



1994

## A Descriptive Study of the Perceived Presence of the Effective School Correlates in the Mandated Restructuring of Selected Urban Elementary Schools

Sharon V. Kramer  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kramer, Sharon V., "A Descriptive Study of the Perceived Presence of the Effective School Correlates in the Mandated Restructuring of Selected Urban Elementary Schools" (1994). *Dissertations*. 3302.

[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/3302](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3302)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact [ecommons@luc.edu](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1994 Sharon V. Kramer

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE PERCEIVED PRESENCE  
OF THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL CORRELATES IN THE  
MANDATED RESTRUCTURING OF SELECTED URBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

SHARON V. KRAMER

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

January, 1994

Copyright by Sharon V. Kramer, 1994  
All Rights Reserved.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank each of the members of her dissertation committee: Dr. Safer, Chairman, for his valuable assistance and support in providing direction throughout her course of study and later completion of the research, Dr. Bailey for his logical and timely advice, and Dr. Rancic for his faith in her capabilities. Further appreciation is extended to Ruby Payne for her unwavering conviction to the completion of this process. Appreciation is also extended to her many colleagues who cooperated and supported her in the completion of the study. Special thanks to Ann Chamernik for her willingness to see this project to fruition.

The author also acknowledges the sacrifices made by her family and the encouragement from them on a daily basis. This study is complete with a keen sense of accomplishment of a long cherished goal.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
LIST OF FIGURES. . . . .	ix
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	7
Methodology of the Study . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms. . . . .	12
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	14
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . . . . .	16
Effective Schools Movement . . . . .	16
Restructuring Movement . . . . .	33
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	47
Design of the Study. . . . .	47
Research Question. . . . .	47
Methods for Collection of Data . . . . .	48
Procedures for Analysis of Data. . . . .	62
Summary. . . . .	63
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	65
<u>School Learning Climate Assessment</u> Data. . . . .	66
Interview Data . . . . .	100
Analysis and Implications. . . . .	108
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	118
Summary of the Study . . . . .	118
Conclusions. . . . .	120
Recommendations for Further Study. . . . .	122
 Appendix	
A. Pilot Study Participations. . . . .	125
B. Letters of Permission . . . . .	127

C. <u>School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument</u> .	130
D. Interview Guide . . . . .	142
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	143
VITA . . . . .	149

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. School Demographic Information . . . . .	50
2. Survey Items Corresponding to Administrative (or Principal) Instructional Leadership .	52
3. Survey Items Corresponding to the Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment . . . . .	54
4. Survey Items Corresponding to the Expectations and Evaluations of Students . . . . .	55
5. Survey Items Corresponding to the Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Programs .	57
6. Survey Items Corresponding to a Safe and Orderly Environment . . . . .	58
7. Survey Items Corresponding to Grouping for Instruction . . . . .	59
8. Survey Items Corresponding to Time for Instruction . . . . .	59
9. Interview Questions with Each of the Corresponding Factors . . . . .	61
10. Mean Scores of Questionnaire by Schools. . .	67
11. Grouped Mean Scores of the Questionnaire . .	68
12. Individual School Profile School A1. . . . .	70
13. Individual School Profile School A2. . . . .	71
14. Individual School Profile School A3. . . . .	72
15. Individual School Profile School A4. . . . .	73
16. Individual School Profile School A5. . . . .	74
17. Individual School Profile School B1. . . . .	75

Table	Page
18. Individual School Profile School B2. . . . .	77
19. Individual School Profile School B3. . . . .	78
20. Individual School Profile School B4. . . . .	79
21. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to Administrative or Instructional Leadership. . . . .	82
22. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment. . . . .	83
23. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Expectations and Evaluations of Students . . . . .	84
24. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Use of Test Data to Evaluate the Instructional Program . . . . .	85
25. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to a Safe and Orderly Environment	86
26. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to Grouping for Instruction . . .	87
27. Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to Time for Instruction . . . . .	88
28. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 1 . . . . .	91
29. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 2 . . . . .	93
30. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 3 . . . . .	94
31. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 4 . . . . .	96



Table	Page
32. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 5 . . . . .	97
33. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 6 . . . . .	98
34. Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 7 . . . . .	99
35. Difference in Mean Scores of the Questionnaire Between Professional Staff and Principal(s)	100

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Characteristics of "Effective" Schools . . .	22

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The portrait of the urban school as it progresses through the last decade of the Twentieth Century is hardly an encouraging one. Anyone can easily ascertain the problems and concerns of our urban schools by reading the headlines in most daily newspapers. The lack of student achievement, drug problems, gang and safety concerns, the dropout rate and teenage pregnancies are subjects which highlight the description of urban education.

A two-day educational summit held in January 1991 with officials from the forty-seven largest school systems in the United States resulted in the adoption of the following six goals.

1. Achieve a level of educational attainment that would allow urban pupils to compete with their national and international peers.
2. Enroll children at the age of six with the background that enables them to be ready to learn.
3. Increase graduation rates to the national average.
4. Prepare high school graduates adequately so that they will be able to pursue a higher education program.

5. Staff schools with teachers that reflect the racial composition of the student body.

6. Insure that schools are free of drugs, well-maintained, safe, and contain well-nourished students.

Unfortunately, these educators did not state how these goals were to be achieved. Given the deterioration of urban finances, the increases in state and federal mandates, the racial segregation of urban centers, and the increase in political pressures on schools and school officials, these goals constitute lofty and noble aspirations.

Although ambitious, the goals do recognize the need for basic changes in the American school. One of the curious paradoxes of American public schools is that, on the one hand, schools are very much alike, yet on the other hand they are very different. Seymour Sarason has referred to the similarities across schools as "the regularities of schooling" (Tye, 1987). These similarities are the deep structure of the school and are present along with the distinctive school personality. Barbara Tye's research hypothesis (1987) focuses on how both the deep structure of the school and its school personality can be used to foster school improvement.

School Improvement or reform is not a new idea. The effective schools movement began in 1966 with the publication by James Coleman of *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. This movement has as its focus the development

of more effective schools that can teach all of the children regardless of where they come from or what background knowledge they possess. The effective schools movement has been followed by state and federal reform legislation which is regulatory in nature attacking one program or another and usually targeting a specific population. These reforms include, the Illinois Reform Legislation which introduced state testing annually in April along with mandatory district objectives and tests. The culmination of this yearly activity results in school improvement planning. The state scores are not reported by student, but by school. This makes individual diagnosis and subsequent improvement almost impossible. However, it does allow the media the opportunity to rank order the scores and make the obvious more apparent: urban schools are always at the bottom.

A more recent school improvement movement is restructuring. The restructuring movement is designed on the premise that the schools of the twenty-first century will be different from the schools we have known; different because we face new challenges in meeting the varied needs of all the students we are to teach. The restructuring emphasis is on building a new school not just giving it a different roof. It is calling for the redesign of the current system to meet the demands of a changing society. Restructuring is a current topic in education. There is much to read and understand, but one thing is clear: there

is no one way to restructure schools. The goal is a redesigned educational system where each community can develop its own most appropriate learning environment.

Where does this leave the urban schools? How will they restructure or redesign to ensure success amid all their problems? If in the last twenty years we have determined what is necessary to make an effective school where education exists for all children, how will restructuring change this effort?

To date the most formidable research on school improvement has come out of the effective schools movement. In recognition of this, a question is then raised as to what is the perceived presence of the effective school correlates in the restructuring efforts of urban elementary schools?

What elements of the effective schools research can be found in the restructuring plans? How will the current paradigms be altered, changed, or shifted away from the accepted model of schools?

One of the key components of the restructuring movement is site-based management. This is the process of allowing decisions to be made by a consensus of the people who staff each building as opposed to the top down-model of decision making. The basic premise of this new form of decision making is a belief that people who are closest to the problem are able to make better, more relevant decisions.

In addition, this process is believed to empower staff members to become more creative problem solvers; in essence, decentralization.

The State of Texas has mandated a decentralized or site-based management form of governance in all Texas schools through Senate Bill 1 (June, 1990) and House Bill 2885 (May, 1991). In part House Bill 2885 states:

- (a) Each school district shall develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making not later than September 1, 1992. Each district shall submit its plan to the commissioner of education for approval.
- (b) Each district's plan:
  - (1) shall establish school committees;
  - (2) may expand on the process established by the district for the establishment of campus performance objectives; and
  - (3) shall outline the role of the school committees regarding decision making related to goal setting, curriculum, budgeting, staffing patterns, and school organization.
- (c) A school committee established under this section shall include community representatives. The community representatives may include business representatives (p. VI-4).

It is further stated in Senate Bill 1 as a part of the

decision making process:

- (a) For each school year, the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of parents, community residents,

as provided for through the procedure established in 21.930 of this code.

shall establish academic and other performance objectives of the campus for each academic excellence indicator adopted under Section 21.7531 of this code.

The objectives shall also address the performance of special needs students.

The objectives must be approved by the district's board of trustees (p. IV-2).

The mandating of site-based management and shared decision making in Texas has forced individual school sites to view the school improvement process from a different prospective. The compliance with these mandates requires school sites and districts to study and question their philosophies, beliefs and normal school procedures as they work toward school improvement.

The Effective Schools Movement has a twenty year



formidable body of research. It outlines seven distinctive correlates or characteristics of effective schools that set them apart from their less effective counterparts. This paradigm has been refined over the years to include many additional related studies.

As the schools of Texas implement their restructuring efforts in the area of shared decision making are these effective school correlates perceived as a framework for this school improvement process?

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceived presence of the effective school correlates of Ronald Edmonds, Lawrence Lezotte and Wilbur Brookover in the mandated restructuring of selected urban elementary schools in the State of Texas.

At the time of this dissertation there were no known studies which connected the effective school correlates to the more current restructuring movement although there existed a body of information, data, and conclusions on effective schools and their related aspects. The information available on restructuring tended to be descriptive and prescriptive with little to none in the way of research data.

Because of Texas Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 2885 the Texas School system has established site-based management and shared decision making models. Shared decision making

is a process for redistributing decisions to improve education at each school site. Administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and community representatives consider the educational outcomes, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that their decisions are carried out to help students achieve. At the time of the study mandated site-based decision making had been in effect for one year and seven months in Texas.

The specific factors characteristic of effective schools under study were:

1. administrative or instructional leadership;
2. emphasis on achievement or commitment;
3. expectations and evaluation of students;
4. use of test data to evaluate instructional programs;
5. safe and orderly environment;
6. grouping for instruction;
7. time for instruction.

The presence of these seven correlates was analyzed from the perspective of the teachers and principals surveyed. Specific objectives of the study were:

1. to determine if the effective school correlates were present in the mandated restructuring efforts of the selected urban elementary schools;

2. to determine which if any of the effective school correlates or characteristics were emphasized in the

selected urban elementary schools;

3. to determine if there were any patterns in the perceived presence of the correlates common to the elementary schools in the targeted sample.

### **Methodology of the Study**

For the purpose of this study two urban school districts in Texas were selected. Five elementary school sites from each district were targeted. Each of the districts had total student enrollments in excess of 12,000 located in an urbanized area as defined by the 1990 Census of Population and Housing (August, 1991).

To obtain the necessary data, a two stage procedure was utilized. First, in order to determine the perceived presence of the effective school correlates the sixty item School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument developed by Wilbur B. Brookover of Michigan State University was sent to five schools in each of two districts and administered to a total of two hundred eighty-one professional staff members at the designated sites.

The School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument was developed to measure some aspects of the school environment that were known to be related to student learning. It was designed to assess the school learning climate. It has been validated to distinguish between high achieving schools and low achieving schools. The factors identified are based on the analysis of several sets of data from samples of

Michigan and Tennessee elementary schools.

The items on the survey are clustered into seven factors delineated through the factor-analytic method. The factors are identified as:

1. administrative (or principal) instructional leadership. This includes eighteen items.
2. emphasis on achievement or commitment. This includes eight items.
3. expectations and evaluations of students. This includes seven items.
4. use of test data to evaluate instructional programs. This includes eight items.
5. safe and orderly environment. This includes ten items.
6. grouping for instruction. This includes four items.
7. time for instruction. This includes four items.

Item one is not included in any score. It has been inserted as a warm up item and does not weigh on any of the factors. Each question allowed the individual to respond with varying degrees of intensity on a scale of five to one ranging from strongly agree to agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree. In addition the first eight questions required each respondent to make judgements about their school on a scale of varying intensity which corresponded to the five grade scale listed

above.

Each choice of answer was assigned a numerical value. Factor scores were calculated by averaging the item scores for each of the seven factors. A score of five or near five would indicate that the respondent rated his school favorably on that factor. A factor score of three or below would indicate that the respondent assesses the factor unfavorably and probably indicates an ineffective school learning characteristic. A factor analysis for professional staff members and administration was tabulated jointly as well as in separate categories. In addition the frequencies of the total mean scores were determined and frequencies of the factor scores were tabulated. The response distribution for each factor was completed by school site.

In the second stage ten follow-up interviews were conducted to include one respondent from each of the schools to provide a measure of consistency and accuracy among the collected data. The interviewees were selected randomly by the district contact person. The questionnaire contained eight items. The first item was general in nature intended to obtain background information. Each of the next seven items related to one of the seven factors analyzed on the School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument. The answers derived from the interviews were summarized and compared to the findings of the survey.

### Definition of Terms

The following definitions were applied to the terms as used in the study.

1. Urbanized Area

The Census Bureau defines an urbanized area as comprising "one or more places (central place) and the adjacent densely settled surrounding territory (urban fringe) that together have a minimum of 50,000 persons" (Bureau of the Census, August 1991).

2. Effective School Correlates

The characteristics identified by Edmonds, Lezotte and Brookover as being present in effective schools which set them apart from their less effective counterparts. For the purposes of this study seven characteristics were analyzed to determine effectiveness.

1. Administrative or Instructional Leadership
2. Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment
3. Expectations and Evaluations of Students
4. Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Programs
5. Safe and Orderly Environment
6. Grouping for Instruction
7. Time for Instruction \*

### 3. Site-Based Decision Making

As outlined by Texas House Bill 2885 (May, 1991):

"Each school district shall develop and implement a plan for site-based decision making not later than September 1, 1992" (p. VI-4). Each district plan must have school committees. In addition according to Senate Bill 1 (June 1990):

"Within guidelines established by each district administration, the principal shall organize the leadership structure in each school by using senior and master teachers and school administrators to develop instrumental teams".

This same bill details the process for determining campus performance objectives in this manner.

"For each school year, the principal of each school campus, with the assistance of parents, community residents, and the professional staff shall establish academic and other performance objectives of the campus..." (p. IV-2).

### 4. Elementary School

For the purpose of this study elementary school classification is comprised of prekindergarten through grade five sites.

### 5. Restructuring

The process of school improvement which focuses on changing schools to meet the varied needs of the

students by focusing on issues of school governance, student outcomes, decision making and decentralization. For the purpose of this study restructuring is defined as the utilization of site-based management which includes the decision making process.

### **Limitations of the Study**

Inherent in this study are several limiting factors that have an impact on the results obtained.

1. This study was limited to data obtained from two school districts in urban areas and targeted only five schools per district in the state of Texas.

2. The schools were selected from one state that may not be representative of urban school districts in other states of the United States.

