

**Marina Del Rey Middle School  
CSR Evaluation Report**

**November 2005**

**Research conducted by:**

**Michael Butler  
Mercy Sanchez**

**Public Works, Inc.  
90 N. Daisy Avenue  
Pasadena, CA 91107  
(626) 564-9890  
(626) 564-0657 fax**

# Table of Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Description of Marina Del Rey .....</b>	<b>1</b>
	Overview of Marina Del Rey	
	Context for Evaluation	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Overview of CSR Goals and Objectives .....</b>	<b>2</b>
	Methods	
	CSR Grant Management	
	Description of CSR Activities and Progress	
	Evaluation of CSR Progress	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Summary Evaluation Recommendations .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	
	Appendix A: Student Survey	
	Appendix B: Staff Survey	
	Appendix C: Parent Survey	

## Description of Marina Del Rey

Marina Del Rey (MDR) Middle School serves 1,376 students in grades 6-8. Approximately 40% of students travel to MDR from outside the immediate vicinity. These students include both magnet students who are attracted to the Performing Arts Magnet, as well as students who must travel to MDR because there is insufficient space at their neighborhood schools. Approximately 80% of students qualify for Free or Reduced Meals and 17% are eligible for CalWorks assistance, socioeconomic factors related to the close proximity of a federally subsidized housing project.

The ethnic composition of MDR is 63% Hispanic, 26% African American, 6% White, and 3% Asian/Pacific Islander. Approximately 31% of MDR's students are English Learners (EL). Even though the predominant home language of our EL students is Spanish, there are at least four other languages spoken by the student population. Approximately 12% of students receive special education services including resource services in Math, and English, special day class self-contained, classes for students with health impairment, multiple handicaps, and serious emotional disabilities.

MDR is a Title I school under the No Child Left Behind Act, and as such, we receive federal funding to enhance our total school program. Because MDR has not met all Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) growth targets for three consecutive years, the school is designated as a year three Program Improvement (PI) school. The school's desire is to improve student achievement by living up to the core values expressed in its vision statement:

Marina Del Rey Middle School will be a challenging and supportive learning environment dedicated to nourishing and recognizing student achievement and individuality, promoting self-esteem and encouraging appreciation and respect for cultural diversity.

In 2004-05, MDR received a Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) grant from the California Department of Education (CDE). Under this grant, MDR is receiving \$275,000 each year, for three years. CSR grantees are responsible for implementing comprehensive changes in eleven components. This report summarizes MDR's progress as a CSR grantee in Year One (2004-05).

## Overview of CSR Goals and Objectives

### *CSR Component 1: Proven methods and strategies based on scientifically based research.*

MDR’s plans for improving student achievement are based upon the research which posits that a standards-based instructional model a) plans backward from the standards; b) ensures that teachers are teaching to recognized academic standards; c) regularly measures student progress using assessments aligned to these standards; and d) holds schools accountable for improved student outcomes as measured by standards-based assessments are all key to improved school-wide improvement (Ladd, 1996; Tucker, & Coddling, 1996; Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). In order to move toward this comprehensive model of standards-based education, MDR’s reform plan is framed by three overlapping theories of action (Christman, 2003):

- ❖ Managerial: Clear expectations coupled with strong accountability is a necessary but not sufficient criterion for encouraging school improvement;
- ❖ Capacity Building: Improvements in student learning and school performance are a function of organizational transformation combined with efforts focused on the in-service of a professional teacher workforce; and,
- ❖ Resource Redistribution: Improving low student achievement requires both a redistribution and reallocation of fiscal and personnel resources to (and within) schools.

MDR’s plans for improving student achievement are linked to the following key instructional strategies and school-wide improvement processes:

- Critical Thinking and Problem Solving Skills
- Differentiated Instruction
- Instructional Use of Technology
- Small Learning Communities
- Using Data to Guide and Monitor Instruction
- Parent Outreach and Education

Specifically, MDR’s school-wide improvement priorities include the following:

Core Academic Instructional Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support development of performance-based and “real-life” learning experiences across disciplines to develop students’ critical thinking and problem solving skills.</li> <li>• Provide additional time, support, and intervention services for students struggling to meet academic standards.</li> </ul>
Data Inquiry, Assessment and Monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help teachers systematically identify the academic needs of students based on analyses of formative and summative assessments.</li> <li>• Develop an assessment and monitoring system to ensure that all students have access to and are receiving adequate support to meet high learning expectations.</li> </ul>
Professional Development and Teacher Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide training in differentiated instruction to help teachers serve students at all achievement levels, as well as subgroups such as English Learners and Special Education students.</li> <li>• Provide training in ways to incorporate technological applications into subject area instruction.</li> </ul>

Student Counseling and Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restructure the school’s priorities through the master schedule to include Smaller Learning Communities and a more concrete link between student programming and improved student achievement</li> <li>• Increase student attendance</li> </ul>
Parent/Community Involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide parents with training on standards-based instruction, grade level expectations, and postsecondary options for students</li> <li>• Become more proactive in notifying parents if student is in danger of receiving non-passing marks prior to issuing formal report cards</li> </ul>

***Component 11: Strategies that Improve Academic Achievement.***

MDR is committed to implementing a host of comprehensive changes that will impact classroom instruction, teacher support, student programming and staff assignments, as well as how student outcomes are assessed and acted upon. Rather than adopting an outside model, MDR has chosen to focus on a menu of specific, research-based instructional strategies and priorities for school improvement that will deepen our ability to deliver a standards-based instructional program that does not leave any children behind. These priorities became a focus in the school’s Single School Plan and have been augmented by the CSR needs assessment process to address all of the school’s needs and characteristics. Moreover, MDR’s plan has built in a model of continuous improvement based upon regular analysis of grant progress tied to specific benchmarks facilitated by an external technical assistance partner who reports to the Instructional Cabinet.

