response to ll4i is Problematic
probllgw Variable Indicates if there were any Problematic Responses to any of the Gateway Items on the Log

The accuracy of these logs was reported on by Camburn and Barnes (2004), who found that teacher vs. trained observer match rates on log reports were rarely more than a few percentage points different from observer vs. observer match rates for the same lessons, especially for the most common instructional practices. To assure accuracy in teachers’ log reports, SII researchers conducted a 1 day training for teachers, gave teachers a glossary defining and illustrating the terms used in the log, and encouraged teachers to consult a toll-free phone number with logging questions.


Parent Survey

The Parent Survey component consists of interviews with parents whose children were active participants of the SII. The survey includes questions about each child’s home environment and activities, the child’s experiences with school, services provided, basic demographic information and questions about the family’s access to basic needs. Most of the interviews were conducted by telephone, but where necessary, interviewers in the field conducted face-to-face interview sessions. The Parent Survey is a cross-sectional, rather than longitudinal, designed survey and most parent interviews were conducted in the second year of the study. However, additional interviews were conducted in the third and fourth years of the study to capture information for new students moving into a sample school and to obtain data from parents not reached in year two. Approximately 6,700 interviews were completed.

The Parent Survey data were central in the development of demographic control measures used in our analytic work and these measures frequently appear in published articles by SII researchers. To construct a composite socioeconomic status (SES) measure, SII researchers replicated the procedures commonly used in the development of education databases sponsored
by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). It is important for readers to note, however, that the SES measure developed by SII is not norm-referenced to a national school population. Instead, a standardized coefficient of SES represents a student’s status compared only to other students in the SII population.

SII researchers developed the SES measure using the exact items reported for the SES measure available in the National Educational Longitudinal Study ’88 (NELS: 88) and the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS). The five-item composite measure includes the highest education levels reported for the (1) mother and (2) father, (3) reported total family income level, and the occupational prestige scores of the (4) mother and (5) father. Occupational prestige scores or Total Socioeconomic Index (TSEI) were adopted from the work of Robert Hauser. Succinctly explained, SII researchers standardized the mean average of the five items to produce the SES measure. For more information and example syntax, please see the SII website.

As in all survey data collection, there are limitations and sources of potential measurement error. Parent information was successfully collected for about 75% of the SII sample, and it is known that the missing information is slightly disproportional in the direction of lower income families. However, we remind the reader that face-to-face interviews were arranged to mediate the effects of this common occurrence in survey data collection. Users of SII data will also notice a high rate of missing information for father’s educational background and occupation. The interview protocol called for information to be gathered only for parental figures physically residing in a household where a child participant lived. At the conception of the study, SII researchers did not anticipate that the rate of single parent female households would be as striking (42%). As a consequence, the amount of missing information for male parental figures is high and this limits the number of items to be averaged for the SES calculation.

Although the study was conducted during academic years occurring between 2000 through 2004, the census tracts used in sampling were based on 1990 Census information. Similarly, occupation codes were drawn from occupational titles associated with the 1990 Census. Therefore, it was also necessary to match these occupational codes to 1990 Total Socioeconomic Index (TSEI) scores, also referred to as occupational prestige scores. The household roster section of the Parent Survey is critical in developing several family background variables. First, it helps determine the type of family structure (e.g., mother and father present, single parent home), especially if the marital status information is missing. The roster also helps determine the relationships and age ranges of individuals reported occupying a residence. Additionally, SII researchers used this information to determine a mother’s age at the time of first born child, and sorting informant identity to assign the education levels and occupations of a mother and/or father (or other parent figure).

Student Assessment

As kindergarten students (Cohort A) began the study, they took the Letter/Word identification and applied problems sections of the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement - Revised. It was expected for these sections to take approximately 15 minutes to complete. This assessment was conducted individually with the kindergarten children. The WJ-R was in an easel format. When taking the WJ-R, children look at pictures, letters, words and numbers and answer by pointing or
giving short verbal responses. Assessors recorded children’s answers on a single, two-sided scan form.

In the spring, these same kindergarten students completed the TerraNova Level 10 assessment. The TerraNova is a nationally recognized assessment instrument. SII administered only the Reading/Language Arts and the Mathematics assessments. The Reading/Language Arts section assesses vocabulary, text analysis, evaluating meaning, reading strategies, word analysis, sentence structure, writing strategies, and editing skills. The Mathematics assessment includes number relations, computation and estimation, operation concepts, measurement, geometry and spatial sense, statistics and probability, patterns, functions and algebra, problem solving and communication. These assessments were given one-on-one to first grade students and conducted in a group with second through fifth grade students. It was expected that the TerraNova would take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete in one-on-one sessions. Each fall and spring, Cohort B (3rd grade through 5th grade) participating students completed the TerraNova assessment for their grade or performance level.

Assessment Levels. As previously mentioned, all kindergarten students take the WJ-R and all 3rd grade students take level 12 of the TerraNova or Supera. After the first semester in the study, students were routed to the appropriate TerraNova or Supera level(s) based on scoring information from previous assessments. In addition, students who joined the study through re-sampling after the first semester were routed by a site coordinator to the appropriate assessment level. Most students in the same grade were assessed at the same level. Table 2 below, shows the general assessment level schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade (semester)</th>
<th>TerraNova or Supera Level (Most Common)</th>
<th>Other Levels (Possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten (spring)</td>
<td>Level 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade (fall)</td>
<td>Level 11</td>
<td>Level 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st grade (spring)</td>
<td>Level 11</td>
<td>Level 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade (fall)</td>
<td>Level 12</td>
<td>Levels 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade (spring)</td>
<td>Level 12</td>
<td>Levels 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade (fall)</td>
<td>Level 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd grade (spring)</td>
<td>Level 13</td>
<td>Levels 11, 12, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade (fall)</td>
<td>Level 14</td>
<td>Levels 12, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th grade (spring)</td>
<td>Level 14</td>
<td>Levels 12, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th grade (fall)</td>
<td>Level 15</td>
<td>Levels 13, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th grade (spring)</td>
<td>Level 15</td>
<td>Levels 13, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spanish Assessments. Teachers were asked to give children a score for language at some point before assessments began each school year. Those Spanish-speaking students, who were not ready to take the assessment in English, took the assessment in Spanish. In the fall, Spanish speaking kindergarten children took the Letter-Word Identification and Applied Problems subtests of the Spanish version of the Woodcock-Johnson Test of Achievement – Revised. The Spanish version is called La Bateria Woodcock- Muñoz: Pruebas de

*Note that the Supera assessment was not available at level 10. For this reason, spring kindergartners who needed to take the assessment in Spanish only participated in the Spanish version of the Student Motivation Form.