3. Several limitations of this study are inherent in the questionnaire method of data collection. Isaac and Michael state that "surveys only tap respondents who are accessible and cooperative" and the "surveys are vulnerable to over-rater and under-rater bias - the tendency for some respondents to give consistently high or low ratings" (1981, p. 128).

4. This study assumes that all respondents were truthful in completing the questionnaire and subsequent interview. Due to the fact that the responses of professional staff members were elicited which may not have



reflected positively upon the school or district, this assumption may not be accurate in each case.

5. The structured interview guide was used to obtain a measure of consistency and accuracy among the collected questionnaire data. Limitations in this process include that "in the case of interview, biased reactions can be elicited because of the characteristics of the interviewer or respondent, or the combination..." (Isaac & Michael, 1981 p. 128).

The results of this study were limited to only those findings supported by the collected data.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this section is to review the research and related literature of school improvement based on the effective schools movement and the restructuring movement.

This review includes the following topics:

School Improvement

#### I. Effective Schools Movement

A. Historical Description of the Movement

B. Related Research Studies

#### II. Restructuring Movement

A. Definition and Description of the Movement

B. Key Initiatives

C. Urban Schools

### **Effective Schools Movement**

#### **Historical Description**

For most of human history, men and women have believed that only an elite is worthy and capable of education and that the great mass of people should be trained as hewers of wood and drawers of water, if they are to be trained at all. It was only at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the

nineteenth that popular leaders began to dream of universal school systems that would give everyone a chance to partake of the arts and sciences. Not surprisingly, they had their most immediate successes with the children who were easiest to teach--those who, through early nurture in the family and other institutions had been prepared for whatever it was that the school had to offer.

Now in the twentieth century, we have turned to the more difficult task, the education of those at the margins--those who have physical, mental, or emotional handicaps, those who have long been held at a distance by political or social means, and those who for a variety of reasons are less ready for what the schools have to offer and hence are more difficult to teach (Cremin, 1976, p. 85-86).

The history of education in the United States may record that the decade of the 1980's was a time when necessity for school improvement and the vision of effective schools, to successfully teach all the children, came together to produce change in the public schools. School improvement based on the effective schools research spans nearly twenty years. During these years five relatively distinguishable periods surfaced. The first period deals with the problems of definition and the subsequent search for effective schools. This was followed by a period during

which a series of case studies designed to capture the organizational culture of the identified, "effective schools" were completed. The third period represents a critical transition from that of describing the effective school to that of creating more effective schools. The fourth period represents a close examination of how the larger organizational context, the local school district, played an important role in school improvement. The fifth and final period exemplifies the current federal and state policies and programs that have been implemented to foster the development of more effective schools.

The effective schools movement began on July 3, 1966, with the publication by James Coleman of *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. In this publication Coleman asks the question whether student achievement derives more from the homes from which children have come or the schools to which they are sent. In other words, can schools make a difference independent of the home background of a child?

Coleman states:

Schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context...this very lack of an independent effect means that the inequality imposed on children by their home, neighborhood and peer environment are carried along to become the

inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. For equality of educational opportunity must imply a strong effect of schools that is independent of the child's immediate social environment, and that strong independence is not present in American schools (1966, p. 325).

The Coleman hypothesis was devastating. Several researchers began to formulate strategies that would make children successful regardless of from whence they came. The strategy they used was to find and study schools that did not fit Coleman's mold, those schools that were effective. These first studies constitute the foundation for the effective schools movement. Among the studies frequently cited are: *Inner City Children Can Be Taught To Read: Four Successful Schools* (Weber, 1971); *Elementary School Climate and School Achievement* (Brookover, et al., 1978); and *Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That Are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children* (Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1979).

The case study literature has proven the generalization of Coleman to be wrong in the following way. The case study literature demonstrated, in numerous settings, that there are schools that are able to attain high levels of pupil mastery of basic school skills even though these schools are serving large proportions of economically poor and disadvantaged students, minority and nonminority. Many

criticisms of the effective schools research have been lodged. However, as long as some individual schools are able to achieve results regardless of the background of the student population, the Effective School Model is a viable one.

During the second period of the effective schools movement, the research turned toward the internal operations of these effective schools. Researchers focused their efforts on answering the following general question: In what ways do effective schools differ from their less effective counterparts? Research methodology generally consisted of the following:

1. Effective schools based on measured outcomes were identified and paired with similar schools in all respects except for student outcomes.
2. Field researchers went into the paired schools and conducted interviews, observations, and surveys designed to develop a description of the life of these schools.
3. Data were analyzed to ascertain the distinctive characteristics of the effective schools that set them apart from their less effective counterparts.

The results can be summarized from the Edmonds report (1979b) with these five factors of the effective schools studied.

1. The principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction.

2. A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus.
3. An orderly, safe climate conducive to teaching and learning.
4. Teacher behaviors that convey the expectation that all students are expected to master the content.
5. The use of pupil achievement data as a basis for program evaluation.

Since this original list, many studies have cross-validated the original findings. Some of the more recent studies have added other factors, and others have sought to make the original Edmonds factors more explicit and more operational. The results of four school effectiveness studies typically underlie most school improvement efforts. These studies are the ones reported by Brookover and Lezotte (1979), Edmonds and Frederiksen (1979), Phi Delta Kappan (Duckett and others, 1980) and Rutter and others (1979). See Figure 1 for a comparison of the characteristics of effective schools based on these four studies (D'Amico, 1982). Three conclusions can be drawn from the array of studies in this area. First, the more effective schools do have common describable variables that center around student mastery of the intended curriculum. Second, these factors have surfaced across the various studies. Third, the effective school generally stands on its own irrespective of

Figure 1. Characteristics of "Effective" Schools

Brookover and Lezotte (1979)	Edmonds (1981)	Phi Delta Kappa (1980)	Rutter and others (1979)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Improving schools accept and emphasize the importance of basic skills mastery as prime goals and objectives</li> <li>. Staff of improving schools believe all students can master the basic skills objectives and they believe the principal shares this belief</li> <li>. Staff of improving schools expect their students will go on with their education</li> <li>. Staff of improving schools do not make excuses: they assume responsibility for teaching basic skills and are committed to do so</li> <li>. Staff of improving schools spend more time on achieving basic skills objectives</li> <li>. Principals at improving schools are assertive instructional leaders and disciplinarians, and they assume responsibility for the evaluation of the achievement of basic skills objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Clarity that pupil acquisition of the basic school skills takes precedence over all other school activities</li> <li>. There is a climate of expectation in which no children are permitted to fall below minimum but efficacious levels of achievement</li> <li>. Administrative leadership is strong and without it the disparate elements of good schooling can be neither brought together nor kept a part</li> <li>. A means is present by which pupil progress can be frequently monitored</li> <li>. There is an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Successful schools are characterized by clearly stated curricular goals and objectives</li> <li>. The leader's attitudes toward urban education and expectations for school or program success determine the impact of the leader on exceptional schools</li> <li>. The behavior of the designated school or program leader is crucial in determining school success</li> <li>. Successful urban schools frequently employ techniques of individualized instruction</li> <li>. Structured learning environments are particularly successful in urban classrooms</li> <li>. Reductions in adult/child ratios are associated with positive school performance</li> <li>. Successful schools are often supported with special project funds from federal, state, and local sources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Outcomes were better in schools where teachers expected the children to achieve well</li> <li>. Outcomes were better in schools that provide pleasant working conditions for the pupils</li> <li>. Outcomes were better in schools where immediate, direct praise and approval were the prevalent means of classroom feedback</li> <li>. Outcomes were better in schools where teachers presented themselves as positive role models demonstrating punctuality, concern for the physical well-being of the school building, concern for the emotional well-being of the pupils, and restraint in the use of physical punishment</li> <li>. Children's behavior was better in schools where teachers were readily available to be consulted by children about problems and where many children consulted with teachers</li> </ul>



Figure 1 (continued)

Brookover and Lezotte (1979)	Edmonds (1981)	Phi Delta Kappa (1980)	Rutter and others (1979)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Staff at improving schools accept the concept of accountability and are involved in developing (or using) accountability models</li> <li>. Teachers at improving schools are not very satisfied or complacent about the status quo</li> <li>. There is more parent initiated contact and involvement at improving schools (even though the overall amount of parent involvement is less)</li> <li>. The compensatory education programs in improving schools de-emphasize para-professional involvement and teacher involvement in selection of Comp-Ed-bound students</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Successful urban schools are characterized by high levels of parental contact with the school and parental involvement with school activities</li> <li>. Successful schools frequently use staff development or inservice training programs to realize their objectives</li> <li>. The greater the specificity or focus of the training program in terms of goals or processes, the greater the likelihood of its success</li> <li>. Resource and facility manipulations al one are insufficient to affect school outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Outcomes were better in schools where a high proportion of children held some kind of position of responsibility in the school system</li> <li>. A school's atmosphere is influenced positively by the degree to which it functions as a coherent whole, with agreed ways of doing things that are consistent throughout the school and that have the general support of all staff</li> </ul>

other schools around it. The major implication is that school improvement through the effective schools model is attainable by a single school and one school at a time.

As a result of the studies cited above practitioners became interested. The whole movement seemed logical and also obtainable by the practitioner. However, the original effective schools descriptions provided little guidance as to how the effective schools became effective. In the 1980's the effective schools research provided a vision of what should be without providing the means to get there. This created confusion and frustration as urban school systems mandated that their local schools become effective. During this period Edmonds and Lezotte worked as consultants to schools as they implemented the changes. They developed the following guiding principles for implementation of the effective schools research (Lezotte, 1989).

1. Preserve the single school as the strategic unit for change.

2. Principals, though essential leaders of change, could not do it alone. Teachers and others must be an integral part of the improvement process.

3. School improvement is a process not an event and should be thought of as continuous.

4. The research is useful in facilitating the change process but it would have to include suggestions of practices, policies, and procedures that could be

implemented as part of the process.

5. Like the original effective schools, these improving schools must feel as if they have a choice in the matter and that they have control over the change process.

The next phase of the movement emphasized district-wide programs based on the effective schools research. Clearly the research intent was school improvement at the building level. However, experience with the school model reinforced the district-wide concept. Two forces combined to push district-wide adoption of the research. First, the educational reform movement of the 1980s meant that local school districts needed a comprehensive program of school improvement. Secondly, individual school improvement was more difficult if the organizational setting of the local district was ignored. This was due to the challenges individual schools met as they tried to change or alter district policies, patterns, and practices.

The result of these concerns was the formulation in some instances of a district plan that supported school change. In this plan, the policies, programs, and procedures were aligned to support improvement efforts.

The final phase of development of the effective schools movement is the more recent effort to support school by school improvements of intermediate educational agencies, state departments of education, regional accreditation groups, and the federal government. There have also been

international meetings on effective schools research and practices.

The intermediate agencies, such as county school boards, intermediate districts, and boards of cooperative educational service centers assist school districts by providing training and technical support for the implementation of effective schools research. They sponsor conferences and workshops for the individual districts bringing in national speakers.

Nearly all the state departments of education have been actively involved in school reform. Some specifically target effective schools as the preferred model. This is most certainly the case in Illinois given the School Improvement Process currently in operation statewide.

The various regional accreditation agencies have utilized effective schools research as new standards for accreditation are developed. This is especially important to stimulating secondary school involvement in the process viewed by some as an elementary school movement.

The 1988 Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Bill. Chapter 2 provides funds to allow local districts to use a portion of their special monies to support the planning and implementation of their school improvement programs based specifically on the effective schools research.

In January 1988, the first International Congress on

School Effectiveness was held in London, England. The meeting was attended by nearly two hundred educators, both researchers and practitioners, from more than thirty countries. A similar follow-up meeting was held in 1989 in Rotterdam, Holland.

This historical description of the effective schools movement is one of expanding organization from school, to district, to state, to national, and international levels. In his book, *Making the Future Work*, John Diebold makes the following statement: "Enduring change tends to occur when necessity coincides with vision" (1984, p. 180). This overview demonstrates that during the past twenty years it became necessary to improve schools to successfully teach all the children and the effective schools vision offered a formidable paradigm.

### **Related Research Studies**

A plethora of related research on the effective schools movement exists. This research spans the years beginning in 1966 and continuing even to the present, although major works of the movement tended to culminate in 1990. The effective schools research studies can be grouped into studies describing and introducing the movement and the extensive studies of each correlate.

In an attempt to review the literature, the following studies were deemed important by the writer. In no way can the limited amount of research reported constitute the

immense information available on this subject.

In 1982 Karl White asked the vexing question: "Does a student's achievement derive more from his or her home environment or from the influence of the school?" This study began with the restatement of the ideology of Coleman in 1966. White completed a thorough review of the literature that considers the relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) and academic achievement. The results of the meta-analysis of one hundred and one studies was that the information indicated that the relation between SES and academic achievement was only .251. This was probably much weaker than many people assumed. Further analysis indicated that when SES data and achievement are aggregated to the school level the strength of the correlation increased dramatically; when achievement and SES of individual students was used as a unit of analysis, the correlation was much weaker. White's analysis stated that a student's achievement is and ought to be thought of as much more independent of family background than has been previously thought by most educators and researchers. This was supportive of the effective schools philosophy that all children can learn regardless of their family background.

In 1981, Richard Murnane, examined and reviewed the quantitative studies dealing with school effectiveness and how the findings and implications of these studies influenced the formulation and implementation of school

policies. The researcher focused on the following three questions. Are there systematic differences in the quality of education provided in public schools? What school resources really make a difference? What public policies should be implemented to improve the quality of education provided to disadvantaged children? The most important finding of this study was that schools do make a difference and that a great parity existed in the amount of learning that occurred across schools and even across classrooms within a school. Also teachers and students responded differently as a result of changes in policies, rules, customs, and contracts that influence how resources were allocated. This implied the need for a school to identify a common purpose or mission and make the policies, rules, customs, and contracts consistent with this mission.

Peter Mortimer and Pam Sammons (1987) designed and implemented a long-term study in England which confirmed the earlier studies of effective elementary schools in the United States (Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971).

The researchers identified twelve factors that were crucial to a school's effectiveness. These characteristics demonstrate the interdependence of the school and classroom. What the teacher can and cannot do often depends on what is happening in the school as a whole.

Donald Mackenzie (1983) conducted an extensive study dealing with effective schools, school improvement,

classroom management, the role of the principal, and effective teaching practices. His findings concluded that the characteristics of effective schools and teaching cannot be viewed separately or as a checklist of things to get done. The strategies to implement these characteristics were determined by the past history of the school, the present climate in the school, and the views held by the staff. No single answer can be used by every school. The characteristics will only be effective to the degree that they are incorporated into the belief and value structure of the school and to the extent to which they are assimilated into practice.

Ronald Edmonds (1982) in his speech presented at the conference on "The Implications of Research for Practice" echoed Mackenzie's findings. He stated that characteristics of an effective school are not a list to be implemented or a cookbook recipe to be followed; rather they are a powerful set of research-based constructs for guiding decisions and actions.

Each of the seven correlates of effective schools have been studied extensively. In addition each correlate has been more specifically defined over the years.

The first correlate defined and detailed school climate. It includes a component on discipline as well as the most conducive conditions necessary for teaching and learning to occur.



The second correlate which expressed the need for a climate of high expectations for success has been studied from the perspectives of quality instruction, incentives and rewards to build motivation, interaction between teachers and students, and the grouping of students to promote effective instruction. The teacher expectations, student achievement (TESA) movement was implemented to effect this component. Mastery learning, cooperative learning, and ability grouping studies further defined this correlate.