**CSR Grant Management**

MDR’s Instructional Cabinet serves as the primary management and forum for the CSR grant with governance and budgetary functions exercised through the School Site Council (SSC). The Instructional Cabinet is comprised of representation from school administration (principal and two assistant principals), coordinators and coaches (Title I, Literacy, and Math), and faculty (department chairpersons). This group met monthly to monitor and coordinate CSR activities, integrating the different components of the grant into a coherent, school-wide implementation of improvement strategies. For example, the Instructional Cabinet largely focused on coordinating the work of the Secondary Literacy Cadre and departmental-based professional development to solidify linkages between school site professional development and District plans for curricular pacing and formative assessment in the various content areas.

***Component 10: Coordination of resources.***

Allocation of CSR Funds.

*Salaries and Benefits.* Nearly half of the \$275,000 CSR grant (\$130,000) was allocated to certificated salaries and benefits during the first year (2004-05) of the grant. Approximately \$50,000 was used to pay teachers in all content areas their hourly rate for participation in after-school and Saturday professional development, training, and collaboration. MDR also allocated \$40,000 for substitute release time for teachers in all

content areas to participate in grant and evaluation activities including peer classroom observations. In addition, \$15,000 was allocated for certificated staffing of both the after-school intervention program targeting English Learners in the school library as well as \$15,000 for staffing of the Saturday intervention classes targeting students struggling in mathematics. MDR used \$10,000 to stipend the school coordinators who will be responsible for CSR grant coordination services during the first year. After salaries and benefits, MDR was left with a \$20,000 surplus, which is scheduled to be allocated to their Instructional Materials Account. Classified salaries and benefits will constitute \$10,000 (4%) of the CSR grant for overtime associated with evaluation and recordkeeping.

- *Books, Materials, and Supplies.* MDR's CSR budget allocated \$43,100 (16%) to Books, Materials, and Supplies. Approximately, \$20,000 of these funds was used to purchase supplemental instructional materials for the planned after-school and Saturday academic intervention programs. An additional \$23,100 were used to purchase books and technology for the library to be used as part of the after-school intervention program targeting English Learners.
- *Contracted Services.* Outside contracted services comprised \$45,000 (16%) of the CSR budget for evaluation services, professional development and leadership facilitation services with Public Works, Inc.
- *Capital Outlay.* MDR allocated \$35,000 (13%) to capital outlay during the first year of the grant. These funds were used to enhance the Multi-Purpose Room so that it would be suited to serve as a forum for parent involvement meetings and activities.
- *District Indirect Rate.* MDR allocated \$12,100 (4%) to cover LAUSD's indirect rate. This rate is applied to all outside grants.

Matching Resources. MDR matched funds from the CSR grant with approximately \$765,000 from a variety of financial and in-kind resources. For example, MDR leveraged \$309,300 in resources from the Middle School Mathematics and Science Technology Program, which includes both training and technological equipment. MDR matched \$10,000 from our GEAR-UP grant supporting parent education and outreach. LAUSD District 3 provided \$50,000 of funding for the coaching support from Action Learning Systems as well as district coaching support in Mathematics and Literacy in the amount of \$84,000. Additional matching funds included Title I in the amount of \$85,000 for our Title I Coordinator who will serve as a coordinator for the CSR grant. Matching Title I resources also supported substitute release time for teachers to participate in professional development (\$25,300), conference attendance (\$7,000), teaching assistants and instructional aides assigned to classrooms (\$48,000), a Community Representative for parent outreach (\$11,000), and supplementary instructional materials (\$72,000). Other categorical programs such as State LEP and School Improvement funded professional development, instructional aides, and instructional materials (\$60,000).

Budget Priorities for 2005-06. In Year Two of the CSR grant, the allocation of resources will differ significantly. In particular, since we will be receiving funds closer to the start of the school year (as opposed to the middle of a school year in Year One), \$184,000 (67%) grant will be allocated to full- and part-time curricular coaches in all core academic areas.

Remaining funds will be allocated to support interventions after-school and on Saturday along with contracted evaluation and monitoring services.

## Description of CSR Activities and Progress

### *Component 2: Comprehensive Design.*

MDR is focused on helping teachers deliver a standards-based instructional program that includes greater emphasis on critical thinking, problem-solving, and differentiated instruction. During 2004-05, the comprehensive nature of the CSR grant was apparent in the variety of programs, research-based strategies and techniques employed to improve student achievement.

#### *Assessment/Use of Data.*

MDR is committed to becoming a truly “data-driven” school. During 2004-05, all MDR staff received a presentation on summative data indicators from its external evaluator and technical assistance provider, Public Works, Inc. (PW). PW also facilitated departmental meetings to review the summative data in-depth, including analysis of CST skill strands/cluster as a tool to focusing and then differentiating instruction.

To supplement the summative data measures, MDR drew on LAUSD’s periodic assessments in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science. These formative assessments are administered quarterly and then analyzed within academic departments and the Instructional Cabinet. Because the data from the periodic assessments is provided by specific, grade level standards at regular intervals, the periodic assessments function as an important tool for gauging the extent to which instruction is aligned to the standards. MDR faculty also had opportunities to collectively examine student work during four specially designated professional development days and two common planning time meetings each year.

Survey Results. On average, 62% of MDR staff who responded to the survey expressed agreement with survey items related to assessment.<sup>1</sup> As such, assessment practices were the third highest rated area of the survey, preceded only by standards-based instruction and professional development. In addition, students were overwhelmingly positive about their academic classes. As shown in the table below, an average of 92% of students agreed that they knew what to do to earn good grades. Also, slightly more than 80% of students also reported receiving encouragement, learning something new each week, knowing where to go for help, feeling respected by their teachers, making an effort every day in class, as well as being prepared for each class. Students were least positive regarding the extent of feedback received from teachers. On average, 65% said that they receive “regular” information on how they are doing in class from teachers. According to the survey, an

---

<sup>1</sup> Surveys developed by Public Works, Inc., evaluator for Marina Del Rey’s Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) grant was administered to staff, students, and parents in Spring 2005. Respondents were asked to respond based on a four-point Likert scale (4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, or “Don’t Know”). To aid the reader, we have displayed the average agreement (both Strongly Agree and Agree).

average of 70% of students reported usually completing their classroom assignments and 67% said that they “always” complete homework.