Due to copyright limitations, SII cannot provide copies of the test batteries used as part of the study, but they may be available for purchase through McGraw-Hill.

**Student Motivation Form/Student Rating Form**

The Student Motivation Form (SMF) is designed to provide information from the student on how the student perceives him/herself in academic interests or skills. The SMF form, a self-description form, is administered each spring as part of the assessment. This SMF asked children to report on how much they enjoy reading and mathematics, how easy or hard reading and mathematics are for them, and any behaviors with which they might struggle that may also interfere with their learning. The SMF was administered individually to kindergartners through 2nd graders in an easel format, and an assessor recorded the students’ answers on a single-sided scan answer form. The form was administered in small groups to 3rd through 5th graders. In this case, students each had their own 2-sided scan answer sheet. An assessor read the instructions from a card and the students filled in their own answers. Both individual and group administrations take approximately 10 minutes.

Teachers were asked to complete a Student Rating Form (SRF) for each student for whom they filled out an instructional log. The SRF instrument gathers information on a student’s academic engagement, approaches to learning, and problem behaviors (if any). The form also contains several Yes/No questions about the student’s participation in Title 1 programs and other school services. Unlike the instructional logs, the SRF did not need to be completed on specific days for the specific target students. However, the response rate coincides with the log response rate of about 89%. It should also be noted that students may have multiple Student Rating Forms from teachers in a given year if the target student had different teachers for mathematics and language arts instruction. Additionally, a very small number of target students have two SRFs from different teachers of the same subject.
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Survey Component Response Rates*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sample / completed</td>
<td>sample / completed</td>
<td>sample / completed</td>
<td>sample / completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Administered Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics Inventory (SCI)</td>
<td>107/73</td>
<td>114/110</td>
<td>107/107</td>
<td>104/103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Leader Questionnaire (SLQ)</td>
<td>437/326</td>
<td>503/407</td>
<td>439/380</td>
<td>434/391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Questionnaire (TQ)</td>
<td>2874/1806</td>
<td>4043/2969</td>
<td>3751/2861</td>
<td>3650/3119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Logs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts (LA log)</td>
<td>9440/7923</td>
<td>34566/28438</td>
<td>43724/35676</td>
<td>21517/16470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Math log)</td>
<td>9440/8216</td>
<td>34566/28560</td>
<td>43724/36066</td>
<td>21517/16342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts (LA log)</td>
<td>306/292</td>
<td>880/787</td>
<td>1092/946</td>
<td>555/467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Math log)</td>
<td>178/172</td>
<td>570/519</td>
<td>793/707</td>
<td>469/397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2343/1999</td>
<td>3777/2877</td>
<td>1967/1223</td>
<td>1047/628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010/968</td>
<td>1223/1172</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TerraNova (TN) - Fall</td>
<td>1289/1247</td>
<td>3845/3690</td>
<td>4868/4638</td>
<td>2387/2245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TerraNova (TN) - Spring</td>
<td>2313/2220</td>
<td>5080/4897</td>
<td>4743/4595</td>
<td>2313/2152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rating Form (SRF)</td>
<td>3009/2714</td>
<td>6442/5746</td>
<td>6140/5579</td>
<td>2976/2603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Motivation Form (SMF)</td>
<td>2375/2275</td>
<td>5144/4958</td>
<td>4743/4598</td>
<td>2313/2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reported rates are administrative estimates and may include successful contact with participants who refused to complete a survey.

a Log samples filtered by teacher refusal, student move-out, student ineligible, and parental refusal.
**Appendix B**

**Teacher Questionnaire Cross-Reference List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOTE: PCK questions, which are unique from year to year, are not included in this cross-reference</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your Perspective on the School**

tq1_2a  tq2_1a  tq3_1a  tq4_2a  Teachers respect colleagues expert in craft

tq1_1b  tq2_1b  tq3_1b  tq4_1b  Teachers trust each other

tq1_1c  tq2_1c  tq3_1c  tq4_1c  Teachers care about each other

tq1_1d  tq2_1d  tq3_1d  tq4_1d  Teachers respect other teachers who take lead

tq1_1e  tq2_1e  tq3_1e  tq4_1e  Teachers openly express views at meetings

tq1_1f  tq2_1f  tq3_1f  tq4_1f  Teachers question views of others

tq1_1g  tq2_1g  tq3_1g  tq4_1g  We talk through views, opinions

tq1_1h  tq2_1h  tq3_1h  tq4_1h  Teachers continually learn-seek out ideas

tq1_1i  tq2_1i  tq3_1i  tq4_1i  Teachers encouraged to experiment

tq1_1j  tq2_1j  tq3_1j  tq4_1j  Teachers encouraged to take risks

tq1_1k  tq2_1k  tq3_1k  tq4_1k  Teachers expect students complete work

tq1_1l  tq2_1l  tq3_1l  tq4_1l  Teachers encourage students try hard

tq1_1m  tq2_1m  tq3_1m  tq4_1m  Teachers set high expectations

tq1_1n  tq2_1n  tq3_1n  tq4_1n  Teachers think-important students do well

tq1_2a  tq2_2a  tq3_2a  tq4_2a  Teachers take responsibility-help others

tq1_2b  tq2_2b  tq3_2b  tq4_2b  Teachers help maintain student behavior

tq1_2c  tq2_2c  tq3_2c  tq4_2c  Teachers take responsibility-quality

tq1_3a  tq2_3a  tq3_3a  tq4_3a  Policies often contradictory

tq1_3b  tq2_3b  tq3_3b  tq4_3b  Difficulty choosing among options

tq1_3c  tq2_3c  tq3_3c  tq4_3c  Unsure how to prioritize teaching info

tq1_3d  tq2_3d  tq3_3d  tq4_3d  Instructional policies seem inconsistent

tq1_4a  tq2_4a  tq3_4a  tq4_4a  Detailed knowledge content covered-others

tq1_4b  tq2_4b  tq3_4b  tq4_4b  With new students-knowledge of prior learning

tq1_4c  tq2_4c  tq3_4c  tq4_4c  Teachers know what students learned in my class

tq1_4d  tq2_4d  tq3_4d  tq4_4d  Frequently plan-coordinate w-- teachers

tq1_4e  tq2_4e  tq3_4e  tq4_4e  Teachers use similar methods-for achievement level