The third correlate described the role of instructional leader as being key to the improvements of the school and the guiding of the instructional program. This area has probably been researched more than any other to determine the best use of the administrators time and effort.

The fourth correlate of a clear and focused mission has been studied in two basic areas:

1. the emphasis on the importance of learning.
2. the clearly defined and communicated goals and objectives of learning.

These two components have fostered the development of methods for curriculum alignment, collaborative curriculum development, and the communication of curricular goals.

The fifth correlate focused on the opportunity to learn and student time on task. This correlate has been studied extensively in the time on task research, instructional grouping procedures, the planning of lessons, and the use of

questioning techniques.

The sixth correlate emphasizing the frequent monitoring of student progress has focused on assessment methods and monitoring along with the improvement of teachers' instructional effectiveness.

The seventh correlate stressed parent and community involvement. Efforts in this area have concentrated on procedures for enhancing communication, increasing parental involvement, and parental training sessions.

The area of school improvement based on the effective schools research has spanned across twenty years or more and captured the attention of both researchers and practitioners. It has been expanded to include information and research in almost every area of the school program as we know it today. As Ronald Edmonds stated:

We can, whenever and wherever we choose successfully teach all the children whose schooling is of interest to us. We already know more than we need in order to do this. Whether we do it or not must finally depend on how we feel about the fact that we haven't done it so far (October 1979, p. 23).

In his keynote address at the 1991 Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Conference in San Francisco, California, Asa Hilliard III stated that "Now is the time to find the genius in all of our children" (March 1991).

## Restructuring Movement

### Definition and Description

"The Limitations of our factory model of education have become manifest, and they are crippling" (Shanker, 1990, p. 350). These words form the basis of the restructuring movement. Restructuring is the new catch word of the decade. Few people can actually define and describe what it entails. Restructuring means different things to different people. The dictionary defines restructuring in these terms: to change the makeup, organization, or pattern of. One thing is certain restructuring means change.

There are several reasons for the confusion as to what restructuring of schools is all about. First, it is a relatively new term in education. School reform was the term used throughout most of the 1980s. Reform was the name used for a variety of changes in schools that started in many states in the early 1980s and then became almost a universal happening after the publication of *A Nation at Risk* by a federally appointed commission in 1983. After these early reform efforts produced a view that changes were too slow and inadequate, more drastic measures of restructuring or second wave reform came to the forefront.

The subject of restructuring began to appear on the agendas of the National Governors Association and the Education Commission of States in 1987. At about the same time, advocacy groups adopted a broader view of education

for at-risk children and youth, arguing that current school structures did not meet the needs and provide opportunities for most students. The push for more radical changes were also evident in the business community as more and more training was needed in the basic skill areas to adequately meet staffing demands.

It is also important to note that restructuring has been implemented differently by individual schools, school districts, states, researchers, and reformers. Yet the term restructuring has been used to define each of these changes. This further adds to the confusion in defining this initiative.

The nation's policymakers, many researchers, leaders, and practitioners can agree on the common themes that formulate the restructuring movement (Lewis, 1989, p. 3-5).

Restructuring means changing the nature of schools from the interior so that students become active learners, partners in the learning process (Frank Newman, President of the Education Commission of the States).

Education is what teachers do. If policy is to affect students' experiences in schools, it must be through what teachers do, how they do it and what it means to them (Eleanor Duckworth, Harvard University Research).

It means commissioning people who work in real schools to fashion workable solutions to real problems, and allowing those solutions the opportunity to fail and the time to

succeed (Richard Elmore and Milbrey McLaughlin, *Rand Report, Study Work*).

Most school reforms try to improve the system without changing the basic structure. Restructuring is different. It seeks to create new relationships for children and teachers (Albert Shanker, President American Federation of Teachers).

Restructuring is about the dynamics of learning. It focuses on the essentials on collaboration and on problem solving (Adam Urbanski, President AFT unit at Rochester, New York).

Restructuring takes rethinking. The clear message of second wave reform is that we need to examine our basic philosophical beliefs about teaching, learning, the nature of human beings, and the kinds of environments that maximize growth, for teachers and students alike (Ken Michaels, Supervisor of the Bureau of Human Resource Development for the Miami/Dade County Schools) (1988, p. 3).

The ultimate goal of restructuring is to open up the process of learning and teaching of human interaction and decision making. If most students are to enjoy much higher levels of learning success, schools will need flexible structures to accommodate different content goals, learning rates, interests, and styles (David Florio, National Science Foundation).

The goal of restructuring is long-term, comprehensive

change guided by a conception of schools as stimulating workplaces and learning environments (Jane David, Consultant to the Center for Policy Research in Education).

We are trying to change the way we go about educating our young. We are trying to change from a system in which teachers are regarded as almost assembly-line classroom production workers to a system in which teachers are free to innovate and experiment and use creativity to improve teaching.

We are trying to deregulate, to move the control of the schools from top-down to bottom-up. We are trying to provide better financing and attract better people into the profession. This requires a total change in "corporate culture" (Owen Butler, Retired Chairman of Procter & Gamble Company and Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development).

The goal of current changes, and of education in general, is to teach students to think (TheodoreSizer, Coalition of Essential Schools).

These statements reflect commonalities which aid in defining the restructuring movement. It is apparent that restructuring:

1. is student and teacher centered.
2. changes the way students learn and teachers teach.
3. applies to all students and all schools, not just the disadvantaged.

4. affects curriculum and organization.
5. requires a vision or mission which everyone adopts.
6. must be separated from past reform movements to a decentralized viewpoint.
7. is supported by diverse interests in society.

The lack of a clear-cut universally agreed upon definition or description of restructuring is viewed as a positive aspect of the movement. Since restructuring is geared to meet individual community needs, it must be flexible enough to accomplish its goals on a school by school basis.

### **Key Initiatives**

While many focused on traditional solutions to the problems of schools, Mortimer Adler (1982), Ernest Boyer (1989), TheodoreSizer (1984), John Goodlad (1983), Albert Shanker (1990), Marc Tucker (1986) and others looked at what was happening in classrooms and often came up with different views of the problems and different solutions. Their conclusions and extended research form the base of what is being called restructuring. They agree that the restructuring of schools covers four categories: context or substance, people, place, and time.

The attempt is to begin a fundamental shift away from surface coverage of content and toward deeper understanding, problem solving, creativity, and analytical thinking. Tests must also reflect this deeper understanding of content.

As it becomes increasingly more difficult to attract the necessary talent to education, personnel structures must also change. Technology will need to replace routine tasks and free teachers for different roles.

The physical arrangements of schools are based on an antiquated, factory model of efficiency. The arrangements of people, materials, and equipment need a variety of alternatives.

Student learning time must accommodate new curriculum and learning goals, cooperative learning, and the deeper analysis and synthesis of content.

Content, people, time, and flexibility of space within the context of such process changes as different groupings and interactions, interdisciplinary approaches and school base decision making are the themes of the major contributors to a working definition of restructuring.

Mortimer Adler in *The Paideia Proposal* (1982) wants all children to have the same quality of schooling. He believes that there are no unteachable children. His approach has children analyzing and discussing the writings of Galileo, Aristotle, Shakespeare, Martin Luther King, Jr., Newton and Herman Melville as part of the Paideia Proposal's curriculum. Through the discussion of these great works, higher order thinking skills are promoted.

John Goodlad seeks to change classroom practices through improving the preparation of teachers and



administrators. He has created a network of collaborations between universities and school districts. Goodlad's seven year study of thirty-eight schools uncovered haphazard short-term staff development activities focused on individuals removed from school sites; little time or stimulus for site-based renewal; little evidence of long-term planning at the school or district level (1983). He linked schools with universities as a way of renewing themselves. He believed for schools to get better they must have better teachers.

The Puget Sound Educational Consortium consists of thirteen school districts in the Seattle area and the University of Washington and is an example of Goodlad's partnerships. This is one aspect of a full year program to renew professional preparation and practice through the Center for Educational Renewal. He is also conducting a study on the current conditions of the education of educators. The third component is an examination of preparation programs in other fields to obtain ideas on how to further educators' professional development.

TheodoreSizer studied fifty schools and the people affected by them in his book *Horace's Compromise* (1984). It refers to the "deals" that teachers and students in a typical high school make to avoid hassling each other in order to keep schools quiet but unchallenging places. From his studies, a network, The Coalition of Essential Schools,

was formed. Sizer developed a set of principles that the Coalition schools support which include an intellectual focus, limited amount of essential skills, universal goals, personalization, student-as-worker philosophy, student exhibition as assessment, mutual expectations, and integrated curriculum.

Broxville High School is a charter member of the Coalition of Essential Schools. The basis of their restructuring centers around an interdisciplinary program of study. The focus of this program is on increasing the connections among the disciplines. Although the staff acknowledges that this is time consuming and difficult, they find it as difficult to teach any other way.

The report of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy on Teaching, *A Nation Prepared* (1986), has led to the establishment of a center at Rochester, New York to stimulate restructuring of education. It established teacher quality as a priority.

Marc Tucker, executive director of the Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy established the National Center at Rochester. With additional funding, Rochester Schools worked on three reform goals:

1. a relook at the federal role in education;
2. strategies to link education and the economy in New York State through restructured school and job training systems;

3. support and expansion of the redesign of the Rochester school system utilizing the guidelines outlined in *A Nation Prepared*.

Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, in an address to the Business Roundtable in Washington, D.C. in June 1989, outlined five necessary strategies for national leadership in education:

1. school-based management;
2. urgent call to action led by the President;
3. commitment to the disadvantaged;
4. a crusade to strengthen teaching and the quality of curriculum;
5. effective methods for monitoring results.

The key initiatives discussed in this section represent only a cross-section of the important programs underway to date. They do, however, reflect the general direction of the efforts, thus far, of second wave reform.

### **Urban Schools**

A 1988 study of urban school districts by the RAND Corporation concentrated on school districts that were experiencing some success. The districts in this study included Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Atlanta, Miami, Memphis, and San Diego. The researchers' findings detailed a specific role for superintendents. The most effective superintendents create a public mandate for improvement by

being clear about educational priorities and basing them on broad public consultation. The other important findings of the study of city districts included:

1. Some districts created processes that promise to promote the necessary ideas, funds, and person-power to foster educational improvement.

2. A failing urban school system can be turned around only if the entire community unites on its behalf.

3. Choice plans that encourage parents to seek alternatives to public schooling are not necessary for improvement of schools.

4. Communitywide educational improvement strategies depend on broad community support outside and restructuring of schools on the inside.

5. The public supports improvements that are long-range and not quick solutions.

6. Involvement of powerful community actors reduces the status and independence of school administrators and the school board.

7. Business leaders can provide several functions, but the most important may be in raising educational problems to the top of the local public agenda.

8. Change needs the cooperation of powerful, well-led teachers' unions.

*Saving the Urban School* (1988) argued for four priorities: affirm that every student can succeed, build an effective governance arrangement, introduce in every school a comprehensive program of renewal, create a network of support beyond the school.

The Center for Policy Research in Education summarized the early efforts of restructuring in urban schools in Jeannie Oakes report, *Improving Inner-City Schools: Current Directions in Urban District Reform* (1988). Oakes found many changes taking place such as early childhood programs, social supports, and efforts to use effective schools research. She also delineates promising strategies that diverge from traditional urban school practice which will require urban educators to assume new roles and responsibilities and to restructure schools and learning.

Several school districts have put the new ideas in motion by adopting one or more of the components of restructuring. East Baton Rouge Parish School System, Baton Rouge, Louisiana launched a program in September 1988, that combines school-based management and parental choice. Each pilot school has a school advisory council of ten to twelve members. Each council developed a needs assessment, mission statement, and action plan. Some discretion over financial resources has been given to schools, and each school was encouraged to develop a curricular specialty.

The New Orleans Public Schools in conjunction with the

Southern Coalition for Educational Equity implemented a program to improve instruction in the system's lowest achieving schools.

This project contains the following components.

1. The creation of a partnership with an outside advocacy group and the school district, the teachers' union, and the community.

2. Management of the project by a team of four experienced teachers formerly with the school systems.

3. A highly successful Summer Program that provides long, uninterrupted blocks of instructional time for reading and extra resources and support for teachers.

The Memphis, Tennessee Comprehensive Educational Reform Plan contains three principal components: administrative reorganization, deregulated schools and restructuring.

One of the most radical restructuring plans in the country is the program outlined by the Chicago School Reform Act. The major components include:

1. Local school councils which make all important decisions including hiring and negotiating the principals' contract.

2. Control of hiring staff to principals regardless of seniority.

3. Teacher advisory committees to help local school councils and principals make curricular decisions.

4. Representation by each local school council on the district council.

5. Appointment of board members by the Mayor.

6. A forty million dollar district budget cut to pass funds onto the schools.

7. The creation of an oversight authority to enforce the plan for five years.

The fourth largest school district in the nation, Dade County, Florida, has developed pilot schools to participate in school-based management which included flexible budgeting, waivers from regulations, freedom in governance, and funding for staff development.

The Rochester, New York plan for restructuring is actually a national model of the Carnegie Forum's report on teaching, *A Nation Prepared*. Marc Tucker, the author, is also the director of the National Center on Education and the Economy and the consultant to the Rochester Schools. The key to this movement is the union contract, one in which teachers gave up some traditional bargaining items to gain salary increases and the position of lead teacher. Over the three-year span of the contract beginning teachers received a fifty-two percent salary increase and experienced teachers' salaries increased forty percent. The plan also included:

1. a career ladder with four professional categories,
2. teacher mentor program,

3. school-based planning and decisionmaking,
4. district-wide schools of choice,
5. longer school year with a student advisory component.

The plan was implemented in December 1987 and has progressed very slowly to assure representation by all constituencies.

The programs described in this section constitute a very small amount of the current restructuring initiatives. Although there are no definitions of restructuring cast in stone, one thing can be surmised from the literature: restructuring means changing or redesigning the rules, roles, relationships, and resources of schools to make them more responsive to the needs of students.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### **Design of the Study**

The focus of this chapter was to detail the methods and procedures used for the collection and analysis of data in this study. The research question was stated along with the purpose statement. The methods of investigation utilized were described. This section included a description of the composition of the targeted population, the content of the questionnaire, the administration and scoring of the questionnaire and the interview guide.

The methods utilized for the scoring of the questionnaire, the interpretation of the interview responses and the treatment of the data for the analysis of the findings was also included.

#### **Research Question**

This study focused on the following research question:

What is the perceived presence of the effective school correlates in the mandated restructuring of selected urban elementary schools?

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceived presence of the correlates in the selected schools. The

primary focus was to obtain a snapshot view of the restructuring process as it related to the effective school correlates.

Specific objectives of the study were:

1. to determine if the effective school correlates were present in the mandated restructuring efforts of the selected urban elementary schools;

2. to determine which if any of the effective school correlates or characteristics were emphasized in the selected urban elementary schools;

3. to determine if there were any patterns in the perceived presence of the correlates common to the elementary schools in the targeted sample.

#### **Methods for Collection of Data**

The collection of data consisted of a two staged process involving a validated assessment instrument mailed to the ten targeted schools and a structured interview guide.