**Student Ratings of Core Academic Classes (% Agreement) (N=821)**

<b>Survey Item</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>	<b>Average</b>
I know what I need to do to get good grades.	94	90	92	93	<b>92%</b>
I am encouraged to do my best.	88	86	89	89	<b>88%</b>
I learn something new each week.	80	81	81	88	<b>83%</b>
I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	59	61	68	72	<b>65%</b>
I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	84	80	78	86	<b>82%</b>
I feel that this teacher respects me.	78	75	82	84	<b>80%</b>
I do my best every day in class.	81	80	85	83	<b>82%</b>
I always come to this class ready to learn with books and materials.	82	82	86	85	<b>84%</b>
I always complete all my assignments for this class.	65	68	75	73	<b>70%</b>
I always complete homework for this class.	64	65	72	68	<b>67%</b>
<b>Average</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>82%</b>	

*Academic Intervention and Support.*

Identifying and serving students with academic intervention and support is a central component of MDR’s plan. There are a number of intervention programs embedded into the regular school day at MDR. For example, the *Developing Readers and Writers Course* (DRWC) served approximately **XXX** students in 2004-05. In addition, MDR provided intervention to **XXX** English Learners in ELD levels 1-4 through the *High Point* curriculum.

As part of MDR’s CSR plan, student access to academic intervention and support was expanded to after-school and on Saturday. Data showed that English Learners were experiencing the most difficulty making inferences from text (Literary Response & Analysis) and writing assignments (Writing Strategies). Using this information, an after-school enrichment program was developed which incorporated Science, Math, and English. Approximately 18 students (primarily ESL levels 1 and 2) participated in the program, which met twice weekly for 90 minutes from March-May. Staffed by Marina’s Bilingual Coordinator, the English Department chair, and a Social Studies teacher, the program offered a variety of opportunities for English Learners to expand their reading, speaking, and life skills in a non-threatening, small group setting. The program included hands-on activities, such as putting on plays, readers’ theatre, cooking, and sewing. These activities were aimed at giving students the opportunity to apply their English language skills in ways that are not possible in the classroom. This intervention program will not be continued in 2005-06 because it will be folded into LAUSD’s mandated Required Learning Academy (RLA) and Extended Learning Program (ELP).



Additional after-school intervention was offered in English (Voyager curriculum) and Math (Princeton Review curriculum) for students that scored below proficiency on the California Standards Tests (CSTs) and also held a grade of a D or less.

Counselors referred students to attend one and one half hours of after-school tutoring two days out of the week from March-June. A total of 30 students were serviced in English and approximately 90 in Math. According to staff interviews, students were assessed through pre/post tests, however teachers have not received the results from those assessments. In addition, Saturday intervention was offered for students that could not attend after-school tutoring. In 2005-06, Saturday school will be mandatory for all students who received a D or lower in English and/or Math.

MDR also offers after-school tutoring and mentoring through the Bruin Partners program. This program was open to all students and operated four days out of the week, pairing students on a 1-to-1 basis with UCLA students. In addition, the YWCA offered tutoring, mentorship, and extracurricular activities every day for the 2004-05 school year. Approximately 75-90 students participated in the YWCA program. Both the programs mentioned above will continue in the 2005-06 school year.

In 2004-05, the IMPACT program taught coping skills to students who were experiencing grief and/or crisis (e.g., death of family member, drug/alcohol abuse, etc.). The groups met for an hour on a weekly basis for 10 weeks. Students were referred to the program by teachers, dean, counselors, their parents, or through their own choice. The coordinator of IMPACT emphasized the program's focus on providing students the tools necessary for handling the pressures of school while dealing with emotional stress. IMPACT utilized a District-supplied curriculum and at the end of each session students, parents, and facilitators completed program evaluations. Funding for IMPACT, a District initiative, ceased for the 2005-06 school year. As such, Marina staff will look at alternative options for funding the program.

Survey Results. On average, only 36% of MDR staff who responded to the survey expressed agreement (either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree") with survey items related to intervention programs and services. In addition, 31% of staff cited Intervention as a top priority for the school. More efforts are needed to improve student access to intervention by informing staff about how to refer students to programs and services that exist. In addition, interventions occurring after-school need more time to showcase academic benefits for participating students.

### *Personalization*

MDR is focused on providing engaging, personalized, and standards-based instruction. The primary vehicle for this is restructuring the school into Smaller Learning Communities (SLCs). During 2004-05, the focus was on laying the groundwork for SLCs at MDR. At each grade level, interdisciplinary teams were formed of core academic teachers who share the same students. Structural changes were made to the master schedule in order to provide these teams of teachers with common prep periods. This common planning time

was instrumental in developing a school culture based on collaboration and personalization. In the 2005-06 school year, MDR anticipates that all students and faculty will be assigned to teams. Cohesion of faculty and students will promote a learning environment where students have a more personal relationship with the adults whom they most regularly interact. SLCs will also promote interdisciplinary learning that helps make learning more authentic and relevant because students see the cross-disciplinary connections. Counselors will support the SLC teams by helping teachers identify students in need of additional academic assistance, coordination of parent conferences, and informing teachers when students or parents initiate contact with counselors.

Survey Results. On average, only 38% of MDR staff who responded to the survey expressed agreement (either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”) with survey items related to student guidance and counseling. In addition, more than half (53%) of staff indicated that improving school discipline policies should be a priority at MDR. Of all areas on the survey, students were least positive about counseling, guidance, and support. Although more than two-thirds (68%) of students indicated that they had an adult at the school to go to for help or personal support, very few students reported talking to either a teacher (40%) or counselor (30%) about their plans for the future. Moreover, one-third reported that they felt unsafe at school. These results highlight the need for increased emphasis on personalization.

### ***Component 3: Professional Development.***

MDR’s CSR grant identified a set of professional development priorities to guide teacher training, coaching, and support. These included: 1) Instructional Differentiation; 2) Relevant, Engaging Learning; 3) Smaller Learning Communities; 4) Instructional Use of Technology; and 5) Understanding and Use of Data.