tq1_4f  tq2_4f  tq3_4f  tq4_4f  Students expected master content

tq2_5a  tq3_5a  tq4_5a  Pct LEP--ESL

tq2_5b  tq3_5b  tq4_5b  Pct emotional--behavior problem

tq2_5c  tq3_5c  tq4_5c  Pct Learning disabled

**Reading/Language Arts Instruction**

tq1_5   tq2_6   tq3_6   tq4_6   Assigned to teach reading

tq1_5b  tq2_6b  tq3_6b  tq4_6b  Assigned to teach reading (recode)

tq1_rvld tq2_rvld tq3_rvld tq4_rvld  Valid reading section responses

tq1_r1  
tq1_r2  
tq1_r3  
tq2_7a  tq3_7a  tq4_7a  Teach more than one group

tq2_7b  tq3_7b  tq4_7b  Teach several groups-periodically assigned
tq2_7c  tq3_7c  tq4_7c  Teach one class during year

tq1_6  tq2_8  tq3_8  tq4_8  How many students-reading?
tq1_7  tq2_9  tq3_9  tq4_9  How students assigned-reading?
tq1_8  tq2_10  tq3_10  tq4_10  How often group changes-reading?
tq1_9  tq2_11  tq3_11  tq4_11  Grade level-reading

tq2_12  tq3_12  tq4_12  Class comprehension performance-reading

tq1_10a  tq2_13a  tq3_13a  tq4_13a  Students can learn what I teach-reading

tq1_10b  tq2_13b  tq3_13b  tq4_13b  Different methods affect students' achv-reading

tq1_10c  tq2_13c  tq3_13c  tq4_13c  Feel satisfaction when students learn-reading

tq1_11  tq2_14  tq3_14  tq4_14  Minutes teaching reading

tq1_12a  tq2_15a  tq3_15a  tq4_15a  Whole class grouping-reading

tq1_12b  tq2_15b  tq3_15b  tq4_15b  Ability grouping-reading

tq1_12c  tq2_15c  tq3_15c  tq4_15c  Mixed ability grouping-reading

tq1_12d  tq2_15d  tq3_15d  tq4_15d  Individualized instruction-reading

tq1_13a  Contain useful information about content

tq1_13b  Provide useful information about how to teach

tq1_13c  Provide useful information about what students typically know

tq1_14a  Frequently refer to and use information found in curr. frameworks

tq1_14b  Frequently refer to and use information from teachers' guides

tq1_14c  Frequently refer to the content of assessment

tq1_15a  tq2_16a  tq3_16a  tq4_16a  Focus - Word Analysis

tq1_15b  tq2_16b  tq3_16b  tq4_16b  Focus - Reading fluency

tq1_15c  tq2_16c  tq3_16c  tq4_16c  Focus - Listening Comprehension

tq1_15d  tq2_16d  tq3_16d  tq4_16d  Focus - Reading Comprehension

tq1_15e  tq2_16e  tq3_16e  tq4_16e  Focus - Grammar

tq1_15f  tq2_16f  tq3_16f  tq4_16f  Focus - Spelling

tq1_15g  tq2_16g  tq3_16g  tq4_16g  Focus - Written composition

tq1_16a  Focus - Word Analysis

tq1_16b  Focus - Reading fluency

tq1_16c  Focus - Listening Comprehension

tq1_16d  Focus - Reading Comprehension

tq1_16e  Focus - Grammar

tq1_16f  Focus - Spelling

tq1_16g  Focus - Written composition

tq1_17a  tq2_17a  tq3_17a  tq4_17a  Focus - Using phonics-based or letter-sounds

tq1_17b  tq2_17b  tq3_17b  tq4_17b  Focus - Using context, pictures, and--or sentence meaning

tq1_17d  tq2_17d  tq3_17d  tq4_17d  Focus - Sound blending

tq1_17c  tq2_17c  tq3_17c  tq4_17c  Focus - Sound segmenting

tq1_17e  tq2_17e  tq3_17e  tq4_17e  Focus - Common sight word recognition

tq1_18a  tq2_18a  tq3_18a  tq4_18a  Focus - Activating prior knowledge-personal connections

tq1_18b  Focus - Making predictions, previews or surveying text

tq1_18c  tq2_18b  tq3_18b  tq4_18b  Focus - Students generating their own questions

tq1_18d  tq2_18c  tq3_18c  tq4_18c  Focus - Summarizing important or critical details

tq1_18e  tq2_18e  tq3_18e  tq4_18e  Focus - Examining literary techniques

tq1_18f  tq2_18f  tq3_18f  tq4_18f  Focus - Identifying the author's purpose

tq1_18g  tq2_18g  tq3_18g  tq4_18g  Focus - Using concept maps, story maps

tq1_18h  tq2_18h  tq3_18h  tq4_18h  Focus - Answering questions-detail from text

tq1_18i  tq2_18i  tq3_18i  tq4_18i  Focus - Answering questions-require inferences

tq1_19a  tq2_19a  tq3_19a  tq4_19a  Wrote brief answers to questions
Wrote extensive answers to questions

Do think-aloud or explained strategy

Students editing their own writing ... capitalization, etc

Students revise their own writing by elaborating

Students revise their own writing by reorganizing

Using only letter strings or words

Individual sentence

Individual paragraph--separate paragraphs

Two or more connected paragraphs

Informational text

Chapter book

Informational text

Narrative text--patterned or predictable

Narrative text with controlled vocabulary

Short narrative without attempt to control voc

Chapter book

Assigned to teach math

Assigned to teach math (recode)

Valid math section responses

Teach more than one class - math

Teach several groups-periodically assigned

Teach one class - math

How many students in math class?

How Math students assigned to you?

How often group of math students change?