The School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument was developed to measure some aspects of the school environment that were known to be related to student learning. It was designed to assess the school learning climate. It has been validated to distinguish between high achieving schools and low achieving schools. The effective school factors identified were based on an analysis of data from samples of Michigan and Tennessee elementary schools. The sixty items

were clustered into seven factors delineated through factor-analytic methods.

The interview guide allowed the respondent to answer questions in greater detail and also clarify their responses to the original questionnaire. It also allowed the researcher the opportunity to probe the responses to obtain more accurate data.

### **Target Population**

The State of Texas has mandated site-based decision making by state statute, Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 2885. The target population consisted of two urban school districts in Texas. For the purposes of this study they were referred to as District A and B.

These selected districts were designated urban areas as described by the Bureau of the Census. In addition the targeted districts had a student enrollment of 12,000 or more. In each of the designated school districts five elementary schools ranging from prekindergarten to grade 5 were selected. Each school selected within the district was assigned a number that followed the letter of the school district. The sample schools contained between 40 and 94 percent economically disadvantaged students as measured by the Chapter 1 Federal guidelines. Table 1 displayed the demographics of each school in the study. Included in the table was the total enrollment and percent of economically disadvantaged students in each school. In addition the

total enrollment for each district has been listed.

Table 1

School Demographic Information

School	Enrollment	Percent Economically Disadvantaged
A1	809	81.5
A2	474	46.4
A3	486	77.8
A4	766	40.1
A5	697	42.2
B1	526	89.9
B2	744	94.5
B3	557	93.7
B4	580	93.1
District	Total Enrollment	
A	17,943	
B	38,973	

The professional staff members of each school were administered the School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument.

**School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument**

The School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument has been validated to distinguish between high achieving schools and low achieving schools in samples of Michigan schools and a set of Memphis schools. The items on the questionnaire are clustered into seven factors or correlates. The correlates are identified as:

1. administrative (or principal) instructional

## Leadership

2. emphasis on achievement or commitment
3. expectations and evaluations of students
4. use of test data to evaluate instructional

## programs

5. safe and orderly environment
6. grouping for instruction
7. time for instruction

This survey contained sixty questions. Fifty-two questions allowed the individual to respond on a Likert scale in varying degrees of intensity from 5.0 to 1.0 ranging from strongly agree to agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree. The first eight questions required each respondent to make judgements about their school utilizing percentages on a scale of varying intensity which corresponded to the five grade scale listed above.

Each choice of answer was assigned a numerical value. Correlate or factor scores were calculated by averaging the item scores for each of the seven correlates. A score of five or near five indicated that the respondent rated his school favorably on that factor. A factor score of three or below indicated that the respondent assessed the factor unfavorably and indicated an ineffective school learning characteristic.

Each professional staff member was asked to indicate

the answer that most closely reflected their own perception of each statement about their school. Respondents were instructed to complete all questions on a scantron answer document. Answer documents were precoded to distinguish administrators from other professional staff.

Each survey item was designed to correspond to one of the seven effective school correlates under study. The following information will outline the characteristics of the seven effective school correlates and list the corresponding survey questions.

I. Administrative (or Principal) Instructional Leadership

The questions determining the effectiveness of the administrative or instructional leader center on the leader's ability to focus on the instructional program as the primary responsibility (See Table 2).

Table 2

Survey Items Corresponding to Administrative (or Principal) Instructional Leadership

- 
- 15. In your school teachers are more likely to receive approval from the principal for being good disciplinarians than they are for being good instructors.
  - 16. You are not likely to be considered a good teacher in your building if you don't get your paper work in on time.
  - 17. The principal praises teachers who don't send many students to his/her office.
  - 21. Discussions with the principal often result in some aspect of improved instructional practice.

Table 2 (continued)

- 
22. The principal makes frequent formal classroom observations.
  23. The principal reviews and interprets test results with and for the faculty.
  24. Instructional issues are seldom the focus of faculty meetings.
  27. The principal uses test results to recommend modifications or changes in the instructional program.
  28. There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in your school.
  38. The principal regularly brings instructional issues to the faculty for discussion.
  39. The principal puts much emphasis on the meaning and use of standardized test results.
  40. The principal frequently communicates to individual teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement.
  41. The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for faculty.
  42. The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.
  44. The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.
  45. Supervision is directed at instruction.
  46. Teachers in your school turn to the principal with instructional concerns or problems.
  51. The principal is an important instructional resource person in your school.
-

## II. Emphasis On Achievement or Commitment

The items determining the emphasis on achievement or commitment in each school site focused on clear instructional objectives with particular emphasis on the learning of basic math and reading skills (See Table 3).

Table 3

### Survey Items Corresponding to the Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment

- 
- 9. The students in your school are told what objectives they are expected to learn.
  - 10. All staff in your school clearly understand their responsibility for basic skill achievement.
  - 11. Your school has a strong feeling of "lets get things done, especially basic skills."
  - 13. All teachers in your building care about is "getting by" and picking up their checks.
  - 14. Teachers in your building will do anything necessary to get all students to read and do math.
  - 18. All teachers in this building teach the basic skill objectives identified for their grade level to all their students.
  - 19. In your building only those teachers who get all of their students to master grade-level objectives are considered good teachers.
  - 8. Has the priority of basic skills achievement in your school changed over the last few years?  
 Increased greatly  
 Increased slightly  
 Remained unchanged  
 Decreased slightly  
 Decreased greatly
-



### III. Expectations and Evaluations of Students

The items corresponding to the expectations and evaluations of students focused on student achievement or mastery for all students. The emphasis was on whether the professional staff believed that all students could master the basic skill areas (See Table 4).

Table 4

#### Survey Items Corresponding to the Expectations and Evaluations of Students

---

12. Teachers feel that nothing they do makes any difference with regard to achievement in your school.
  
2. How would you rate the academic ability of students in your school compared to students in other schools?
  - Ability here is much higher
  - Ability here is somewhat higher
  - Ability here is about average
  - Ability here is somewhat lower
  - Ability here is much lower
  
3. How many teachers in your school believe that all their students have the ability to master grade level academic objectives?
  - Almost all the teachers
  - Most of the teachers
  - Half of the teachers
  - Some of the teachers
  - Almost none of the teachers
  
4. What percent of the students in your school do the teachers generally believe are able to master the basic reading/math skills?
  - 90% or more
  - 70% - 89%
  - 50% - 69%
  - 30% - 49%
  - Less than 30%

Table 4 (continued)

- 
5. On the average, how well do you expect the students in your school to perform?
- Much above national norm
  - Slightly above national norm
  - Approximately at national norm
  - Slightly below national norm
  - Much below national norm
6. What percent of the students in your school do you expect to complete high school?
- 90% or more
  - 70% - 89%
  - 50% - 69%
  - 30% - 49%
  - Less than 30%
7. What percent of the students in your school do you feel are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives?
- 90% or more
  - 70% - 89%
  - 50% - 69%
  - 30% - 49%
  - Less than 30%
- 

#### IV. Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Programs

The survey items corresponding to the use of test data to evaluate instructional programs focused on a variety of assessment tools (See Table 5). The major emphasis was on data obtained from standardized and criterion referenced tests.

Table 5

Survey Items Corresponding to the Use of Test Data to  
Evaluate Instructional Programs

---

- 25. Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school.
  - 26. The principal uses test results to recommend modifications or changes in the instructional program.
  - 31. The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in your school.
  - 32. Standardized test results are not available or are not used to evaluate program objectives.
  - 34. Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g. criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery checklists, etc.).
  - 35. Teachers and the principal thoroughly review and analyze test results to plan instructional program modifications.
  - 37. Student assessment information (such as criterion-referenced tests, skills checklists, etc.) is regularly used to give specific student feedback and plan appropriate instruction.
  - 49. In your school there is annual standardized testing at each grade level.
- 

V. Safe and Orderly Environment

The survey items corresponding to the safe and orderly environment factor can be divided into several categories (See Table 6). Safety and security issues only partly defined this correlate. School climate and student discipline were also considered in the analysis of this factor.

Table 6

Survey Items Corresponding to a Safe and Orderly Environment

---

- 20. Your school is a safe and secure place to work.
  - 29. Staff and students do not view security as an issue in your school.
  - 30. A positive feeling permeates the school.
  - 33. The physical condition of your school is generally pleasant and well-kept.
  - 36. Teachers, administrators and parents assume responsibility for discipline in your school.
  - 43. The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable.
  - 47. Student behavior is generally positive in your school.
  - 48. Students in your school abide by school rules.
  - 50. Class atmosphere in your school is generally very conducive to learning for all students.
  - 52. Discipline is not an issue in your school.
- 

VI. Grouping for Instruction

The survey items corresponding to the grouping for instruction factor focused primarily on heterogenous versus homogeneous groups in a variety of settings (See Table 7).

Table 7

Survey Items Corresponding to Grouping for Instruction

- 
53. All students are heterogeneously grouped within classrooms with regard to basic skill level.
54. The principal assigns students to classrooms heterogeneously with regard to basic skill level.
55. When students are homogeneously grouped in classrooms the groups are changed frequently to prevent labeling.
56. The school has a clearly defined policy concerning heterogeneous and flexible grouping of students.
- 

VII. Time for Instruction

The survey items corresponding to time for instruction emphasized the need for few interruptions in the instructional program of the students (See Table 8).

Table 8

Survey Items Corresponding to Time for Instruction

- 
57. Less than five minutes of instruction time is lost as a result of noise, announcements, discipline and/or organizational activities per hour.
58. The level of teacher attendance is acceptably high.
59. This school has an effective program to maintain a high level of student attendance.
60. If students are pulled out of classrooms for special instruction it always increases the total time.
-

### **Questionnaire Return**

The questionnaire was mailed to a total of ten schools in two distinct Texas school districts. District A had a 100% rate of return. All five of the designated schools participated which accounted for fifty-eight percent of the total survey responses or one hundred sixty-four.

Of the five designated schools in District B, only four completed the survey. The fifth school in District B stated that the surveys were administered and mailed. However, the surveys were never received by the investigator. A postal service investigation was conducted but the surveys were never located. District B accounted for forty-two percent of the total survey responses or one hundred seventeen.

### **Interview Guide**

The structured interview guide was developed to correspond to each of the seven effective school factors under study. Question one was intended to be general in nature to lead to the next seven questions.

It is important to note that the interview guide was pilot tested on a group of six professional staff members (See Appendix A). Each was interviewed to point out and further clarify any ambiguities. This group of pilot interviewees made minimal changes to the original document.

One professional staff member from each of the ten sites was selected to be interviewed. Of the ten people selected only nine were interviewed since surveys were not

received from one school in District B. The staff members were selected randomly by the district contact person, utilizing a random table of numbers. The School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument did not identify respondents therefore, the interviewees could not be selected by scores obtained on the questionnaire.

At the beginning of the interview a brief explanation of the study was offered to each interviewee. A structured interview guide containing eight questions was administered (See Appendix D). The first question was general in nature intended to obtain background information and lead the way for the next seven questions. The next seven items corresponded to one of the seven factors analyzed on the School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument (See Table 9).

Table 9

Interview Questions with Each of the Corresponding Factors

---

1. What restructuring activities have you been a part of in the last two years? (General Background)
2. How are the students grouped for instruction in your school? (Grouping for Instruction)
3. How does or should the principal help to improve instruction in the school? (Administrative or Instructional Leadership)
4. How often do you use test data to evaluate instruction? (Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Programs)
5. How is discipline handled in your school? (Safe and Orderly Environment)

Table 9 (continued)

- 
6. How often is instructional time interrupted in a given day? (Time for Instruction)
  7. How well do you expect the students in your school to perform? (Expectations and Evaluations of Students)
  8. How has the emphasis on achievement in your school changed over the last few years? (Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment)
- 

### **Procedures for Analysis of Data**

Each survey item had a possible score of 5, 4, 3, 2 or 1. The higher score indicated a higher degree of agreement with the statement presented. The survey statements clustered around the seven effective school correlates or characteristics. Each high response indicated the perceived presence of the characteristic in the school site. Conversely, each low score indicated the unlikelihood that the effective school correlate was perceived to be present. In this manner a description or profile of each targeted site was included. The scores of each item were summed to yield a possible raw score within the range of 300 points, as the highest score, and 60 points, as the lowest score. The total raw score was divided by the total number of questions answered out of 60 items to yield a mean score for each respondent. Mean scores of the questionnaire by school were charted and presented in Chapter IV as a part of the analysis of the data.



Since each survey item was clustered specifically to one of the seven effective school characteristics, the raw scores of each item were also summed and averaged according to their respective correlate. The mean scores by correlate sought to indicate those areas within the total concept of effective schools that were emphasized at the targeted sites.

The final objective of the study was to determine any commonalities in the responses of the schools. To analyze the pattern of response an item analysis was included in Chapter IV for each of the seven effective school factors.

In addition the responses of the building administrator were compared to the responses of the professional staff as a whole to determine if any differences were present. These findings were also charted in Chapter IV.

#### **Interpretation of the Interview Data**

The interviews were analyzed qualitatively. The respondents' answers to each question were summarized and presented. The collected data was utilized to identify common qualities or differences of answers. Comparisons and contrasts of data from both collection methods were noted.

#### **Summary**

The data for this study were collected in two phases. The sixty item School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument was sent to five elementary schools in each of two urban districts in Texas and yielded a ninety percent (90%)

response. One professional staff member from each school was selected randomly by the district contact person to participate in the interview session.

The data from the questionnaire were scored in three ways. An averaged total score was calculated for each respondent which was grouped by school. The response scores of each statement as categorized by the seven effective school correlates were calculated. Therefore, a mean score for each of the effective school factors was derived as well as the total mean score of the questionnaire for each targeted school. An item analysis was completed for each of the effective school factors. The distribution of responses in percentages for each item clustered around a correlate was presented. The responses of the interviewees were compared and contrasted with the results of the survey.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data obtained from the School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument and the interviews were presented in this chapter. The implications of the research findings were cited and discussed.

The data were presented according to the two methods of collection.

- 1) School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument results and
- 2) interview guide responses.

Appropriate tables were utilized in this chapter to display the findings. Data from the questionnaire identified the total mean scores by schools, grouped mean scores, individual school profiles, mean scores of each effective school factor, differences in mean scores of total professional staff members compared with the principal(s), and an item analysis in percentages according to the effective school factors.

The interview guide responses were delineated by effective school factors. Responses followed each question and were compared to the corresponding survey responses.

Collected data was reviewed and summarized.

### **School Learning Climate Assessment Data**

The School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument utilized in this study asked two hundred eighty-one professional staff members from two urban school districts in Texas to determine the perceived presence of the effective school correlates in their school setting. The sixty item Likert scale tied each question to one of the seven effective school characteristics as identified in the research question of the study.

The first eight items were questions which required a judgement or assessment of the school. Items nine through sixty were declarative sentences phrased to evoke a rated reaction of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

The survey had sixty items that provided possible raw scores ranging from three hundred (300) to a low score of sixty (60). Mean scores were calculated which corresponded to the answers of "strongly agree" for a score of 5.00, "agree" for 4.00, "neither agree nor disagree" for 3.00, "disagree" for 2.00 and "strongly disagree" for 1.00. The mean scores of the schools were ranked from high to low on an ordinal scale. The mean scores of the schools were reflected in Table 10. The total number of respondents for each school is also listed.