- ❖ *Instructional Differentiation.* Department meetings regularly utilized the school’s professional development calendar in order to discuss strategies for meeting the demands of curricular pacing while also providing differentiated instruction and intervention to students struggling to meet and master standards. In addition, training was available for teachers with sheltered courses, as well as additional SDAIE support.
- ❖ *Relevant, Engaging, Learning/Smaller Learning Communities.* Training was offered on the development of performance-based and “real life” learning experiences across disciplines to develop students’ critical thinking and problem solving skills. In addition to a focus on differentiated instruction, there was a common thread centered on providing relevant learning tied to cross-disciplinary and “real life” learning experiences. Teacher focus groups offered several examples of the use of more relevant instruction grounded in “real life” experiences. For instance, students in a History class replicated an Egyptian Market and modeled the exchange of goods through bartering as was done in their lesson. For 2005-06, functioning SLC teams will provide major support for effectively engaging students in more performance-based activities.
- ❖ *Smaller Learning Communities.* Training was aimed at providing a foundation for restructuring the school into interdisciplinary teams delivering personalized,

standards-based instruction. LAUSD recently adopted a policy for creating Smaller Learning Communities (SLCs) at all secondary schools in the district. The research on SLCs centers on providing students with a more personalized learning environment by restructuring the school into interdisciplinary teams of educators that share the same students in common. MDR is in the beginning stages of developing SLC teams. While the Performing Arts Magnet functions as a quasi-SLC, most students at MDR do not have a school-within-a-school experience. MDR devoted at least one Tuesday Professional Development and/or one Common Planning Time on Thursday for these SLC teams to develop interdisciplinary curricula and other unique characteristics that students will identify as a “community” in which they belong. In addition, the SLC team meetings provided an opportunity for teachers to review assessment data and to address learning and/or behavioral issues among the students that they share in common. In order to be successful, professional development on the purposes, expectations, and outcomes associated with SLC reforms will need to occur among the entire staff and be communicated to parents in order to build buy-in for this new reform and refine its implementation along the way.

- ❖ *Instructional Use of Technology.* MDR is receiving a grant from the LAUSD Middle School Mathematics and Science Technology Program (MSTP). As part of the grant, 10 Math and Science teachers were chosen by the program to be extensively involved in the efforts to integrate technology into classroom instruction. Lessons are delivered using technological tools and students complete assignments on computer laptops provided through the grant. According to Science teachers, a large portion of their classes utilized technology for accessing scientific information. Science teachers feel that technology helps engage students and thereby ensure bell-to-bell instruction (maximize instructional time). On the other hand, Math teachers emphasized inquiry tied to student needs (i.e., technology as motivational tool). Math teachers indicated technology was used to simplify and focus lesson planning, as well as smaller group and cooperative learning. The MSTP grant has had an overarching positive effect on the entire school through the dissemination of laptops and computers to other classrooms not directly involved in the grant. In addition, many staff members reported they benefited from professional development on technology, which was offered twice this year.
- ❖ *Understanding and Use of Data.* Departmental meetings and professional development began with focused analysis of student assessment results using both summative (e.g., CST skill strands) and formative (LAUSD periodic assessments) data. Once there was a clear understanding of the data and consensus on how to proceed as a department in a strategic fashion, subsequent training sessions were allocated to discussion of effective pedagogical techniques, examination of student work samples, and review of assessment practices tied to the school’s professional development priorities.

Coaching. The curricular coaches at MDR played a pivotal role in providing professional development to teachers. During 2004-05, MDR employed full-time Literacy and Math coaches. Part-time coaches existed for Science and History. The coaches provided demonstration lessons, assisting teachers with pacing and cross-curricular planning. In addition, coaches coordinated peer observations and facilitated the implementation of

curricular pacing tied to LAUSD's instructional guides and periodic (formative) assessments.

Literacy Cadre. MDR's Secondary Literacy Cadre played an important role in designing and presenting professional development tied to literacy and serving the needs of English Learners. For example, the Cadre presented on Tuesday banked time to the entire faculty on techniques such as "Transmission of Learning" that address the learning needs of low achievers as well as on techniques and strategies for delivering Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE).

Professional Study Groups. During 2004-05, MDR established more than 20 professional study groups. Teachers submitted proposals outlining the aims and focus of their study groups to the principal. Typically, the groups comprised 3-5 teachers focused on an interdisciplinary theme (e.g., differentiation strategies) or a group of content area teachers engaged in deep collaborative planning (e.g., Social Studies). The groups met 4-6 times throughout the year.

Survey Results. On average, two-thirds (66%) of MDR staff who responded to the survey expressed agreement (either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree") with survey items related to professional development. At the same time, survey results suggested that some staff desire more concrete links between professional development and student needs (as expressed in student achievement data), as well as more time for peer observations and demonstration lessons. Survey results also indicate that staff would like to continue the focus on building collaboration as nearly one-half (47%) identified this a one of their top priorities for school-wide improvement.

### ***Component 5: Support within the school.***

The CSR needs assessment process employed at MDR was inclusive and comprehensive in nature. The investigations touched on all aspects of the school's instructional program and involved input and data from staff, students, and parents. In order to assure that both parents and the community were involved in the development of school-wide improvement strategies, the MDR study team met with both the School Site Council (SSC) and other parent groups (i.e., Bilingual Advisory Council) to describe the process for ascertaining school strengths and weaknesses and to enlist support.

Results from data, surveys and other data collection methods were shared with faculty during professional development and common planning time. In addition, school leadership forums such as the SSC and Instructional Cabinet reviewed the findings of the needs assessment and solicited further input for identifying school-wide improvement priorities. Because the school's conclusions about the areas in need of improvement resulted from multiple assessments and/or sources of data, it was not difficult to reach consensus among key staff and leadership groups. In fact, the call for greater focus and restructuring of the instructional program was embraced by the staff and school community eager to capitalize on a new, energetic administrative team committed to distributed leadership after a decade of stalled reforms and staff turnover.

The school's Instructional Cabinet served as the key management structure for implementation of the school's CSR plan. This group is an example of the kind of distributed leadership necessary to develop instructional leaders at multiple levels within the school – administration, coaches and coordinators, and departmental chairs. This way, the progression of reform at MDR is building the capacity of a team of individuals and ensuring reform sustainability.