Grade level of students - math class

Mathematics performance of students

Most students can learn what I teach

Different methods affect students' achv

Feel satisfaction when students learn what I teach

Minutes of math instruction

Whole class grouping

Ability or achievement grouping

Mixed ability grouping

Individualized instruction

Contain useful information about underlying mathematical ideas

Provide useful information about how to teach particular ideas

Provide useful information about what students typically know

Frequently refer to and use information found in curr. frameworks

Frequently refer to and use information from teachers' guides

Focus - Only whole numbers 0-20

Focus - Whole numbers 0-100

Focus - Whole numbers > 100

Focus - Negative numbers

Focus - Fractions
tq2_37f  tq3_36f  tq4_37f  Focus - Decimals

Focus - Counting

Focus - Number concepts with whole numbers

Focus - Number concepts with fractions--decimals

Focus - Addition

Focus - Subtraction

Focus - Multiplication

Focus - Division

Focus - Explaining patterns--sequences

Focus - Functions of algebra

Focus - Geometry or spatial sense

Focus - Measurement

Focus - Using tables, tallies, graphs

Focus - Writing, reading or recognizing whole numbers

Focus - Comparing or ordering two or more quantities

Focus - Properties of whole numbers

Focus - Factors, multiples, or divisibility with whole numbers

Focus - Composing or decomposing whole numbers or decimals

Focus - The meaning of fractions

Focus - Relationships between decimals and fractions

Focus - Estimating the size of quantities or rounding off numbers

Focus - Meaning or properties of an operation

Focus - Methods or strategies-basic facts

Focus - Practicing basic facts-speed

Focus - Why conventional computational works

Focus - Steps of a conventional computation

Focus - Practicing computational procedures

Focus - Developing alternative methods

Focus - Applying basic facts - word problems

Focus - Estimating the answer

Focus - Organizing objects by size, number, or other properties

Focus - Creating, continuing, or explaining repeating patterns

Focus - Finding and explaining other patterns

Focus - Understanding and using formulas and equations

Focus - Expressing a function or sequence as a general rule

Listen to teacher define term--do steps

Perform tasks requiring methods introduced

Assess a problem--choose a method

Perform tasks requiring methods not yet introduced

Explain an answer

Analyze similarities--differences

Prove that a solution is valid or a method works for all similar cases

Work on mathematics textbook, worksheet, or board work for practice

Work problems multiple answers--solutions

Discuss mathematics ideas

Discuss mathematics ideas in pairs or small groups

Write extended explanations

Work on math problem--project for days
**Instructional Improvement**

```
tq1_46a  tq2_47a  tq3_44a  tq4_47a  Accelerated Schools Project
q1_46b  tq2_47b  tq3_44b  tq4_47b  America's Choice
q1_46c  tq2_47c  tq3_44c  tq4_47c  Roots and Wings
q1_46d  tq2_47d  tq3_44d  tq4_47d  Success for All
q1_46e  tq2_47e  tq3_44e  tq4_47e  Other program
q1_47a  tq2_48a  tq3_45a  tq4_48a  Detailed plan for improving instruction
q1_47b  tq2_48b  tq3_45b  tq4_48b  Steps for improvement staged and sequenced
q1_47c  tq2_48c  tq3_45c  tq4_48c  Steps for improvement clearly outlined
q1_47d  tq2_48d  tq3_45d  tq4_48d  Instructional goals clearly defined
q1_47e  tq2_48e  tq3_45e  tq4_48e  Participation exposed examples of kinds of student work
q1_47f  tq2_48f  tq3_45f  tq4_48f  Participation exposed examples of kinds of teaching
q1_47g  tq2_48g  tq3_45g  tq4_48g  Provide ideas--resources for changing practices
q1_48a  tq2_49a  tq3_46a  tq4_49a  Capable of making required changes
q1_48b  tq2_49b  tq3_46b  tq4_49b  Changes help students reach higher achievement
q1_48c  tq2_49c  tq3_46c  tq4_49c  Program requires major changes in classroom practice
q1_48d  tq2_49d  tq3_46d  tq4_49d  I value changes
q1_49  tq2_50  tq3_47  tq4_50  Professional development hours
q1_50a  tq2_51a  tq3_48a  tq4_51a  Sessions - Student assessment
q1_50b  tq2_51b  tq3_48b  tq4_51b  Sessions - Curriculum materials or frameworks
q1_50c  tq2_51c  tq3_48c  tq4_51c  Sessions - Content or performance standards
q1_50d  tq2_51d  tq3_48d  tq4_51d  Sessions - Teaching methods
q1_50e  tq2_51e  tq3_48e  Sessions - Use of technology
q1_50f  tq2_51f  tq3_48f  tq4_51f  Sessions - Multicultural issues
q1_50g  tq2_51g  tq3_48g  tq4_51g  Sessions - Classroom management--discipline
q1_50h  tq2_51h  tq3_48h  tq4_51h  Sessions - School governance
q1_50i  tq2_51i  tq3_48i  tq4_51i  Sessions - School improvement planning--goal setting
q1_50j  tq2_51j  tq3_48j  tq4_51j  Sessions - Social services for students
q1_50k  tq2_51k  tq3_48k  tq4_51k  Sessions - Safety or school climate issues
q1_50l  tq2_51l  tq3_48l  tq4_51l  Sessions - Parent involvement--community relations
q1_51a  tq2_52a  tq3_49a  tq4_52a  PD Focus - Analyzing math materials
q1_51b  tq2_52b  tq3_49b  tq4_52b  PD Focus - Designing mathematics
q1_51c  tq2_52c  tq3_49c  tq4_52c  PD Focus - Knowledge number concepts
q1_51d  tq2_52d  tq3_49d  tq4_52d  PD Focus - Knowledge of comp procedures
q1_51e  tq2_52e  tq3_49e  PD Focus - Knowledge of patterns, functions, & algebra
q1_51f  tq2_52f  tq3_49f  tq4_52f  PD Focus - Knowledge of representations for # cont
q1_51g  tq2_52g  tq3_49g  tq4_52g  PD Focus - Knowledge of representations for ops
q1_51h  tq2_52h  tq3_49h  PD Focus - Knowledge of representations for patterns, functions, & algebra
q1_52a  tq2_53a  tq3_50a  tq4_53a  PD Focus - Analyzing reading curriculum materials
q1_52b  tq2_53b  tq3_50b  tq4_53b  PD Focus - Miscue analysis
q1_52c  tq2_53c  tq3_50c  tq4_53c  PD Focus - Designing reading--LA tasks
q1_52d  tq2_53d  tq3_50d  tq4_53d  PD Focus - Knowledge of phonetics
q1_52e  tq2_53e  tq3_50e  tq4_53e  PD Focus - Knowledge context clues
q1_52f  tq2_53f  tq3_50f  tq4_53f  PD Focus - Knowledge of writing process
q1_52g  tq2_53g  tq3_50g  tq4_53g  PD Focus - Knowledge blend and segment sounds
q1_52h  tq2_53h  tq3_50h  tq4_53h  PD Focus - Knowledge reading comp strategies
q1_53a  tq2_54a  tq3_51a  tq4_54a  Staff - Clarifying standards through discussion
q1_53b  tq2_54b  tq3_51b  tq4_54b  Staff - Developing thematic units
q1_53c  tq2_54c  tq3_51c  tq4_54c  Staff - Examining scope or sequence
q1_53d  tq2_54d  tq3_51d  tq4_54d  Staff - Examining alignment
```
Staff - Use of particular grouping strategies
Freq - observed another teacher
Freq - Another teacher observed me
Freq - observed another teacher - feedback
Freq - watched instructional leader
Freq - instructional leader observed me
Freq - instructional leader feedback on materials
Freq - instructional leader studied my students' work
Opportunities to develop
Provided useful information
Experiences coherently related
Focus on a problem - extended period
Focused on too many topics
Provided useful feedback about my teaching
Pay closer attention teaching
Seek out additional information
Think about teaching in a new way
Try new things