The mean scores represented general agreement, general disagreement or neither agreement nor disagreement. For

instance, a mean score of 3.75 indicated that the effective school factors were perceived as present in the site. . . Conversely, a mean score of 1.46 indicated general disagreement with the belief that the effective school factors were present. Any score between and including 2.50 through 3.49 indicated neither agreement nor disagreement that the effective school factor was present.

Table 10

Mean Scores of Questionnaire by Schools

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Mean Score of Questionnaire</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Total Respondents (N)</u>
Strongly Agree			
Agree	3.56	A2	28
Neither Agree/Disagree			
	3.39	B4	25
	3.36	B2	37
	3.34	B3	34
	3.32	B1	21
	3.17	A4	43
	3.00	A1	26
	2.83	A5	34
	2.79	A3	33
Disagree			
Strongly Disagree			
Total		9	281

The mean of all the questionnaire scores was 3.195 which indicated neither agreement nor disagreement with the presence of the effective school factors in the selected sites. Due to the large number of individual score units, the mean scores were grouped in Table 11 and the frequency distribution was indicated.

As displayed in Table 11 not one school received a score between 4.50 and 5.00 which would have indicated strong agreement with the presence of the effective school factors. Also displayed in Table 11 was the result that not one school received a score between 1.50 and 1.00 which would have indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with the presence of the effective school factors.

Table 11

Grouped Mean Scores of Questionnaire

<u>Categories of Response</u>	<u>Mean Score of Questionnaire</u>	<u>Number of Respondents</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
Strongly Agree	4.50-5.00	0	0.0
Agree	3.50-4.49	28	9.96
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2.50-3.49	253	90.0
Disagree	1.50-2.49	0	0.0
Strongly Disagree	1.00-1.49	0	0.0
		281	99.96

Of the nine schools surveyed only one school indicated agreement that the effective school factors were present in their school site. The other eight schools indicated a score which varied between 3.39 and 2.79 in the neither agree nor disagree category.

A score of 3.50 and above would have indicated general agreement with the majority of the statements in the survey that the effective school factors were present in the restructuring or school improvement efforts of the selected schools. Only one school or eleven percent (11%) of the targeted population demonstrated overall agreement with the presence of the effective school factors. Eight schools or eighty-nine percent (89%) of the population were neutral in their responses to the survey as a whole. This finding required further disaggregation of the data. Tables 12 through 19 further delineated the study findings through the use of individual school profiles. Each school's mean scores were calculated for the seven effective school factors.

In Table 12 school A1 displayed agreement only on the administrative or instructional leadership factor. This school also disagreed with one factor. The respondents did not perceive their school as having a safe and orderly environment. All other factors were ranked in the neither agree not disagree category. This would indicate that the school was perceived to have a strong instructional leader

without an effective plan for safety and discipline within the school.

Table 12

Individual School Profile School A1

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.65	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.08	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.85	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.10	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	2.41	Disagree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	2.90	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(7) Time for Instruction	3.02	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Total Mean Score	3.00	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

School A2 displayed a school profile that indicated general agreement with the statements in the survey. The respondents agreed with the presence of all the



factors except the one related to the expectations and evaluations of students (Table 13). This finding would indicate that all the characteristics of an effective school were present, but the overall expectations for achievement were perceived as low by the respondents. This was the only school in the study that generally agreed with the presence of the effective school factors as a part of their restructuring efforts.

Table 13

Individual School Profile School A2

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.83	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.52	Agree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.15	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instruction	3.87	Agree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.52	Agree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	4.04	Agree
(7) Time for Instruction	4.01	Agree
Total Mean Score	3.56	Agree

School A3 (Table 14) demonstrated the lowest total mean score at 2.79. Five of the seven factors were rated in the neither agree nor disagree category. Two factors were rated

in the disagree category. Neither the factor related to expectations and evaluations of students nor the factor related to time for instruction were perceived by the respondents to be present at this site.

Table 14

Individual School Profile School A3

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.25	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(2) Emphasis or Achievement or Commitment	2.75	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.40	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.27	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	2.56	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	2.92	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(7) Time for Instruction	2.39	Disagree
Total Mean Score	2.79	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

The individual school profile of A4 displayed

five of the seven effective school factors in the neither agree nor disagree category. The factor related to the expectations and evaluations of students was ranked at the disagree level. In addition the factor related to maintaining a safe and orderly environment was ranked as having general agreement (Table 15).

Table 15

Individual School Profile School A4

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.39	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.15	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	1.98	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.49	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.91	Agree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	3.13	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(7) Time for Instruction	3.15	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Total Mean Score	3.17	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

School A5 rated five of the seven effective school factors in the neither agree nor disagree category. Two factors were perceived as not being a part of the description of this school. They were: 1) expectation and evaluations of students and 2) a safe and orderly environment. This school did not demonstrate agreement with the statements from the questionnaire (Table 16).

Table 16

Individual School Profile School A5

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.25	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.25	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.06	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.19	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	2.49	Disagree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	2.76	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(7) Time for Instruction	2.80	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

Table 16 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
Total Mean Score	2.83	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

In school district B the first school (B1) rated three of the seven factors in the neither agree nor disagree category. There was general agreement on three of the factors. They were: 1) administrative or instructional leadership, 2) the use of test data to evaluate instructional programs, and 3) grouping for instruction. The one factor which was rated in the disagree category was the expectations and evaluations of students (Table 17).

Table 17

Individual School Profile School B1

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.78	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.48	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluation of Students	2.18	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.94	Agree

Table 17 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.41	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	3.55	Agree
(7) Time for Instruction	2.87	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Total Mean Score	3.32	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

School B2 (Table 18) demonstrated general agreement on four of the seven factors. They were: 1) administrative or instructional leadership, 2) the use of test data to evaluate instructional programs, 3) a safe and orderly environment and 4) grouping for instruction. The factor related to the expectations and evaluations of students was rated as generally disagreed with by the respondents at this school. The remaining two factors were rated in the neither agree nor disagree category. Although the total mean score for this school ranked in the neither agree nor disagree category with a 3.36 score, four of the seven factors received general agreement. This indicated the presence of a majority of the effective school factors.

Table 18

Individual School Profile School B2

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.76	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.23	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.20	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.66	Agree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.91	Agree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	3.55	Agree
(7) Time for Instruction	3.24	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Total Mean Score	3.36	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

School B3 received general agreement on the perceived presence of three of the effective school factors. They were: 1) administrative or instructional leadership, 2) the use of test data to evaluate instructional programs, and 3) a safe and orderly environment (Table 19). The one factor that received general disagreement was related to expectations and evaluations of students. The remaining three factors were ranked in the neither agree nor disagree

category.

Table 19

Individual School Profile School B3

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.59	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.40	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluations of Students	2.14	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.78	Agree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.71	Agree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	3.43	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(7) Time for Instruction	3.33	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Total Mean Score	3.34	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

The final individual school profile displayed general agreement on five of the seven factors (Table 20). The factors rated agree were 1) administrative or instructional leadership, 2) the use of test data to evaluate the instructional program, 3) a safe and orderly environment, 4) grouping for instruction, and 5) time for instruction. The



one factor that was perceived as not being present at this school site was expectations and evaluations of students. Although the total mean score was 3.39 which indicated neither agreement nor disagreement with the statements on the survey, the majority of the factors or seventy-one percent (71%) were rated in the generally agree category.

Table 20

Individual School Profile School B4

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>	<u>Rating</u>
(1) Administrative or Instructional Leadership	3.66	Agree
(2) Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment	3.32	Neither Agree Nor Disagree
(3) Expectations and Evaluation of Students	2.26	Disagree
(4) Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Program	3.56	Agree
(5) Safe and Orderly Environment	3.76	Agree
(6) Grouping for Instruction	3.66	Agree
(7) Time for Instruction	3.52	Agree
Total Mean Score	3.39	Neither Agree Nor Disagree

The specific objectives of this study were: 1) to determine if the effective school correlates were present in the mandated restructuring efforts of the selected urban

elementary schools; 2) to determine which if any of the effective school characteristics were emphasized in the targeted schools; 3) to determine if any common patterns existed in the perceived presence of the effective school factors in the elementary schools under study.

The previously discussed findings and tables demonstrated that a range of between one and six of the effective school factors were present in eight of the schools. Schools A2 and B4 demonstrated the most general agreement that the effective school factors were present in their schools as restructuring efforts were implemented. School A5 indicated general disagreement with the presence of the effective school factors in the description of their school.

To determine which if any of the effective school factors or characteristics were emphasized in the schools the mean scores of the survey statements relating to each factor were calculated for each school. The sixty item questionnaire contained eighteen questions related to administrative or instructional leadership. Eight items related to the emphasis on achievement or commitment. A total of seven survey statements related to the expectations and evaluations of students. Eight survey statements related to the use of test data to evaluate the instructional program. A total of ten survey statements related to maintaining a safe and orderly environment. Four

items on the questionnaire focused on grouping for instructional purposes. Lastly, four survey statements focused on time for instruction which completed the sixty item questionnaire. Thus, a total of sixteen thousand eight hundred sixty responses were fielded from two hundred eighty-one respondents.

In order to determine which if any of the effective school characteristics were emphasized, each of the seven effective school factors were displayed and discussed in the Tables that follow.

#### **Administrative or Instructional Leadership**

Responses to those statements designed to determine if the focus of the school was on instructional related behavior as opposed to management oriented activities reflected general agreement with six of the nine schools indicating a mean score in the agree category. The remaining three schools indicated neither agreement nor disagreement with the statements related to administrative or instructional leadership. None of the schools disagreed or strongly disagreed with the survey statements related to this factor (See Table 21).

Table 21

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to  
Administrative or Instructional Leadership

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 1</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	3.65	Agree
A2	3.83	Agree
A3	3.25	Neither
A4	3.39	Neither
A5	3.25	Neither
B1	3.78	Agree
B2	3.76	Agree
B3	3.59	Agree
B4	3.66	Agree

Total Survey Items 18

Q15, Q16, Q17, Q21, Q22, Q23, Q24, Q27, Q28, Q39, Q39, Q40,  
Q41, Q42, Q44, Q45, Q46, Q51

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor  
Disagree

**Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment**

This factor was related to the school's commitment that all students will learn well with particular emphasis on the basic skills. The respondents were asked to rank their school on five common goals which effect higher student achievement. The goals were: 1) preparing students for future change, 2) having students master basic skills, 3) emphasizing different ability levels among students, 4) producing good citizens, and 5) developing students' critical thinking skills. Table 21 indicated that only one school in the sample agreed that this factor was present in

their school. The other eight schools surveyed demonstrated mean scores in the neither agree nor disagree category. The general indication was that the five common goals focused on in this factor were not present in these sites.

Table 22

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 2</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	3.08	Neither
A2	3.52	Agree
A3	2.75	Neither
A4	3.15	Neither
A5	3.25	Neither
B1	3.48	Neither
B2	3.24	Neither
B3	3.4	Neither
B4	3.32	Neither

Total Survey Items 8

Q8, Q9, Q10, Q11, Q13, Q14, Q18, Q19

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

Expectations and Evaluations of Students

The survey statements related to this factor determined the extent to which professional staff actually expect their students to learn and believe their students have the ability to learn. The intent of the survey statements was to determine whether the respondents were committed to producing high achievement for all students. As Table 23

displayed eight of the nine schools surveyed indicated disagreement with the statements related to the expectation that all students have the ability to learn. One school neither agreed nor disagreed with the survey statements for this factor. This is significant since it was the only factor which was rated consistently low at each site and across both school districts.

Table 23

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Expectations and Evaluations of Students

---

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 3</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	2.85	Neither
A2	2.15	Disagree
A3	2.40	Disagree
A4	1.98	Disagree
A5	2.06	Disagree
B1	2.18	Disagree
B2	2.20	Disagree
B3	2.14	Disagree
B4	2.26	Disagree

---

Total Survey Items 7

Q2, Q3, Q4, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q12

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

---

Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instruction Programs

This factor determined the effective use of assessment data. It included continuing diagnosis, feedback, and monitoring of student progress as well as collecting

schoolwide data used to evaluate and improve the instructional program. Five of the nine schools agreed that test data was being utilized to monitor and evaluate student progress and the instructional program. The remaining four schools neither agreed nor disagreed that test data was being utilized in their schools to evaluate the instructional program.

Table 24

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to the Use of Test Data To Evaluate the Instructional Program

---

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 4</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	3.10	Neither
A2	3.87	Agree
A3	3.27	Neither
A4	3.49	Neither
A5	3.19	Neither
B1	3.94	Agree
B2	3.66	Agree
B3	3.78	Agree
B4	3.56	Agree

---

Total Survey Items 8

Q25, Q26, Q31, Q32, Q34, Q35, Q37, Q49

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

---

**Safe and Orderly Environment**

This factor referred to the maintenance of an orderly work-oriented school environment with clearly defined

classroom discipline. The responsibility for this business-like but friendly school climate is viewed as shared by staff, students, parents and the community. As displayed in Table 25, five of the nine schools agreed that a safe and orderly environment described their site. Two of the schools disagreed and, therefore, perceived their sites as not maintaining a safe and orderly environment. The last two sites were split on this factor as indicated by the neither agree nor disagree score.

Table 25

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to a Safe and Orderly Environment

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 5</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	2.41	Disagree
A2	3.52	Agree
A3	2.56	Neither
A4	3.91	Agree
A5	2.49	Disagree
B1	3.41	Neither
B2	3.91	Agree
B3	3.71	Agree
B4	3.76	Agree

Total Survey Items 10

Q20, Q29, Q30, Q33, Q36, Q43, Q48, Q50, Q52

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

Grouping for Instruction

This factor referred to the extent to which students



are selected and sorted into groups for instruction either between or within classes. The survey was developed and scored so that more groupings and tracking was negative. This negative effect was more pronounced on students in the average or low achievement groups.

As indicated in Table 26, four schools surveyed responded that grouping for instruction was accomplished appropriately. The other five schools neither agreed nor disagreed with the survey statements related to the extent of tracking or grouping of students in their sites.

Table 26

Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to Grouping for Instruction

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 6</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	2.90	Neither
A2	4.04	Agree
A3	2.92	Neither
A4	3.13	Neither
A5	2.76	Neither
B1	3.55	Agree
B2	3.55	Agree
B3	3.43	Neither
B4	3.66	Agree

Total Survey Items 4

Q53, Q54, Q55, Q56

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

### Time for Instruction

The factor related to time for instruction referred to academic engaged time or time-on-task. The survey statements indicated that the higher the time-on-task, the higher the student achievement. Two schools responded that the time for instruction was being utilized effectively. One school disagreed with the use of instructional time while the majority of schools (6) neither agreed nor disagreed with the amount of time for instructional purposes (See Table 27).

Table 27

#### Mean Scores by School of Survey Statements Related to Time for Instruction

<u>School</u>	<u>Mean Score Factor 7</u>	<u>Rating of Response</u>
A1	3.02	Neither
A2	4.01	Agree
A3	2.39	Disagree
A4	3.15	Neither
A5	2.80	Neither
B1	2.87	Neither
B2	3.24	Neither
B3	3.33	Neither
B4	3.52	Agree

Total Survey Items 4

Q56, Q58, Q59, Q60

Neither rating indicates a response of Neither Agree Nor Disagree

---

Overall a school's survey score on an effective school

factor indicated the emphasis or importance of the factor in the school. The seven factors generally were not distinguishable in the sense that one was emphasized more than another. However, factor three which referred to the expectations and evaluations of students was not emphasized in the study population. In general the respondents perceived their schools as not having high expectations for students or as not having an inherent belief that all students could achieve. Since the underlying purpose of restructuring was improvement of achievement for all students, this finding indicated a negative effect on the overall achievement of students.