*Component 6: Support for teachers and principals.*

Secondary Literacy Cadre. The Secondary Literacy Cadre is a key support for teachers at MDR. In the last three years, the Cadre has focused on building the capacity of teachers to support student literacy within all departments and disciplines. Coordinated by a Literacy Coach from UCLA and comprised of representatives from every department, the Cadre has been successful in developing a Teacher Practitioner Center that houses a host of sample lesson plans and supplementary instructional resources for teachers that draw on research-based pedagogy including: differentiated instruction/SDAIE techniques, the writing process, reader's theater, persuasive writing, expository writing, response to literature, etc. Cadre members indicated that last year their activities were more integrated across subject-areas, which they attributed to the school's focus on cross-curricular planning. The Cadre continues to play a critical role in shaping and delivering school-wide professional development on disciplinary literacy, including coordination of sessions that involved faculty in the examination of student work in relation to standards-based rubrics.

Content Coaches. Support is also manifest through four content coach experts. In addition to directing the work of the Secondary Literacy Cadre, the Literacy Coach provided teachers with access to demonstration lessons, coordinated peer observations, and facilitated the implementation of LAUSD's instructional guides tied to the State content standards and periodic (formative) assessments in English/Language Arts. The Math Coach focused on modeling demonstration lessons, analyzing SPA data, and diffusing knowledge of resources for teachers. The Social Studies Coach operated largely as a mentor, working alongside teachers to provide detailed lessons, as well as coordinating lesson plans between teachers. The Science Coach helped teachers reflect on practice as well as create unit plans tied to consistent instructional pacing. MDR also contracted with Action Learning Systems (ALS) to provide monthly coaching, training, and demonstration lessons for ELD teachers and teachers of sheltered academic instruction.

Local District Support. LAUSD District 3 provided on-going monitoring and evaluation of the effective implementation of MDR's school improvement efforts. For example, the Middle School Director and Testing & Intervention Coordinator met with the CSR external evaluator regularly to monitor activities in support of the school improvement program with an emphasis on creating a culture of data-driven instruction. In addition, the Testing & Intervention Coordinator supported the implementation of the Extended Learning Program, and provided curriculum training to teachers within these programs. District 3 also monitored the implementation of MDR's professional development plan by gathering quarterly information related to the topics, agendas and presentation materials. In addition the district provided on-going support to the school in terms of English Language Development, Special Education inclusion and mainstreaming efforts, and integrating the use of technology into interdisciplinary, standards-based thematic units. For

instance, the Middle School Director and Testing & Intervention Coordinator supported the school in the design of the master schedule to address access and equity issues, particularly with regard to English Learners and at-risk students. Site-based teams were developed with staff representation from various stakeholder groups (i.e., DRWC, ESL, Special Education) in order to ensure that efforts were coordinated and that school-wide scheduling needs were met.

*Component 7: Parent and community involvement.*

Parent Education. MDR contracted with the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) to provide parents with in-services on standards-based instruction and grade level standards. A variety of important workshops were offered that covered topics such as, raising teenagers and methods for becoming meaningfully involved in school activities. As a result, MDR witnessed an increase in parent participation in other areas such as parent-teacher and parent-counselor conferences. The program culminated with a graduation ceremony for parents that participated in six or more sessions. This year, slightly more than 100 parents graduated, with more than 300 participating in at least one session. MDR plans on continuing the program in 2005-06 although an alternative funding source will need to be identified as the Gear-Up grant is expiring. MDR hopes that PIQE graduates will form a nucleus for a future PTSA.

Based on parent surveys, nearly, 40% of parents are interested in parent education workshops on preparing students for high school and keeping youth away from drugs/gangs. More than one-quarter (27%) are interested in training workshops aimed at helping their children with reading and math at home. In addition, 27% of parents reported they wanted more information on after school classes and tutoring. Parents reported that they were most likely to participate in parent education held in the evening between 5-7 pm (48%), on Saturday (29%), or after-school 3-5 pm (27%).

Other Parent Outreach. MDR's Gear-Up grant provided parent workshops on graduation requirements, the college admissions process, and financial aid. MDR also maintained its relationship with its Healthy Start partner in order to provide support for its students and families in need of personal, medical, and/or emotional counseling. In addition, MDR was involved in linking initiatives that provided after-school and/or Saturday academic intervention and support to struggling students.

Survey Results. On average, 50% of MDR staff who responded to the survey expressed agreement (either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree") with survey items related to parent involvement. In addition, 24% of staff identified parent education as a school-wide priority, and 20% cited parent-teacher relationships as a school improvement priority. Most (84%) students reported that their parents were supportive of teachers and that their parents were comfortable interacting with teachers (88%). Students were less positive about parent attendance at school events and activities. Nonetheless, 67% reported that their parents "usually" come to events like Back to School Night or parent-teacher conferences. Parent survey respondents reported receiving information on programs and/or activities at MDR at least once a month. Parents would like weekly (35%) or monthly (33%) information on their child from classroom teachers. Most (68%) parents cited school safety as their top priority for improvement. However, more than one-third of parents also indicated that

student math skills and parent-teacher relationships should be a priority and more than one-in-four also reported student reading skills and student guidance services as priorities for improvement.

*Component 8: External technical support and assistance.*

Coaching. A grant through LAUSD District 3 enabled MDR to work with Action Learning Systems (ALS) to provide coaching and professional development for teachers serving English Learners in either ELD or sheltered academic instruction. The coaching support model from ALS included initial training, classroom demonstration lessons, co-teaching, collegial planning support, and data analysis. MDR's full-time Literacy Coach was provided through an agreement between LAUSD District 3 and UCLA. The Literacy Coach directed the work of the Secondary Literacy Cadre and developed an on-site Practitioner Center which functions as a clearinghouse of lesson plans, professional development, and supplementary materials and resources for teachers.