Your Background
Gender
Race - ethnicity
Employment status
MAIN teaching assignment?
Subject specialty
Years Experience
Years at school
Undergraduate major field of study?
Major field - graduate degree?
Permanent or standard certification
Probationary certification
Temporary certification
Alternative certification
Not certified
Courses - English - LA
Methods Reading - LA
Courses - mathematics
Methods of teaching mathematics
Prof dvlp (hours) Reading - language arts
Prof dvlp (hours) Mathematics
Prof dvlp (days) Reading - language arts
Prof dvlp (days) Mathematics
## Appendix C

### School Leader Questionnaire Cross-Reference List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sl1_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl2_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary role in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl2_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years working in school in role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Role in school include teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sl2_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage time teaching (codes 1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage time teaching (codes 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Schools Coach - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5a1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Schools Coach - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5a2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Schools Coach - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Design Coach - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5b1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Design Coach - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5b2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Design Coach - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Literacy Coordinator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5c1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Literacy Coordinator - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5c2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Literacy Coordinator - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Community Outreach Coordinator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5d1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Community Outreach Coordinator - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5d2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Community Outreach Coordinator - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Reading Facilitator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5e1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Reading Facilitator - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5e2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Reading Facilitator - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Mathematics Facilitator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5f1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Mathematics Facilitator - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5f2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Mathematics Facilitator - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Family Support Coordinator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5g1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Family Support Coordinator - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5g2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Family Support Coordinator - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other school reform program role - Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5h1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other school reform program role - Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_5h2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other school reform program role - Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Schools Coach/Facilitator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4b</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Design Coach- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4c</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4c</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Literacy Coordinator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Math Lead Teacher- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Community Outreach Coordinator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>America's Choice Parent/Community Outreach Coordinator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4e</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4f</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Reading Facilitator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4f</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4g</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Mathematics Facilitator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4g</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4h</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success for All Family Support Coordinator- %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl2_4h</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl3_4i</td>
<td></td>
<td>sl4_4i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other school reform program role - %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl1_6a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Program Coordinator - Y/N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Program Coordinator - Years
Special Program Coordinator - Months
Reading/Literacy Program Coordinator - Y/N
Reading/Literacy Program Coordinator - Years
Reading/Literacy Program Coordinator - Months
Math Program Coordinator - Y/N
Math Program Coordinator - Years
Math Program Coordinator - Months
Other Subject Area Program Coordinator - Y/N
Other Subject Area Program Coordinator - Years
Other Subject Area Program Coordinator - Months
School Improvement Coordinator - Y/N
School Improvement Coordinator - Years
School Improvement Coordinator - Months
Master/Mentor Teacher - Y/N
Master/Mentor Teacher - Years
Master/Mentor Teacher - Months
Teacher Consultant - Y/N
Teacher Consultant - Years
Teacher Consultant - Months
Other responsibilities - Y/N
Other responsibilities - Years
Other responsibilities - Months

Supervise clerical, cafeteria
Monitor public spaces
Deal with emergencies
Work with students and parents on discipline
Complete routine paperwork
Attend district/board meetings
Seek resources outside the school
Work with local community member/organization
Demonstrate instructional practices
Observe teacher who was trying new instr. practices
Share info about classroom practices with teacher
Examine what students were working on during a teacher's lesson
Examine the standardized norm-referenced test result
Framing and communicating broad goals for school imprv.
Examining school’s progress towards goals
Setting timelines for instructional imprv.
Clarify standards for academic performance
Examining exemplars of academic work
Plan instructional changes using school's standardization
Promote alignment in school instr. program and what's taught in class
Promote instr. coordination across grade levels
Promote instr. coordination across regular and special ed.
Promote integration of school's curriculum
Developing staff development program
Personally providing staff development
Support school improvement efforts
Monitory the implementation of school imprv. efforts
Work on plans to improve the teaching of specific curricular units
Interact in formally scheduled meetings
Interact in informal meetings
Leadership team express professional views
Leadership team willing to question one another's views
Leadership team talk through views, opinions
Members of leadership team work closely to lead
Team tries to come to consensus
Few in team dominate decision making process
I am not usually involved in the decision making

The School Improvement Process

Has written school improvement plan
Years of improvement plan
School's improvement
Important priority- Improving facilities
Important priority- Improving school climate
Important priority- Improving parent participation
Important priority- Improving student attendance
Important priority- Improving health and welfare
Important priority- Improving reading/language arts program
Important priority- Improving math program
Important priority- Improving library, technology, or media
Important priority- Improving another academic program
Requiring imprv. by state education agency
Requiring imprv. by federal Title 1 program
Requiring imprv. by school district
Requiring imprv. by other agency
Participate in CSR
Aspects of reform model implemented successfully
Areas of implementation of the reform model schools needs imprv.
Change teaching to implement the model better
Using assessments for data-based decision making
Ways prof. development could better support program
School district has formal procedures for imprv.
School district encourage adopting CSR model
Increase in funds for school imprv.
Dissatisfaction with student achievement amongst staff
Staff press each other for imprv.
Staff see evidence of successful imprv. in other schools
Staff feel school has poor reputation
Parents/community groups demand imprv.