The third specific objective of this study was to determine if any common patterns existed in the presence of the effective school factors in the selected elementary schools. An item analysis was calculated for each of the seven effective school factors to detect if a pattern of response existed in the study.

Table 28 displayed the distribution of responses in percentages of the factor related to administrative or instructional leadership.

The following statement on the survey gathered the most positive feedback within this factor:

41. The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for faculty.

Fifty percent (50%) of the two hundred eighty-one respondents indicated that they strongly agree with the above statement.

The statement that follows gathered thirty-five percent (35%) in the neither agree nor disagree category:

17. The principal praises teachers who don't send many students to his/her office.

The next statement yielded the most disagreement:

24. Instructional issues are seldom the focus of faculty meetings.

Statement seventeen was reversed in the scoring to indicate a positive response in the disagree categories.

Table 28

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of  
Factor 1

Factor 1 Administrative or Instructional Leadership Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15	3	4	17	41	34
16	5	13	20	43	19
17	6	9	35	27	23
21	23	49	18	5	4
22	10	37	23	23	5
23	46	43	7	1	2
24	6	7	11	39	36
27	12	35	33	13	6
28	36	42	11	4	5
38	29	50	12	6	2
39	15	39	28	14	2
40	21	46	21	10	2
41	50	36	8	3	2
42	28	51	15	5	0
44	41	43	10	3	4
45	20	53	22	2	1
46	30	52	9	6	4
51	48	34	9	4	3

The second factor which was related to the emphasis on achievement or commitment was displayed in Table 29. The following statement yielded a forty-five percent (45%) agreement of the survey respondents:

10. All staff in your school clearly understand their responsibility for basic skill achievement.

If both the strongly agree and agree categories were

combined the following statement yielded eight-six percent (86%) agreement:

9. The students in your school are told what objectives they are expected to learn.

The survey statement that yielded the most disagreement was:

13. All teachers in your building care about is "getting by" and picking up their checks.

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the respondents strongly disagreed with the above statement. Statement 13 was reversed in the scoring to indicate a positive response in the disagree categories. In addition fifty-one percent (51%) of the respondents indicated in statement eight that the priority of basic skills achievement in their school had greatly decreased over the last few years.

Table 29

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of  
Factor 2

Factor 2 Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8	5	4	6	31	51
9	44	42	8	2	3
10	45	39	6	6	2
11	41	39	12	4	4
13	2	1	7	31	58
14	40	36	13	8	3
18	32	40	14	11	3
19	5	8	18	47	23

Items 8, 13, 14 were reversed to calculate the factor scores.

The factor related to expectations and evaluations of students indicated the most general disagreement of all the factors under consideration with two items yielding zero percent in the positive response category.

The one question which gathered the most negative response was:

7. What percent of the students in your school do you feel are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives?

Thirty-five (35%) percent of the respondents indicated that less than thirty percent (30%) of the students were

capable of mastering the grade level objectives while fifty-two (52%) percent of the respondents indicated that between thirty and forty-nine percent (30%-49%) were capable.

Question four of this same factor indicated that fifty-five percent (55%) or just over half the respondents believe that fifty to sixty-nine percent (50%-69%) of the students are able to master basic reading and math skills (See Table 30).

Table 30

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 3

Factor 3 Expectations and Evaluations of Students Distribution in PERCENTAGES						
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
2	4	22	55	16	2	
3	2	12	15	51	20	
4	1	2	19	60	18	
5	2	15	46	25	11	
6	0	1	16	53	30	
7	0	1	12	52	35	
12	2	5	10	37	45	

The factor related to the use of test data to evaluate the instructional program yielded strong agreement on the following statement:

34. Multiple assessment methods are used to assess



student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery check lists, etc.)

Thirty-six percent (36%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement above. In addition forty-nine percent (49%) indicated that they agreed with the statement.

Since survey item thirty-two (32) was reversed in the scoring to indicate a favorable factor, the statement that yielded the most disagreement was the following:

31. The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in your school.

Thirty-five percent (35%) of the respondents disagreed and fourteen percent (14%) strongly disagreed (See Table 31).

Table 31

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of  
Factor 4

Factor 4 Use of Test Data to Evaluate the Instructional Program Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25	25	40	27	5	2
26	31	51	11	6	1
31	4	23	23	35	14
32	1	5	11	48	33
34	36	49	8	5	1
35	29	47	17	4	1
37	20	52	20	6	1
49	30	43	10	12	4

Item 32 was reversed to calculate the factor score.

The factor that described a safe and orderly environment yielded the most agreement on the following survey statement:

50. Class atmosphere in your school is generally very conducive to learning for all students.

The strongly agree and agree rating had a combined percent of seventy-four (74%) of the respondents.

The following statement gathered the most disagreement in this category:

52. Discipline is not an issue in your school.

The disagree and strongly disagree ratings yielded a

combined percent of sixty-three percent (63%) of the respondents (See Table 32).

Table 32

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 5

Factor 5 Safe and Orderly Environment Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
20	27	38	14	12	8
29	12	35	21	21	11
30	23	37	19	16	4
33	29	33	12	13	12
36	13	41	16	17	12
43	29	31	13	14	12
47	11	49	15	13	12
48	6	50	19	12	12
50	28	46	10	11	4
52	6	16	12	37	26

The item analysis for the factor related to grouping for instruction was detailed in Table 33. The following statement received the most agreement:

53. All students are heterogeneously grouped within the classrooms with regard to basic skill level.

Twenty percent (20%) of the respondents strongly agreed and forty percent (40%) agreed with the statement above.

Survey statement number fifty-five yielded forty-three percent (43%) of the respondents neither agreeing nor

disagreeing. This survey statement was:

55. When students are homogeneously grouped in classrooms the groups are changed frequently to prevent labeling.

To summarize Table 33 indicated there was under seven percent (7%) disagreement with any of the statements related to the grouping for instruction factor.

Table 33

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 6

Factor 6 Grouping for Instruction Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
53	20	44	16	14	4
54	19	36	28	11	4
55	8	23	43	15	6
56	14	34	27	17	4

The final factor was related to time for instruction. The survey statement which yielded the most agreement was the following:

59. This school has an effective program to maintain a high level of student attendance.

Sixty percent (60%) of the respondents either strongly

agreed or agreed with the statement above. The survey item that gathered almost as much agreement (44%) as disagreement (38%) was statement fifty-seven as follows:

57. Less than five minutes of instruction time is lost as a result of noise, announcements, discipline, and/or organizational activities per hour.

The survey statement below yielded thirty-eight percent (38%) of the respondents neither agreeing nor disagreeing (See Table 34).

60. If students are pulled out of classroom for special instruction it always increases the total time.

Table 34

Item Analysis: Distribution of Responses in Percentages of Factor 7

Factor 7 Time for Instruction Distribution in PERCENTAGES					
Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
57	16	28	13	23	15
58	12	35	33	14	1
59	15	45	20	14	2
60	4	28	38	19	5

Data were also collected to determine if differences existed between the mean scores of the questionnaire

completed by all the professional staff members and the principal(s) in each of the schools. Table 35 displayed the calculated results. School B1 did not provide an administrative respondent. In the other eight sites the general difference was positive with most principals indicating with a varying amount of certainty that the effective school factors were present. The more positive scores ranged from +.17 to +1.79. In three schools the principal(s) was in less agreement with the presence of the factors.

Table 35

Difference in Mean Scores of the Questionnaire Between Professional Staff and Principal(s)

School	Staff	Principal(s)	Difference
A1	3.00	2.80	-0.20
A2	3.56	3.73	+0.17
A3	2.79	3.48	+1.79
A4	3.17	3.42	+0.25
A5	2.83	3.17	+0.34
B1	3.32	No Respondents	0
B2	3.36	3.59	+0.23
B3	3.34	3.13	-0.21
B4	3.39	3.24	-0.15

### Interview Data

Of the two hundred eighty-one survey respondents, nine professional staff members were randomly selected by the individual district contact to be interviewed. Each district contact person utilized a random table of numbers

to select an individual from each of the nine schools that returned surveys.

Eight specific questions served as a guide to the interview with other comments being noted. The questions were open-ended to allow the respondent to react without any constraints on the reaction. Open-ended questions also allowed for unexpected responses or comments which revealed other significant information.

Each of the nine interviews was transcribed for accurate reporting of the respondents comments. The responses were analyzed, compared and synthesized into summary concepts. Direct quotes from the respondents supported each summarized statement. This section was organized and reported by each of the eight interview questions.

#### Interview Question 1:

What restructuring activities have you been a part of in the last two years?

Summary Response:

All of the respondents had served on one of the committees, councils, or leadership teams either at their campus or at the district level. Some were appointed to one of these positions by their principal and others volunteered. The district A instructional leadership team had provided participants with a stipend the first year. However, due to budget restraints, the stipend was

eliminated. The respondent from this team reported that all participants attended even after this practice of compensating them discontinued.

Supporting Quotes:

...I was appointed to the campus advisory council.

...I was on the instructional leadership team at our campus and later I became a representative on the district team. The stipend was removed but everyone still attends. We are trying to become more of a decision making body not just there to disseminate information to the campuses.

...I have been on the team for three years. This year we are utilizing a structure of families at our school. We are in teams across grade levels.

...I was on the campus team.

Interview Question 2:

How are the students grouped for instruction in your school? (Grouping for Instruction)

Summary Response:

The majority of respondents indicated that heterogeneous groups were utilized to determine classes at each grade level. However, students were grouped homogeneously for the delivery of instruction in the basic skill areas such as reading and math. Many of the respondents indicated that these homogeneous groups were determined not by student ability but by actual student performance. When student performance was further explained it was equated with ability grouping in each instance.



### Supporting Quotes:

...Students are heterogeneously grouped for homeroom, but grouped based on performance for other subjects like reading and math. Performance groups are ability groups. That is what they are actually doing.

...We have family groups that are heterogeneously grouped. In some cases two teachers get together and one teaches math and science and the other teaches reading and language. We have performance groups. They really are ability grouped. One-half of the students have music and art the other half stay for English. The students are homogeneously grouped for English class. Therefore, the art and music class is also homogeneously grouped.

...We are heterogeneously grouped but we do have reading groups.

...We have regular grade levels but we have homogeneous groups for reading and the slow math students are grouped to help them. I don't do any cross-grade level things except if a student can't do reading in grade 3, we do send him to grade 2 for instruction.

### Interview Question 3:

How does or should the principal help to improve instruction in the school? (Administrative or Instructional Leadership)

#### Summary Response:

Eight of the respondents indicated that instructional leader was the preferred role of the principal. Each indicated that in most cases this was not possible due to the amount of managerial tasks assigned to the principal daily.

One of the interviewees refused to respond to this question. She indicated that it may reflect on her and her principal may find out even though complete anonymity was promised.

### Supporting Quotes:

...The principal should be the instructional leader, however, this is not always possible. Our principal is trying more this year. He is helping teachers to get materials and things that they need.

...The principal is trying to get into the classroom. Last year she didn't. This year she is making suggestions to teachers for staff development and she is much more visible in the hallways and classrooms. She is trying to get out of her office.

...Our principal is not an instructional leader. There is too much other administrative stuff to do. She is the chairman of our campus. Instructional Leadership Team.

...I won't respond.

### Interview Question 4:

How often do you use test data to evaluate instruction?

(Use of Test Data to Evaluate the Instructional Program)

### Summary Response:

All of the respondents indicated that the Texas State Testing Program was the criterion used to determine achievement. Since schools and school districts were being compared across the state, these tests were considered very important. No mention was made of standardized achievement or aptitude tests. Checklists and other alternate forms of assessment were also never mentioned.

The state testing program mandated testing once per year at specific grade levels. All respondents indicated that they received printouts which contained these results. The main focus was to improve these test results.

Supporting Quotes:

...We use to look at our test data at least yearly and sometimes twice a year. Now we test weekly on specific objectives. We then retest a couple weeks later. The test is recursive.

...We test at the classroom level weekly. At the district level we look at our test scores twice per year when our state results come.

...The test data we look at is the TAS (Texas State Test). Each teacher gets a printout of scores. District test data as a whole is very important.

...We test whenever its required by the state. The scores come to the school.

Interview Question 5:

How is disciplined handled in your school? (Safe and Orderly Environment)

Summary Response:

Each respondent indicated that a discipline plan existed in their school. The plans ranged from flexible to a structured behavioral modification program. All respondents indicated that the district had a discipline plan or program. Each interviewee mentioned the district, campus, and classroom plans as being a comprehensive framework for the discipline of students.

Supporting Quotes:

...Our campus has a discipline management plan that is behavioral modification. It has some positive rewards and some punitive measures. We are just getting involved with the Koality Program.

...We are a quality school. We have an incentive program for rewarding extraordinary behavior. We have a developed plan that has first a warning then a second warning and finally sent to the principal.

...We have a plan at the campus level and each teacher has their own discipline plan. We also have a discipline committee made up of administrators, teachers and parents. We try to be flexible enough to deal with all the cases on an individual basis.

...There is a district discipline program, a campus plan and each teacher also has a plan.

#### Interview Question 6:

How often is instructional time interrupted in a given day? (Time for Instruction)

Summary Response:

All of the respondents indicated that instructional time was protected from interruptions at their school. Each response identified a time for general announcements with emergency announcements as the only other interruptions.

Supporting Quotes:

...There is one announcement in the morning and then typically only in emergency situations would there be more.

...Not much. There are announcements for three or four minutes at the start of the day. There are telephones in our rooms which is great.

...Announcements are in the morning only. During core subject area teaching, there are no interruptions.

...There are announcements fifteen minutes before school.

#### Interview Question 7:

How well do you expect the students in your school to perform? (Expectations and Evaluations of Students)

Summary Response:

There was a full range of responses to this question. Several interviewees indicated expectations were low especially for minority students. One respondent noted that

expectations were average. One respondent indicated that high expectations were an integral part of their school.

Supporting Quotes:

...The expectations in our school are average. We are expecting about seventy percent (70%) to reach mastery.

...We have very high standards even though we have forty percent (40%) minority students. We maintain goals and expect ninety-five (95%) of our students to pass these goals.

...Our standards in schools across the country are not high enough especially for our minority kids.

...Our students make great advances for the level they come in. Their level is so low because of where they come from. This year we have had to bring in child protective services. We had drive-by shootings and fighting in the neighborhoods.

Interview Question 8:

How has the emphasis on achievement in your school changed over the last few years? (Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment)

Summary Response:

The response to this question tended to be related to the state mandated testing program. There was no mention of a school based emphasis on achievement. It appeared that achievement was in direct correlation with the results of the Texas State tests.

Supporting Quotes:

...The emphasis on achievement has increased since the state report card has been developed which lists attendance and state test scores for everyone to see. Our district surpassed state average on the tests.

...People are trying to do better things like critical thinking, etc. but people are still tied to basal readers and the teachers manual. Before things can change we need

to get teachers in our system who should be teachers, not just people who can't do anything else.