Evaluation and Accountability. MDR contracted with Public Works, Inc. (PW) as its external evaluator for the CSR grant. PW was responsible for facilitating the Instructional Cabinet in implementing the CSR Plan as well as monitoring school progress towards all goals and benchmarks. PW helped teachers identify the academic needs of students based on analyses of formative and summative assessments.

Parent Education. To support parent involvement, MDR used resources from its GEAR-Up grant to contract with the Parent Institute for Quality Education (PIQE) to deliver a nine-week curriculum to 100 parents. The focus of PIQE's parent education module was on empowering parents to negotiate the school system and function as true child advocates during the critical adolescent years. Not only did parents learn about the curricular expectations and standards, they received support and training on how to interact effectively with teachers, counselors, and other staff as well as helpful parenting tips in order to keep their child moving toward postsecondary education.

## **Evaluation of CSR Progress**

*Component 9: Annual Evaluation.*

One of MDR's external technical assistance providers, Public Works, Inc. (PW), supervised the evaluation and monitoring of the CSR grant. PW was responsible for facilitating monthly meetings of the Instructional Cabinet. At these meetings, PW engaged MDR staff in the review and analysis of student achievement, school performance, and CSR implementation data. In this way, school management for the CSR grant will model what a "data driven" school committed to continuous improvement looks like.

At the beginning of the school year, all staff received a presentation on summative data indicators from the prior school year. At this professional development, PW presented school progress toward AYP and API targets, results of the CST and CELDT, as well as other key indicators of student achievement. Using data in the school's Student Information System (SIS) and Decision Support System (DSS), PW provided individual

teachers with a roster of their current students with the prior year's CST and CELDT data. In addition, PW facilitated departmental meetings to review the CST data in-depth, including careful analysis of CST skill strands/cluster as a tool to focusing and then differentiating instruction.

To supplement the summative data measures, MDR drew on LAUSD's periodic assessment results in English/Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science.<sup>2</sup> These formative assessments were administered quarterly and then analyzed within academic departments and by the Instructional Cabinet. Because the data from the periodic assessments is provided by specific, grade level standards in core subject areas at regular intervals, the periodic assessments function as an important tool for gauging the extent to which instruction is aligned to the standards. Moreover, the reporting of the periodic assessments provides the basis upon which to measure the extent to which students are demonstrating mastery of the standards classifying performance as "benchmark" (meeting standard), strategic (partial mastery), and intensive (not meeting standard). This classification, in turn, offers a guide for differentiating instruction to meet individual student needs and for possible referral of students to academic intervention and support outside of the regular school day (i.e., after-school, Saturday, and intersession).

The evaluation of MDR's implementation of the CSR plan also included annual surveys of staff, students and parents. The student survey focused on collecting information on perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors in four areas: Curriculum and Instruction, Personalization, Learning Expectations, and Student Counseling and Guidance. The staff surveys covered key areas related to school instruction including: Standard-based Instruction, Assessment, Academic Intervention, Professional Development, Teacher Collaboration, Instructional Materials, School Culture/Climate, Parent Involvement. The parent survey was focused on incorporating parental input on Home-School Communication, Parent Education, and Parental Improvement Priorities.

### Summary of Survey Respondents

Survey	Total Respondents	Response Rate
Staff	53	62%
Student	821	72%
Parent	492	36%

The results of all surveys were presented to the Instructional Cabinet and the School Site Council in order to engage both school staff and parent/community stakeholders in discussions about how to use the data from the surveys for further school improvements. PW also coordinated and facilitated break-out sessions with faculty following presentation of survey results in order to elucidate survey findings and develop action steps. PW has many years of prior experience designing, administering, and analyzing surveys of staff, students, and parent at middle schools in LAUSD and other school districts in the county.

In 2005-06, the evaluation will expand to include structured observations of classroom instruction in selected core academic areas throughout the school year. Evidence from the

---

<sup>2</sup> LAUSD has not yet developed periodic assessments for Social Studies/History.



classroom observations will be used to sharpen the focus of departmental planning, data analysis and collaboration.

**CSR Component 4: Measurable Goals and Benchmarks.**

As shown in the table below, MDR has been successful in meeting five of the eight CSR evaluation goals and benchmarks in 2005.

**Summary of CSR Evaluation Goals and Benchmarks**

Annual Goal/Benchmark	2003	2004	2005
Achieve State mandated growth targets for the Academic Performance Index (API) school-wide and for all subgroups	✓	✓	✓
Achieve Federal mandated targets for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English/Language Arts	✓	✓	Not met
Achieve Federal mandated targets for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics	Not met	Not met	Not met
5% increase the percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient on the English/Language Arts CST	Not met	Not met	✓
Increase the percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient on the General Math CST	Not met	✓	✓
Increase the percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient on the Algebra I CST	✓	Not met	✓
3% increase in the percentage of ELL students with up to 3 years of LAUSD instruction who are redesignated during the school year	Not met	✓	✓
1% increase in attendance rate leading to the 95% attendance goal set by LAUSD	Not met	Not met	Not met

For example, MDR gained 56 Academic Performance Index (API) points since 2002. As shown below, MDR met both school-wide and subgroup API growth targets in 2004-2005 as fewer students are scoring in the Far Below Basic and Below Basic proficiency levels on the California Standards Test (CST).

**Academic Performance Index (API), 2001-2005**

	2001 Base API	2002 Growth API	Met 2002 Target?	2002 Base API	2003 Growth API	Met 2003 Target?	2003 Base API	2004 API Growth	Met 2004 Target?	2004 API Base	2005 Growth API	Met 2005 Target?
School-wide	583	587	No	590	599	No	592	620	Yes	624	643	Yes
Subgroups												
African American	575	584	Yes	583	594	Yes	585	618	Yes	631	663	Yes
Asian	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Hispanic	563	559	No	562	579	Yes	573	606	Yes	608	623	Yes
White	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Economically Disadvantaged	565	566	No	569	585	Yes	579	603	Yes	607	633	Yes

However, MDR has struggled to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) which measures the proportion of students scoring either Advanced or Proficient in English/Language Arts and Mathematics. This year, the AYP criteria required more students (from 13.6% to 24.4%) to achieve proficiency in English/Language Arts and Mathematics (from 16.0% to 26.5%). MDR managed to meet AYP targets in the last four years in English/Language Arts school-wide and for most subgroups with the important exceptions of English

Learners and Special Education students. By contrast, MDR has not met AYP targets in Mathematics, either school-wide or for any subgroups since 2001.