School receive monetary rewards for imprv. in achievement scores

Personnel in school evaluated/rewarded on student achievement

Leadership role in instr. imprv. a good way to move ahead

Monitor curriculum to see that it reflects school imprv. efforts

Monitor instr. practice to see that it reflects school imprv. efforts

Observe class to examine what students learn

Personnel in school evaluated/rewarded on student achievement

Leadership role in instr. imprv. a good way to move ahead

Monitor curriculum to see that it reflects school imprv. efforts

Monitor instr. practice to see that it reflects school imprv. efforts

Observe class to examine what students learn

Evaluate other teachers with criteria related to imprv. efforts

Praise teachers whose instructional practices support imprv. efforts

Praise/provide rewards to students who succeed academically

Has shared value that guide school imprv. efforts

Alternatives are researched

Detail plans for administrators, teachers, and students

Worry that too many different programs are being adopted

Review programs brought into school for compatibility

Improvement efforts are staged and sequenced

Teachers are given flexibility to pursue imprv. with unique skills

Imprv. based upon school's plan and goals

Steps for organizing and staffing instructional program are clear

Staff feels imprv. will only be achieved through collaboration

Pass up imprv. opportunities that do not fit imprv. goals

Steps teachers expected to take to improve are clear

Uses well-developed process to identify issues for imprv.

Define specific goals for students

Rules that govern which imprv. initiatives are allowed

Group investigation is central to achieving imprv. goals

Steps for improving home-school relations and parent participation

Hire new administrative staff with instructional expertise

Hire new teachers with expertise and interests

Change instructional assignments to match teacher's expertise

Provide teachers with prof. development opportunities

Provide administrators with prof. development

Results from your district's assessment program

Results from your state's assessment program

Reports by on school imprv. progress by state/fed agencies

Student grades and report cards

Results from standardized, curriculum-referenced testing

Informal assessments conducted by teachers

Learning or curriculum standards

Samples of students' academic work

Your own and others' observations in class

Statistical reports of discipline problems and behavioral referrals

Attendance reports

Info about effective instr. practices gained from reading, workshops

Info about curriculum programs gained from reading, workshops

Info about student learning processes gained from reading, workshops

Practices found to be successful in other schools in district

Visits to schools outside your district

Input from community members or groups
District, State, and Community Environments

- District’s curriculum frameworks are specific and clear
- District’s assessment program provides info on what students should know
- District’s instructional policies give clear info on what to teach
- District’s standards for student learning drive improvement agenda
- District is an important source of funding for school improvement agenda
- District provides flexibility in resources allocation
- District’s staff provide important info that support improvement efforts
- Great deal of turnover in district central office
- Consensus among district leaders about priorities for improvement.
- District central office policies change frequently
- District’s improvement agenda makes difficult to tailor plans for specific needs
- District’s personnel policies make it difficult to hire staff with expertise
- Parents well informed about school improvement activities
- Teachers use well-developed routines to communicate with parents
- Teachers provide detailed info to parents about students at home
- Parents understand academic standards
- Community members work as tutors
- Workshops that help parents work with children are held regularly
- Home visits by teachers are an important element of improvement.
- Most parents and community members agree with changes
- Staff take advantage of resources and support from community
- State curriculum guides are specific
- State's assessment program proves specific info
- Special funds from the state are an important source of support
- Personnel from state ed. agency provide info that support improvement.
- State policies, procedures, personnel make improvement difficult
- State agencies' improvement agenda makes it difficult to tailor to specific needs
- State's assessment program provides specific info on what students should know
- State curriculum guides are specific
- Staff take advantage of resources and support from community
- Most parents and community members agree with changes
- Community members work as tutors
- Parents understand academic standards
- Teachers use well-informed about school improvement activities
- District's improvement agenda is consistent with state education policies
- State agency's improvement agenda makes it difficult to tailor to specific needs
- State's assessment program proves specific info
- State’s curriculum guides are specific

The Reading and Language Arts Program

- LA program needs major improvement.
- LA instructions this year are better
- Work attack skills of most students at or above grade level
- Reading comprehension skills of most students at or above grade level
- Ability of students to write for a variety of purposes at or above grade level
- Existing curriculum materials were organized into a sequenced structure
- New reading curriculum was developed
- New standards for student learning in reading were developed
- Teachers learned to use new reading curricular materials
- New curriculum-referenced examinations were introduced
- Teacher-made assessments were improved to reflect the learning standards
- Textbook assignments were changed to reflect the learning standards
- Curriculum-referenced LA assessments used to place students in groups
- Curriculum-referenced LA assessments used to develop individualized prescriptions
- End-of-year LA standardized tests as basis for promotion to next grade
- Reading material levels to assure material match closely with reading level
- Arrange class space to support activities - LA
- Arrange class materials to ensure independent use by students - LA
Teachers have common expectations about what students should learn. Teachers of low-achieving reading students work with classroom teachers to coordinate strategies. Teachers of low-achieving reading students work with classroom teachers on texts. Teachers meet with aides and specialists to discuss reading needs of specific students. Teachers often pick and choose their own curricular content. Teachers have different expectations about what students can learn. Teachers encourage the development of teaching style. LA curriculum organized around grade-level expectations. Math textbooks and assessments improved to reflect learning standards. Students work independently in small groups for students that have not yet mastered a LA topic. Mastery at one level of writing before receiving instruction at the next level. Mastery at one level of reading before receiving instruction at the next level. Students' understanding of patterns, functions, algebra at or above grade level. Mastery at one level of writing before receiving instruction at the next level. Students' understanding of patterns, functions, algebra at or above grade level. Students' understanding of number concepts at or above grade level. Students' understanding of math operations at or above grade level. Math program needs major improvement. Math instruction better than last year. New math curriculum developed. New standards for math developed. New math curriculum materials. Math materials organized into sequenced structure of curricular units. New curriculum-referenced math tests introduced. Teacher-made math assessments improved. Math textbooks and assessments improved to reflect learning standards. Curriculum-referenced math tests to place students in achievement-based groups. Curriculum-referenced math tests used to develop individualized instruction prescriptions. End-of-year math standardized tests as basis for promotion to next grade. Arrange class space to support activities. Math instruction better than last year. Establish class routines that reduce prob. of class management. LA achievement. Math students work with classroom teachers on texts. Achievement-based LA groups for students that have not yet mastered a LA topic. Students not mastered a LA topic have a chance to master in subsequent years. New math curricular materials. New math curriculum developed.
Teachers have common expectations about what students should learn. Mastery at one level of math before receiving instr. at next level. Students work on individualized programs in math. Math curriculum organized around grade-level expectations. Students fail to meet expectations in math are not promoted. Achievement-based math groups for students that have not yet mastered. Students not mastered a math topic have chance to master in subsequent yr.