...I don't know if the emphasis is any different.

...There is a stronger emphasis on achievement. That has positives and negatives. We worry too much on state testing not about if kids are really learning.

### **Analysis and Implications**

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceived presence of the effective school correlates in the mandated restructuring of selected urban elementary schools in the state of Texas. The primary focus was to obtain a snapshot view of the restructuring process as it related to the effective school correlates. The specific objectives of the study were:

1. to determine if the effective school correlates were present in the mandated restructuring efforts of the selected urban elementary schools;
2. to determine which if any of the effective school correlates or characteristics were emphasized in the selected urban elementary schools;
3. to determine if there were any patterns in the perceived presence of the correlates common to the elementary schools in the targeted sample.

The survey scores and the interview responses demonstrated the presence of the effective school correlates in isolated instances across all the elementary schools in this study. However, only school A2 registered general agreement that the effective school components were a part

of their restructuring efforts.

The Texas mandate of site-based management and shared decision making seemed to be viewed as directly related to the Texas State tests rather than school improvement in general. The general focus of the schools' efforts clearly pointed to the raising of these scores. Student achievement in general was equated with scores on state tests given one day per year.

The results indicated a range of the mean scores of the questionnaire between 3.56 and 2.79 with the mean of all the questionnaires being 3.195. This indicated that the respondents in general did not agree or disagree that the effective school correlates were present. The interviews supported this finding. The interviewees in general focused on the results of the state test and did not emphasize the school correlates as a means to improve scores.

The individual school profiles provided a snapshot view of each of the elementary schools in this study. Once again only one school (A2) demonstrated agreement on all but one of the correlates. School A3 did not agree with the presence of even one of the correlates. School A4 agreed that one of the correlates was present. School A5 did not display any agreement with the presence of the effective school correlates at their site. School B1 agreed that three of the seven correlates were present. School B2 agreed that four of the characteristics of an effective

school were present at their campus. School B3 agreed that three of the correlates described their school. School B4 agreed that five of the correlates were present at their school.

These findings demonstrated that a range of between one and six of the effective school correlates were present in eight of the schools. Schools A2 and B4 demonstrated the most general agreement that the effective school factors were present in their schools as restructuring efforts were implemented. School A5 indicated general disagreement with the presence of the effective school factors in the description of their school.

The data collected to determine which if any of the effective school correlates or characteristics were emphasized demonstrated interesting findings. Each of the effective school factors was analyzed separately. Six of the nine schools surveyed or sixty-seven percent (67%) agreed that their schools had a strong instructional leader. The interviews did not support this finding. It was generally stated that instructional leadership was a goal that was not yet attainable due to the amount of managerial tasks assigned to the principal.

Factor two related to the emphasis on achievement or commitment. It was present or emphasized at only one school. The interview findings supported this in that achievement was equated with passing the state test or



raising the scores on the state test. Other achievement concerns or issues were not mentioned during the interview sessions.

Factor three related to the expectations and evaluations of students. This factor was the only one that demonstrated overall disagreement in eight of the nine schools or eighty-nine percent (89%). The ninth school responded in the neither agree nor disagree category. This was the most pronounced finding of the study. Even though schools were setting standards to improve scores on the state tests, most teachers indicated that they did not believe all students were capable of achieving the goals. For the purposes of this study, it was recognized that this singular effective school correlate received the strongest adverse rating and comments by interviewees.

Factor four related to the use of test data to evaluate the instructional program received agreement by five of the schools. However, the interviews indicated that the results utilized in most instances were the Texas state testing printouts. Daily, weekly or monthly comparisons of information or data from checklists, criterion-referenced tests, achievement tests, or portfolios were only mentioned by one respondent.

Factor five related to a safe and orderly environment received agreement in five of the nine schools. One of the schools disagreed a safe and orderly environment described

their school. In each of the interviews discipline plans were described as well-developed from the district, campus, and classroom perspective. The implementation of these plans seemed to be the problem in some instances.

Factor six related to the grouping practices for instructional programs of the schools. Four of the nine schools or forty-four percent (44%) agreed that grouping practices at their schools were appropriate. The other five schools indicated neither agreement nor disagreement with the appropriateness of the groupings in their schools. In the interviews it was obvious that the schools were grouping for instructional purposes in every site. There was an attempt made to group into performance groups rather than ability groups. The distinction being actual student performance versus scores on an aptitude test. However, as interviewees explained the groups each indicated that performance groups were really ability groups. The interview respondents also stated that this was helpful to the learning process. It is apparent that the negative aspects of grouping were present in the schools targeted for study. Therefore, this factor was not emphasized in a positive sense.

Factor seven related to time for instruction or time-on-task. Only two schools agreed that this factor was emphasized at their school. One school disagreed that instructional time was protected at their campus. The other

seven schools were neutral in their responses to this factor. The interviewees equated time for instruction as solely related to morning announcements rather than the protection of instructional time in general. The interviews did not support the survey findings for this factor. Since the focus of the survey items was broader than just interruptions by announcements and the interviewees focused merely on announcements, a discrepancy between the responses existed.

The findings indicated the absence of two of the effective school correlates. The correlates which received the greatest disagreement were related to:

1. the expectations and evaluations of students;
2. the emphasis on achievement or commitment.

The findings supported an emphasis on administrative or instructional leadership. The survey results demonstrated the most agreement in this area. The interview responses indicated that this was a major goal at each school despite the apparent managerial obstacles.

The third objective of this study was to determine any patterns in the data that might describe the schools. An item analysis was completed for this purpose.

The survey statement which received the most positive responses overall was item number forty-one with fifty percent (50%) strong agreement:

41. The principal is very active in securing

resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for faculty.

The survey statement which received agreement from fifty-three percent (53%) of the respondents was item forty-five:

45. Supervision is directed at instruction.

The survey statement which received the most responses (55%) in the neither agree nor disagree category or neutral area was item number 2:

2. How would you rate the academic ability of students in your school compared to students in other schools?

Response: Ability here is about average.

The survey question which received the most disagreement (60%) was item number four related to the expectations of students:

4. What percent of the students in your school do the teachers generally believe are able to master the basic reading/math skills? Response: 30%-49%.

The survey item which produced the strongest negative response on the survey was number seven:

7. What percent of the students in your school do you feel are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives? Response: Less than 30%.

These findings compared to the areas or correlates that were emphasized or not present in the data previously presented. The correlate related to administrative or

instructional leadership provided the most positive feedback in the strongly agree and agree category. This could be due in part to the fear of repercussions of the professional staff members in some instances. This became evident when one of the nine interviewees refused to respond to any questions about the principalship in general or her principal specifically.

It was obvious in the analysis of survey data and interviews that the school districts in Texas were responding to two state initiatives:

1. the site-based management and shared decision making legislation;
2. the Texas state testing program and state report card.

These two state initiatives were the focus of the restructuring efforts at each of the schools. It was difficult to ascertain what, if any, foundation these efforts were based upon. It was clear that most schools had not incorporated the effective school correlates. It was also evident that if the correlates were incorporated into the restructuring plans it was not a conscious effort by the school to include them. The main concern was compliance with the predescribed state mandates. It was apparent that state comparisons of test data was the driving force in all aspects of the school setting.

Although shared decision making and site-based

management are intended to be bottom-up strategies for school improvement, it was evident that in this case the opposite was true. The mandates were issued from a top-down perspective with overall compliance being the only goal.

The most obvious finding of this study was the indication that most professional staff members did not believe that their students were capable of mastering even the basic skill areas. Since school improvement or academic improvement should be based first on the inherent belief that all students can learn given the proper support and instruction, this finding was most alarming. It points further to the focus on the state assessment program. Teachers may believe that students cannot master the necessary skills because they do not score well on these particular tests. As one of the interviewees stated, "We worry too much on state testing, not about if kids are really learning."

This study described the perceived presence of the effective school correlates in the mandated restructuring of selected urban elementary schools in the state of Texas. The overall findings did not support the presence of these correlates as it related to the restructuring efforts. There did exist some indication that the factors were present but these cases were isolated. Only one of the nine targeted schools generated data that supported the presence of the effective school factors. The emphasis was found to

be negative in that the factor most generally agreed upon was related to not having high expectations for all students. The only patterns found were the overall agreement in the area of instructional leadership and the general disagreement related to the expectations and evaluations of students.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### **Summary of the Study**

School improvement or school reform is not a new idea. However, due to increasing public awareness of the problems and concerns that describe urban education, school improvement has become a national outcry. The effective schools movement began in 1966 and has been refined over the past twenty-five years. It has been a benchmark utilized to improve urban schools. A more recent school improvement movement is restructuring. The goal of restructuring is a redesigned educational system where each community develops its own most appropriate learning environment.

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceived presence of the effective school correlates or factors in the mandated restructuring of selected urban elementary schools in Texas.

Specific objectives of this study were:

1. to determine if the effective school correlates were present in the mandated restructuring efforts of the selected urban elementary schools;
2. to determine which if any of the effective school



correlates or characteristics were emphasized in the targeted schools;

3. to determine if there were any patterns in the perceived presence of the correlates common to the elementary schools in the sample population.

To obtain the necessary data a two-step procedure was utilized. First, the sixty item School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument was sent to five schools in each of two Texas urban school districts. This survey was administered to professional staff members at each site. Each survey item was related to one of the seven effective school correlates. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree to the fifty-one statements on a Likert-type scale. In addition the first eight questions required each respondent to make judgements about their school on a scale of varying intensity which corresponded to the format described above. Two hundred eighty-one surveys were utilized for the compilation of data.

Mean scores of the questionnaire were calculated by school to determine the presence of the correlates. Since each item clustered specifically to one of the seven effective school correlates, the mean scores for each correlate were determined. These findings sought to indicate those correlates within the total concept of effective schools that were emphasized. To determine any commonalities in the responses of the schools, an item

analysis for each correlate was compiled.

In the second step of the investigation, nine interviews were conducted and analyzed qualitatively. The interview responses were summarized and compared to the survey findings. Common findings were cited which led to overriding conclusions.

### **Conclusions**

This study described the presence of the effective school correlates in the mandated restructuring efforts of selected urban elementary schools in Texas. It sought to provide a snapshot view of the restructuring process as it related to the effective school correlates and the data collected in the interviews.

1. The study findings did not support the presence of the correlates in the targeted schools.

Overall, there existed fragments of isolated factors or characteristics of effective schools. The driving force during this school restructuring period in Texas was the state mandates particularly those related to testing. Compliance with this legislation was the main focus.

2. The respondents indicated that in general they did not believe their students could master the basic skill areas.

The two dimensions of this included the extent to which teachers actually expected their students to learn and believed their students had the ability to learn.

3. The correlate related to administrative or instructional leadership provided the most positive feedback.

This finding was supported by the survey responses. The interview respondents indicated that this in part was due to the fear that the principal might discover how each teacher responded. It was also evident in the statement of the interviewees that principals in general were making strides in the area of instructional leadership.

4. A variable that may have skewed the outcome of this study was the strong emphasis on the state testing program mandated by the Texas legislature.

The fact that each individual school and school district were compared to each other across the state of Texas, may have unduly influenced this study. The emphasis on these tests and the comparisons made may have affected the respondents' answers to the survey. State tests were discussed frequently and by all persons interviewed during the interview sessions. Site-based management and the shared decision making process were never mentioned during the interviews. There did not appear to be a connection between the mandated restructuring efforts of site-based management and shared decision making and the process of educating students. These restructuring efforts were a part of what everyone was required to do but were not viewed as a process for continuous school improvement.

School improvement or reform is not a new idea. It had its beginnings in the effective schools movement which began in 1966. Since then many models of school improvement have been implemented each with their own promise of success. The problem of school reform is that each approach has tended to emphasize only one area of a complete educational statement. A complete educational statement has to include the four elements of teacher, learner, curriculum and setting. Educators need to think more multi-dimensional if real school improvement is to occur.

"A summit meeting needs to occur on all the major school reform models in an attempt to create a comprehensive multi-dimensional theory of education so that we can all see how all of these areas interconnect and interact to produce learning" (Lezotte in Sparks, 1993, p. 19).

This study demonstrated the need for a more comprehensive far-reaching school improvement model that integrated the best practices known to education thus far.

#### **Recommendations for Further Study**

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are presented for further study.

1. Replicate the study in other states that have mandated restructuring efforts as a way to improve urban elementary schools. The states of Kentucky and Florida along with Rochester, New York would provide the researcher with data related to this area.

2. Replicate the study in more urban elementary schools across the state of Texas so as to broaden the view of the restructuring efforts as related to the effective school correlates.

3. Do a comparative study of urban elementary schools which do not have state mandated restructuring and are involved in their own restructuring efforts to determine if the effective school correlates are present when restructuring is initiated from a bottom-up movement.

4. Replicate the study at a later date after restructuring efforts are more clearly developed and refined. This study-assessed perceptions of a relatively new concept in Texas.

5. Examine the underlying reasons for the low expectations and evaluations of students found in this study.

6. Study the effects of the restructuring efforts in Texas on the achievement of students and other variables related to academic achievement.

APPENDIX A

PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS

## Pilot Study Participants

Principal

Mr. Brian Ali  
Waukegan High School  
2325 Brookside  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

Director of Staff Development

Mrs. Ruby K. Payne  
Goose Creek Independent School District  
P.O. Drawer 30  
Bay Town, Texas 77522

Principal

Mr. Charles Clement  
McCall Elementary School  
3215 McAree  
Waukegan, Illinois 60087

Teacher

Ms. Nancy Johnson  
Greenwood Elementary School  
1919 North Avenue  
Waukegan, Illinois 60087

Principal

Ms. Sharon LaViolette  
Little Fort Elementary School  
1775 Blanchard  
Waukegan, Illinois 60087

Principal

Mr. Thomas O'Rourke  
Clearview Elementary School  
1700 Delaware Road  
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

APPENDIX B

LETTERS OF PERMISSION



## MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

---

URBAN AFFAIRS PROGRAMS  
OWEN GRADUATE CENTER

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1109

February 18, 1993

Ms. Sharon W. Kramer, Director  
Elementary Education  
Lincoln Center for Educational Services  
1201 North Sheridan Rd.  
Waukegan, IL 60085

Dear Ms. Kramer:

You have our permission to use our School Learning Climate  
Assessment Instrument in your research.

Best wishes,



Wilbur B. Brookover  
Professor Emeritus

/jfb

## MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

URBAN AFFAIRS PROGRAMS  
OWEN GRADUATE CENTER

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1109

September 9, 1993

Ms. Sharon V. Kramer  
Director of Elementary Education  
Waukegan Public Schools  
Lincoln Center for Educational Services  
1201 North Sheridan Road  
Waukegan, IL 60085

Dear Ms. Kramer:

I am pleased to know of the progress on your research. I will be interested in knowing of your findings.

You, of course, have permission to publish the survey in your dissertation, providing you give us appropriate credit.

Cordially yours,



Wilbur B. Brookover  
Professor Emeritus

WBB/ff

APPENDIX C

SCHOOL LEARNING CLIMATE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument

This instrument has been designed by staff of Michigan State University and the Pontiac City Schools to measure some aspects of the school environment which are known to be related to student learning. It is designed for the professional school staff to use in assessing the school learning climate. In answering the questions, please fill in the appropriate bubble on the answer sheet. Please answer all the questions, even if you are not sure of an answer. Your responses will not be identified with you in any way. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. In your judgment, how do teachers in other schools rate your school's level of academic achievement?