**Adequate Yearly Progress (% Proficient or Above), 2002-2005**

Groups	English/Language Arts					Mathematics				
	2002 Base AYP	2003 AYP Phase I	2004 AYP	2005 AYP	Met 2005 AYP Criteria	2002 Base AYP	2003 AYP Phase I	2004 AYP	2005 AYP	Met 2005 AYP Criteria
School-wide	18%	19%	21%	25.6	Yes	14%	14%	15%	24.5	No
<b>Subgroups</b>										
African American	18%	16%	23%	29.1	Yes	11%	9%	13%	21.3	No
Asian	38%	21%	20%	47.8	N.A.	51%	58%	28%	60.9	N.A.
Hispanic	13%	16%	17%	20.6	Yes	11%	13%	15%	23.2	No
White	52%	41%	40%	57.7	N.A.	29%	23%	22%	34.4	N.A.
Economically Disadvantaged	14%	17%	18%	21.9	Yes	12%	13%	14%	23.6	No
English Learner	11%	14%	12%	10.5	No	11%	12%	11%	17.7	No
Students w/ Disabilities	3%	2%	10%	8.7	No	2%	1%	6%	10.0	No

Pupil attendance is another area in need of continued improvement at MDR. Currently, MDR has an attendance rate of approximately 92%, 3% shy of the LAUSD goal of 95%.

**Summary Evaluation Recommendations**

Student Achievement. MDR must focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. Continued coaching, professional development, and administrative support should assist math faculty in delivering a standards-based instructional program that addresses student needs. Differentiated instruction that is relevant and engaging to students is key, as is accelerated intervention for students performing well below grade level in mathematics. In addition, MDR should investigate how other departments might reinforce mathematical concepts in their own subject matter. In English/Language Arts, MDR’s efforts should be more focused, targeting the achievement of English Learners and Special Education students.

Professional Development. MDR has a strong model of effective professional development and teacher collaboration. As such, the school should deepen its efforts to maximize small groups of teachers (departments, teams, professional study groups) focused on the existing professional development priorities of differentiated instruction and developing students’ critical thinking and problem solving skills. In addition, more emphasis should be placed on professional development aimed at helping teachers provide relevant learning tied to cross-disciplinary and “real life” learning experiences. Lastly, given the need for improving student achievement in mathematics, professional development should include training on mathematics content and pedagogy.

Student Guidance and Support. There is a clear need for providing a more personalized educational experience to many of MDR’s students. MDR should move rapidly in 2005-06 to implement the “team” concept throughout the school so that a finite number of faculty are accountable for a specific group of students. Professional development and on-going collaboration will be needed to ensure that students are supported both academically and socially. Providing frequent feedback to students on their academic progress and

standing is one place to begin the conversation with students about personalization. MDR will also need to revise the role of counselors to support the move to SLC teams and support the school in improving math.

Interventions. MDR has begun to develop a set of after-school and Saturday interventions to supplement the district-mandated academic interventions that occur during the regular school day. During 2005-06, MDR is set to involve many more students in academic interventions. These interventions should target students who are underperforming in mathematics and English Learners. More work is needed to inform staff of how the various academic intervention programs function, particularly how to refer students and communicate with intervention staff. In addition, there will need to be a renewed emphasis on recordkeeping and assessment so that MDR can determine whether students are benefiting from participation in these programs.

Parent Involvement. The results of the parent survey provide a good road map for revising MDR's parent education and outreach priorities. In addition, MDR has trained a cadre of parent through PIQE that could be transformed into a strong parent leadership group. Lastly, MDR should strive to connect parents to existing academic intervention programs and services and offer trainings to parents on how to support their children in mathematics.

**Appendix A**  
**2005 Student Survey**

## Marina Del Rey Middle School Student Survey (N=821)

All students at Marina Del Rey are participating in a confidential survey that will help your school better meet student needs. To protect your privacy, **please do not write your name on the survey.** When you are finished, please return the survey to your teacher who will place the surveys in a yellow envelope. Your teacher has been instructed not to look at any surveys.

**1. What grade are you in?**

- 6<sup>th</sup>                       7<sup>th</sup>                       8<sup>th</sup>  
 35%                          42%                          23%

**2. Are you:**

- Male                       Female  
 49%                          51%

**3. What is your ethnicity? (mark one)**

- 21%  African American                      1%  American Indian or Alaskan Native                      63%  Hispanic/Latino  
 4%  Asian American/Pacific Islander                      4%  White/Caucasian                      8%  Other

**4. School is...**

- Easy    Just right    Hard  
 9%                      74%                      18%

**5. My grades are usually...**

- A and B                       B and C                       C and D                       D and F  
 26%                          38%                          24%                          12%

**6. Do you participate in any of the following after-school activities? (check all that apply)**

- 14%  Extended Learning Program (ELP)                      5%  Beyond the Bell/Reading Tutoring (Ms. Hirsch)  
 30%  UCLA Bruin Corp                      20%  Beyond the Bell/Youth Services (Ms. Newberry)  
 34%  YWCA                      9%  English Learner Hands-On Learning (Ms. Ortega)

Using the scale where 1=Strongly Disagree and 4=Strongly Agree, please circle the response that best reflects your opinion about each statement for your current class.