Your Background

Gender
Race -- ethnicity
Employment status
Years as administrator
Years as teacher
Undergraduate major field of study
Major field -- graduate degree
College/university classes have you take in the following areas?

Methods of teaching mathematics

Professional Development

PD organized by school district
PD organized by state education agency
PD organized by intermediate education agency
PD organized by professional association
PD organized by university-college
PD organized by school reform program
PD organized your school

PD Focus
Developing a school mission or shared vision
Planning strategies
Working productively w/groups or teams
Promoting shared decision making
Improving parent involvement
Improving school-community relations
Fund raising/grant writing
Organizing the school's instructional program
Your school's reading/LA curriculum and materials
Your school's math curriculum and materials
Specific methods for improving reading/LA instructions
Specific methods for improving math instructions
How to adapt or individualize instruction
Your knowledge of reading/LA
Your knowledge of math
How to observe and monitor classroom instruction
How to promote standards-based learning
New procedures to assess student learning
Working w/students to improve instruction
PD Exp. gave opportunities to improve work
PD Exp. provided info useful in work
PD Exp. were coherently related to each other
PD Exp. Allow for focus on problem over extended time
PD Exp. focused on too many topics
PD Exp. provided useful feedback about work
PD Exp. made me pay closer attention to particulars at work
PD Exp. led to seek out additional info from another leader, teacher
PD Exp. led to think about aspect of work in a new way
PD Exp. led to try new things in my practice or work
## Appendix D

### School Characteristics Inventory Cross-Reference List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Year 1 *</th>
<th>Name Year 2 *</th>
<th>Name Year 3 *</th>
<th>Name Year 4 *</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sc1_1</td>
<td>sc2_1</td>
<td>sc3_1</td>
<td>sc4_1</td>
<td>School operates year-around schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of calendar in use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_3</td>
<td>sc2_2</td>
<td>sc3_2</td>
<td>sc4_2</td>
<td>Number of instructional days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_4</td>
<td>sc2_3</td>
<td>sc3_3</td>
<td>sc4_3</td>
<td>First date of student attendance for this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_5</td>
<td>sc2_4</td>
<td>sc3_4</td>
<td>sc4_4</td>
<td>Last date of student attendance for this year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_6a</td>
<td>sc2_5a</td>
<td>sc3_5a</td>
<td>sc4_5a</td>
<td>Time (hours &amp; minutes per day) school in session for Pre-K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_6b</td>
<td>sc2_5b</td>
<td>sc3_5b</td>
<td>sc4_5b</td>
<td>Time (hours &amp; minutes per day) school in session for K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_6c</td>
<td>sc2_5c</td>
<td>sc3_5c</td>
<td>sc4_5c</td>
<td>Time (hours &amp; minutes per day) school in session for 1-5 Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_7</td>
<td>sc2_6</td>
<td>sc3_6</td>
<td>sc4_6</td>
<td>Type of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_8</td>
<td>sc2_7</td>
<td>sc3_7</td>
<td>sc4_7</td>
<td>School enrollment policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special requirements for admission?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: test scores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: previous academic record?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: special needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: special aptitudes, skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: recommendations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_10f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Admission consideration: personal interview?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District’s per pupil expenditure for this school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount spent on professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount spent on curriculum materials and instr. supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14a</td>
<td>sc2_8a</td>
<td>sc3_8a</td>
<td>sc4_8a</td>
<td>CSR: Accelerated Schools Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14b</td>
<td>sc2_8b</td>
<td>sc3_8b</td>
<td>sc4_8b</td>
<td>CSR: America's Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14c</td>
<td>sc2_8c</td>
<td>sc3_8c</td>
<td>sc4_8c</td>
<td>CSR: ATLAS Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14d</td>
<td>sc2_8d</td>
<td>sc3_8d</td>
<td>sc4_8d</td>
<td>CSR: Audrey Cohen College: Purpose Centered Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14e</td>
<td>sc2_8e</td>
<td>sc3_8e</td>
<td>sc4_8e</td>
<td>CSR: Center for Effective Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14f</td>
<td>sc2_8f</td>
<td>sc3_8f</td>
<td>sc4_8f</td>
<td>CSR: Child Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14g</td>
<td>sc2_8g</td>
<td>sc3_8g</td>
<td>sc4_8g</td>
<td>CSR: Coalition of Essential Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14h</td>
<td>sc2_8h</td>
<td>sc3_8h</td>
<td>sc4_8h</td>
<td>CSR: Community for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14i</td>
<td>sc2_8i</td>
<td>sc3_8i</td>
<td>sc4_8i</td>
<td>CSR: Computer Curriculum Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14j</td>
<td>sc2_8j</td>
<td>sc3_8j</td>
<td>sc4_8j</td>
<td>CSR: Community for Learning Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14k</td>
<td>sc2_8k</td>
<td>sc3_8k</td>
<td>sc4_8k</td>
<td>CSR: Co-NCT Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14l</td>
<td>sc2_8l</td>
<td>sc3_8l</td>
<td>sc4_8l</td>
<td>CSR: Core Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14m</td>
<td>sc2_8m</td>
<td>sc3_8m</td>
<td>sc4_8m</td>
<td>CSR: Different Ways of Knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14n</td>
<td>sc2_8n</td>
<td>sc3_8n</td>
<td>sc4_8n</td>
<td>CSR: Edison Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14o</td>
<td>sc2_8o</td>
<td>sc3_8o</td>
<td>sc4_8o</td>
<td>CSR: Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSR: Foxtfire Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14q</td>
<td>sc2_8p</td>
<td>sc3_8p</td>
<td>sc4_8p</td>
<td>CSR: High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14r</td>
<td>sc2_8q</td>
<td>sc3_8q</td>
<td>sc4_8q</td>
<td>CSR: Integrated Thematic Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sc2_8r</td>
<td>sc3_8r</td>
<td>sc4_8r</td>
<td>CSR: Lightspan Achieve Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14s</td>
<td>sc2_8s</td>
<td>sc3_8s</td>
<td>sc4_8s</td>
<td>CSR: League of Professional Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14t</td>
<td>sc2_8t</td>
<td>sc3_8t</td>
<td>sc4_8t</td>
<td>CSR: MicroSociety (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sc1_14u</td>
<td>sc2_8u</td>
<td>sc3_8u</td>
<td>sc4_8u</td>
<td>CSR: Modern Red Schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSR: Montessori
CSR: Onward to Excellence
CSR: Paideia
CSR: QuEST
CSR: Roots & Wings
CSR: School Development Program
CSR: Success for All
CSR: The Learning Network
CSR: Urban Learning Centers
CSR: Ventures Initiative and Focus (R) System
LA: Accelerated Reading
LA: Breakthrough to Literacy
LA: Carbo Reading Styles Program
LA: CELL/ExLL
LA: Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition
LA: CORE
LA: Early Intervention in Reading
LA: Early Literacy Learning Initiative (ELL)
LA: Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction
LA: First Steps
LA: Junior Great Books
LA: Literacy Collaborative
LA: National Writing Project
LA: Reading Recovery
LA: Reading Renaissance
LA: Strategic Teaching and Reading Project
Math: Comprehensive School Mathematics Program
Math: Math Wings
Math: University of Chicago School Math Project
Math: University of Chicago School Math Project
Associated with Accelerated Schools Project
Associated with America's Choice
Associated with Success for All
Affiliated with Accelerated reform program
Staff from affiliated program visited the school this year
Staff received prof. dev. associated with affiliated program
Teachers, leaders used materials from affiliated program
Staff attended conferences/training assoc. with affiliated program
School received funding for participating in affiliated program
Staff used routines/procedures associated with affiliated program