Among the best..... A

Slightly better than average..... B

About average..... C

Slightly lower than average..... D

Among the lowest..... E

2. How would you rate the academic ability of students in your school compared to students in other schools?

Ability here is much higher..... A

Ability here is somewhat higher.... B

Ability here is about average..... C

Ability here is somewhat lower.... D

Ability here is much lower..... E

3. How many teachers in your school believe that all their students have the ability to master grade level academic objectives?

Almost all the teachers..... A

Most of the teachers..... B

Half of the teachers..... C

Some of the teachers..... D

Almost none of the teachers..... E

-2-

4. What percent of the students in your school do the teachers generally believe are able to master the basic reading/math skills?

- 90% or more..... A
- 70% - 89%..... B
- 50% - 69%..... C
- 30% - 49%..... D
- Less than 30%..... E

5. On the average, how well do you expect the students in your school to perform?

- Much above national norm..... A
- Slightly above national norm..... B
- Approximately at national norm..... C
- Slightly below national norm..... D
- Much below national norm..... E

6. What percent of the students in your school do you expect to complete high school?

- 90% or more..... A
- 70% - 89%..... B
- 50% - 69%..... C
- 30% - 49%..... D
- Less than 30%..... E

7. What percent of the students in your school do you feel are capable of mastering grade level academic objectives?

- 90% or more..... A
- 70% - 89%..... B
- 50% - 69%..... C
- 30% - 49%..... D
- Less than 30%..... E

- 3 -

8. Has the priority of basic skills achievement in your school changed over the last few years?

Increased greatly..... A

Increased slightly..... B

Remained unchanged..... C

Decreased slightly..... D

Decreased greatly..... E

HERE IS A LIST OF STATEMENTS ABOUT TEACHERS AND TEACHING AND YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE INDICATE IF YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE WITH EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. The students in your school are told what objectives they are expected to learn...                    | A | B | C | D | E |
| 10. All Staff in your school clearly understand their responsibility for basic skill achievement...      | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. Your school has a strong feeling of "lets get things done," especially basic skills...               | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. Teachers feel that nothing they do makes any difference with regard to achievement in your school... | A | B | C | D | E |

- 4 -

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
13. All teachers in your building care about is "getting by" and picking up their checks...	A	B	C	D	E
14. Teachers in your building will do anything necessary to get all students to read and do math well...	A	B	C	D	E
15. In your school teachers are more likely to receive approval from the principal for being good disciplinarians than they are for being good instructors...	A	B	C	D	E
16. You are not likely to be considered a good teacher in your building if you don't get your paper work in on time...	A	B	C	D	E
17. The principal praises teachers who don't send many students to his/her office...	A	B	C	D	E

- 5 -

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
18. All teachers in this building teach the basic skill objectives identified for their grade level to all their students...	A	B	C	D	E
19. In your building only those teachers who get all of their students to master grade-level objectives are considered good teachers...	A	B	C	D	E
20. Your school is a safe and secure place to work...	A	B	C	D	E
21. Discussions with the principal often result in some aspect of improved instructional practice...	A	B	C	D	E
22. The principal makes frequent formal classroom observations...	A	B	C	D	E
23. The principal reviews and interprets test results with and for the faculty...	A	B	C	D	E
24. Instructional issues are seldom the focus of faculty meetings...	A	B	C	D	E



-6-

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
25. Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess basic skills throughout the school...	A	B	C	D	E
26. The principal uses test results to recommend modifications or changes in the instructional program...	A	B	C	D	E
27. The principal discusses lesson plans with teachers in relation to instruction...	A	B	C	D	E
28. There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in your school...	A	B	C	D	E
29. Staff and students do not view security as an issue in your school...	A	B	C	D	E
30. A positive feeling permeates the school...	A	B	C	D	E
31. The standardized testing program is an accurate and valid measure of the basic skills curriculum in your school...	A	B	C	D	E

-7-

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
32. Standardized test results are not available or are not used to evaluate program objectives...	A	B	C	D	E
33. The physical condition of your school is generally pleasant and well-kept...	A	B	C	D	E
34. Multiple assessment methods are used to assess student progress in basic skills (e.g., criterion-referenced tests, work samples, mastery check lists, etc.)...	A	B	C	D	E
35. Teachers and the principal thoroughly review and analyze test results to plan instructional program modifications...	A	B	C	D	E
36. Teachers, administrators and parents assume responsibility for discipline in your school...	A	B	C	D	E

- 8 -

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
37. Student assessment information (such as criterion-referenced tests, skills checklists, etc.) is regularly used to give specific student feedback and plan appropriate instruction...	A	B	C	D	E
38. The principal regularly brings instructional issues to the faculty for discussion...	A	B	C	D	E
39. The principal puts much emphasis on the meaning and use of standardized test results...	A	B	C	D	E
40. The principal frequently communicates to individual teachers their responsibility in relation to student achievement...	A	B	C	D	E
41. The principal is very active in securing resources, arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for faculty...	A	B	C	D	E

- 9 -

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
42. The principal leads frequent formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement...	A	B	C	D	E
43. The school building is neat, bright, clean and comfortable...	A	B	C	D	E
44. The principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction...	A	B	C	D	E
45. Supervision is directed at instruction...	A	B	C	D	E
46. Teachers in your school turn to the principal with instructional concerns or problems...	A	B	C	D	E
47. Student behavior is generally positive in your school...	A	B	C	D	E
48. Students in your school abide by school rules...	A	B	C	D	E
49. In your school there is annual standardized testing at each grade level...	A	B	C	D	E

- 10 -

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

50. Class atmosphere in your school is generally very conducive to learning for all students...

A                      B                      C                      D                      E

Please answer the following questions on the portion of the answer sheet labeled "Test 2".

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Agree   Strongly Agree

51. The principal is an important instructional resource person in your school...

A                      B                      C                      D                      E

52. Discipline is not an issue in your school...

A                      B                      C                      D                      E

53. All students are heterogeneously grouped within classrooms with regard to basic skill level...

A                      B                      C                      D                      E

54. The principal assigns students to classrooms heterogeneously with regard to basic skill achievement...

A                      B                      C                      D                      E

- 11 -

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Neither</u> <u>Agree nor</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>
55 . When students are <u>homogeneously</u> grouped in classrooms the groups are changed frequently to prevent labeling...	A	B	C	D	E
56 . The school has a clearly defined policy concerning heterogeneous and flexible grouping of students...	A	B	C	D	E
57 . Less than five minutes of instruction time is lost as a result of noise, announcements, discipline, and/or organizational activities per hour...	A	B	C	D	E
58 . The level of teacher attendance is acceptably high...	A	B	C	D	E
59 . This school has an effective program to maintain a high level of student attendance...	A	B	C	D	E
60 . If students are pulled out of classrooms for special instruction it always <u>increases</u> the total time...	A	B	C	D	E

APPENDIX D  
INTERVIEW GUIDE

## Interview Guide

1. What restructuring activities have you been a part of in the last two years?
2. How are the students grouped for instruction in your school? (Grouping for Instruction)
3. How does or should the principal help to improve instruction in the school? (Administrative or Instructional Leadership)
4. How often do you use test data to evaluate instruction? (Use of Test Data to Evaluate Instructional Programs)
5. How is discipline handled in your school? (Safe and Orderly Environment)
6. How often is instructional time interrupted in a given day?
7. How well do you expect the students in your school to perform? (Expectations and Evaluations of Students)
8. How has the emphasis on achievement in your school changed over the last few years? (Emphasis on Achievement or Commitment)



APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Sharon V. Kramer has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Director  
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Studies, Loyola

Dr. Max A. Bailey  
Associate Professor and Department Chairperson,  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Edward T. Rancic  
Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

Date

---

Director's Signature

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, M. J. (1982). The Paideia Proposal: An educational manifesto. New York: McMillan Publishing Co.
- Boyer, E. (1989). Boyer's view of restructuring. In A. Lewis, Restructuring America's schools (p.55). Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Brookover, W. (1984). A School Learning Climate Assessment Instrument. Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1978). Elementary school climate and school achievement. America Education Research Journal, 15(2), 301-318.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. Michigan: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1982). Educational equity: A democratic principle at a crossroads. The Urban Review, 13(2), 65-71.
- Brandt, R. (1982, December). On school improvement: A conversation with Ronald Edmonds. Educational Leadership, 12-15.
- Carnegie Corporation. (1986). A nation prepared: teachers for the 21st century. New York, NY: Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). An imperiled generation: saving urban schools. Princeton University Press: Author
- Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F., & York, R. (1966). Equal educational opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cremin, L.A. (1976). Public education. New York: Basic Books.

- Cuban, L. (1983, June). Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note. Phi Delta Kappan, 695-596.
- Cuban, L. (1984, May). Transforming the frog into a prince. Harvard Educational Journal, 54(2), 129-151.
- Cuban, L. (1988, January). A fundamental puzzle of education reform. Phi Delta Kappan.
- D'Amico, J. (1982, December). Using effective schools studies to create effective schools: No Recipe Yet. Educational Leadership, 60-62.
- DeBeroise, W. (1984, February). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. Educational Leadership, 14-20.
- Diebold, J. (1984). Making the future work: Unleashing our powers of innovation for the decades ahead. New York: Simon & Schuster, 180.
- Duckett. (1980). Why do some urban schools succeed? Phi Delta Kappan.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1978, July 10-14). A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling: Paper Prepared for the National Conference on Urban Education, St. Louis, MO.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. Social Policy, 9, 28-32.
- Edmonds, R. (1979, October). Effective schools for the urban poor. Education Leadership, 37, 15-23.
- Edmonds, R. (1980). Schools count: New York City's school improvement project. Harvard Graduate School of Education Association Bulletin, 25(1), 33-35.
- Edmonds, R. (1981). The characteristics of effective schools: Research and implementation. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.
- Edmonds, R. Programs of school improvement: An overview. Unpublished manuscript of a speech presented at the conference on The Implications of Research for Practice, Michigan State University.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1981). Making public schools effective. Social Policy, 56-60.

- Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview, Educational Leadership, 40(3), 4-11.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1986-87 Series). School effects and teacher effects. Effective Schools, 1(7), Research Abstracts.
- Edmonds, R. R., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1979b). Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children. (ED 179-396).
- Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis. (1990 April). NWREL, Portland, Oregon: NWREL
- Elmore, R. F. & McLaughlin, M. W. (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice, and the reform of American education. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corp.
- Ford Foundation. (1972). A foundation goes to school. New York, NY: Natchigal, P.
- Fullan, M. G., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for? (Commissioned by the Ontario Public School Teacher's Federation).
- Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A place called school: Prospects for the future. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Hill, P., Wise, A., & Shapiro, L. (1989). Education progress: Cities mobilize to improve their schools. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corp.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: EDITS Publishers, 128.
- Levine, D. U., & Ubanks, E. E. (1987-88 Series). Achievement improvement and non-improvement at concentrated poverty schools in big cities. Effective Schools, 2(6), Research Abstracts.
- Levine, H. M. (1988, Spring). Cost effectiveness and education policy. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(1), 51-69.
- Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Lezotte, L. W. (1989, August). Effective schools research: Model for planned change. Unpublished manuscript.

- Lezotte, L. W., & Bancroft, B. A. (1985, March). Growing use of the effective schools model for school improvement. Educational Leadership, 23-27.
- Lezotte, L. W., & Bancroft, B. A. (1985, Summer Yearbook). School improvement based on effective schools research: A promising approach for disadvantaged students. Journal of Negro Education, 301-312.
- Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1988). This article is a version of the chapter written for Beyond Separate Education: Quality Education for All. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing Co.
- Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (1991). Educational Administration: Concepts and practices. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Mackenzie, D. E. (1983). Research for school improvement: An appraisal of some recent trends. Educational Research, 5(17).
- McCormack-Larkin, M. (1985). Change in urban schools. Journal of Negro Education, 54(3), 409-415.
- Michaels, K. (1988, February). Caution: Second-wave reform taking place. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 3.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., & Sammons, P. New evidence on effective elementary schools. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 4-8.
- Murname, R. J. (1986-87 Series). Interpreting the evidence on school effectiveness. Effective Schools, 1(5), Research Abstracts.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructionally effective school districts. Journal of Educational Research, 81, 175-181.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: Department of Education.
- Oakes, J. (1988). Improving inner-city schools: Current directions in urban district reform. Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University, Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Peterson, E. (1991, January). Are big city schools holding their own? Paper prepared for Milwaukee Public Schools History Project, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1982, December). Synthesis of research on effective schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 64-69.
- Purkey, S. C., & and Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools--A review. Elementary School Journal, 83, 427-452.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. (1985). School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. The Elementary School Journal, 85(3), 353-389.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimer, P., & Ouston, J. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schlechty, P. (1990). Schools for the 21st century. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shanker, A. (1990, January). The end of the traditional model of schooling--and a proposal for using incentives to restructure our public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(5), 345-357.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Slavin, R. E. (1988, October). Cooperative learning and student achievement. Educational Leadership, 46(2), 31-33.
- Sparks, D. (1993, Summer). Insights on school improvement: An interview with Larry Lezotte. Journal of Staff Development, 14(3), 18-21.
- Steadman, L. C. (1987, November). It's time we changed the effective schools research. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(3), 215-224.
- Texas School Law Bulletin. (1992). Texas Education Agency. Austin, TX: West Publishing Company, Education Code, 21.931, p. VI-2-8.
- Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1987, August). Education reform and institutional competence. Harvard Educational Review, 57(3).

- Tye, B. B. (1987-88 Series). The deep structure of schooling. Effective Schools, 2(7), Research Abstracts.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. (1990). Census of Population and Housing Summary Population and Housing Characteristics. Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census Issued 1991, p. A11-12.
- Weber, G. (1971). Inner city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Occasional Paper No. 18. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education.
- White, K. R. (1982). The relation between socioeconomic status and academic achievement. Psychological Bulletin, 91(3), 461-481.

## VITA

The author, Sharon V. Kramer, was born in Chicago, Illinois on April 20, 1949. She obtained her elementary education in a parochial school in Chicago through grade two. The remainder of her elementary and secondary education was completed in the Lake Villa area. She graduated from Grant Community High School in 1967.

In June of 1971, she earned the degree of Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education from Northern Illinois University in DeKalb, Illinois. In 1980 she graduated from National-Louis University with a Master of Science degree in Education and in 1983, she graduated from the same university with a Certificate of Advanced Study in School Leadership and Administration. As she pursued these degrees, she completed the necessary requirements to obtain administrative certification, special certification in the area of language arts, and gifted education verification. In January of 1991, Mrs. Kramer entered the doctoral program in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University.

The author's sixteen years of teaching experience included elementary and middle school assignments in Waukegan, Illinois. Among her current responsibilities as



Director of Elementary Education for Waukegan Public Schools are the supervision and evaluation of the elementary building administrators, the maintenance and monitoring of the curricular and instructional program, and the ongoing assessment of the needs of a strong, continuously improving educational program.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Sharon V. Kramer has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. L. Arthur Safer, Director  
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Studies, Loyola

Dr. Max A. Bailey  
Associate Professor and Department Chairperson,  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Edward T. Rancic  
Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy  
Studies, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

12/4/93  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Director's Signature