Title I Targeted Assistance?
Title I School-Wide Program?
Other Compensatory Education Program?
Special Education?
Bilingual Education?
English as a Second Language?
Gifted and Talented Program?
Medical Health Care Services?
Mental Health Care Services?
Before- or After-School Day Care Programs?
Parenting Education Programs? 
School Breakfast/Lunch Program?

LA - tutoring during school day 
LA - instructional aides work in classrooms 
LA - instructional specialists work in classrooms 
LA - instructional aides provide pullout instruction 
LA - additional support outside the regular school day 

Math - tutoring during school day 
Math - instructional aides work in classrooms 
Math - instructional specialists work in classrooms 
Math - instructional aides provide pullout instruction 
Math - additional support outside the regular school day 

Funding: Special school improvement funds set aside by district 
Funding: Special school improvement funds set aside by state 
Funding: State Compensatory Education funds 
Funding: Private sources (foundations, community, parents) 
Funding: 21st Century Community Learning Center 
Funding: Class Size Reduction 
Funding: Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program 
Funding: Eisenhower Professional Development Grants 
Funding: Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Program 
Funding: Freely Associated State Education Grant Program 
Funding: Fund for the Improvement of Education 
Funding: Innovative Education Program Strategies 
Funding: Magnet School Assistance 
Funding: Native Hawaiian Curr. Devel. Teacher Training & Recruitment Prgm 
Funding: Partnerships in Character Education 
Funding: Smaller Learning Communities Program 
Funding: State and Local Education Systematic Improvement 
Funding: Technology Literacy Challenge Fund 
Funding: Title I, part C (migrant) funds 
Funding: Title 7 bilingual education funds 
Funding: Title 9 funds for Indian Education services 
Funding: Training and Advisory Services 
Funding: Goals 2000 

Students enrolled this year at this school 
Students transferred into school during the year 
Students transferred out of school during the year 
Percent students eligible for free/reduced price lunches 
Percent students identified as limited-English proficient 
Percent students in this school have IEPs? 
Percent students: Hispanic 
Percent students: American Indian/Alaskan Native 
Percent students: Asian or Pacific Islander 
Percent students: Black 
Percent students: White 
[RECODE] SUM OF RACE/ETHNICITY PERCENTAGES 
FTE - Principals 
FTE - Assistant Principals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program area coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher consultant/mentor teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (1st mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (2nd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (3rd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (4th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (5th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prof. personnel (6th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance Officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audologists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (1st mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (2nd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (3rd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (4th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (5th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-instructional professional staff (6th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular classroom teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist teachers in mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist teachers in R/LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional professional staff (1st mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional professional staff (2nd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional professional staff (6th mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-assisted instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional prof. staff (1st mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional prof. staff (2nd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instructional prof. staff (2nd mention)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FTE - Instructional technology
FTE - Other library/media professional staff
FTE - Other library/media prof. staff (1st mention)
Title - Other library/media prof. staff (1st mention)
FTE - Other library/media prof. staff (2nd mention)
FTE - Other library/media prof. staff (3rd mention)
Title - Other library/media prof. staff (3rd mention)
FTE - Clerical/secretarial support (non-certified staff)
FTE - Instructional Aids (non-certified staff)
FTE - Media services (non-certified staff)
FTE - Day care staff
FTE - Cafeteria staff
FTE - Custodians
FTE - Playground/lunchroom supervisors
FTE - Other paid staff
FTE - Other paid staff (1st mention)
Title - Other paid staff (1st mention)
FTE - Other paid staff (2nd mention)
Title - Other paid staff (2nd mention)
FTE - Other paid staff (3rd mention)
Title - Other paid staff (3rd mention)