<b>English/Language Arts</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
7. I know what I need to do to get good grades.	2%	4%	45%	46%
8. I am encouraged to do my best.	2%	9%	46%	42%
9. I learn something new each week.	6%	14%	49%	30%
10. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	13%	28%	39%	20%
11. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	6%	10%	45%	39%
12. I feel that this teacher respects me.	9%	13%	42%	36%
13. I do my best every day in this class.	3%	16%	52%	28%
14. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	4%	14%	50%	32%
15. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	5%	29%	46%	20%
16. I always complete homework for this class.	8%	29%	40%	24%

<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
17. I know what I need to do to get good grades.	4%	6%	36%	55%
18. I am encouraged to do my best.	5%	9%	36%	50%
19. I learn something new each week.	7%	12%	35%	46%
20. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	13%	26%	37%	23%

**Appendix A – Student Survey Frequencies**

<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
21. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	9%	11%	35%	46%
22. I feel that this teacher respects me.	14%	12%	35%	40%
23. I do my best every day in this class.	5%	15%	48%	33%
24. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	5%	13%	40%	43%
25. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	7%	25%	39%	29%
26. I always complete homework for this class.	8%	27%	36%	29%
<b>Science</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
27. I know what I need to do to get good grades.	3%	5%	37%	54%
28. I am encouraged to do my best.	3%	8%	41%	48%
29. I learn something new each week.	7%	12%	36%	45%
30. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	1%	21%	39%	30%
31. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	9%	13%	36%	42%
32. I feel that this teacher respects me.	8%	10%	38%	44%
33. I do my best every day in this class.	3%	12%	47%	38%
34. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	4%	10%	45%	41%
35. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	5%	20%	44%	31%
36. I always complete homework for this class.	6%	22%	42%	30%
<b>Social Studies/History</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
37. I know what I need to do to get good grades..	2%	5%	37%	57%
38. I am encouraged to do my best.	2%	9%	41%	49%
39. I learn something new each week.	3%	9%	40%	49%
40. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	6%	22%	39%	34%
41. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	5%	10%	38%	47%
42. I feel that this teacher respects me.	6%	9%	38%	46%
43. I do my best every day in this class.	3%	14%	47%	37%
44. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	3%	12%	42%	43%
45. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	4%	23%	42%	31%
46. I always complete homework for this class.	4%	23%	42%	31%

**Appendix A – Student Survey Frequencies**

<b>Physical Education</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
47. I know what I need to do to get good grades.	2%	3%	25%	70%
48. I am encouraged to do my best.	3%	6%	30%	61%
49. I learn something new each week.	10%	17%	30%	42%
50. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	13%	21%	31%	35%
51. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	9%	12%	31%	48%
52. I feel that this teacher respects me.	5%	9%	35%	51%
53. I do my best every day in this class.	3%	9%	31%	58%
54. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	9%	10%	30%	52%
55. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	5%	7%	33%	55%
56. I always complete homework for this class.	7%	7%	30%	55%

**57. Are you enrolled in an elective art, drama, or music class?**

Yes (complete questions 58-67 below)

No (skip to question 68)

46%

54%

<b>Visual and Performing Arts</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
58. I know what I need to do to get good grades.	5%	5%	28%	63%
59. I am encouraged to do my best.	6%	7%	30%	57%
60. I learn something new each week.	11%	17%	31%	41%
61. I regularly receive information on how I am doing in this class from my teacher.	14%	24%	32%	31%
62. I can get help from my teacher if I'm having trouble.	12%	12%	34%	42%
63. I feel that this teacher respects me.	12%	11%	35%	42%
64. I do my best every day in this class.	4%	8%	37%	51%
65. I always come this class ready to learn with books and materials.	4%	9%	36%	51%
66. I always complete all my assignments for this class.	2%	7%	34%	56%
67. I always complete homework for this class.	5%	7%	32%	57%

<b>Counseling, Guidance, and Support</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
68. I have an adult at this school that I can go to for help or for personal support.	17%	15%	30%	38%
69. I have talked with a counselor about my plans for the future.	38%	32%	14%	17%
70. I have talked with a teacher about my plans for the future.	30%	30%	21%	19%
71. I feel safe when I am at school.	13%	21%	42%	25%

**Appendix A – Student Survey Frequencies**

<b>Parent Involvement</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
72. My parents feel comfortable speaking with my teachers if they have questions or need information.	5%	7%	36%	52%
73. My parents usually come to events and activities like Back to School Night or parent conferences.	14%	19%	33%	34%
74. My parents support the efforts of my teachers.	6%	11%	43%	40%
75. My teachers have contacted my parents by phone or email.	25%	18%	27%	31%

**Priorities for Improvement**

**76. What do you think are the most important priorities for improvement at Marina Del Rey? (circle your top 3 choices)**

- School safety 63%
- School cleanliness/appearance 46%
- Parent-teacher relationships 14%
- Parent-counselor relationships 7%
- School relationships with parents/community 10%
- Student counseling/guidance services 17%
- Student reading skills 18%
- Student math skills 36%
- Student writing skills 15%
- How the school makes decisions 41%
- School homework policies 20%
- School discipline policies 25%

**Thank you for taking the time to give us your opinions.**



**Appendix B**  
**2005 Staff Survey**

**Appendix B – Staff Survey Frequencies**

**Marina Del Rey Middle School, Staff Survey (N=53)**

Marina Del Rey is actively involved in collecting, analyzing, and using data to drive school improvement. As part of this process of self-examination, we are conducting a survey of teachers and other staff. All information that you provide will remain private and confidential. Please do not write your name on the survey. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please return completed surveys before leaving the meeting today. A representative from Public Works, Inc., the nonprofit consulting firm working with Marina Del Rey as an external evaluator will collect the surveys. Thank you for your help!

**Directions:** Please circle the appropriate number to indicate your responses to the following statements.

1	2	3	4	DK
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know

**Standards-based Instruction**

1. Within my department, teachers understand the State content standards.	2%	6%	23%	55%	15%
2. Within my department, teachers understand the linkage between curriculum and States standards.	4%	6%	34%	47%	9%
3. Within the classes offered by my department, students understand classroom expectations (i.e., they understand what standard they are being held accountable for).	2%	21%	45%	9%	23%
4. Within my department, curriculum delivery accommodates diverse student learning styles and needs.	4%	11%	53%	17%	15%
5. Within my department, teachers regularly use SDAIE and ELD techniques in daily classroom instruction.	6%	14%	37%	23%	21%

**Assessment**

6. Within my department, teachers use common standards and criteria for evaluating student progress.	8%	15%	46%	15%	15%
7. Within my department, teachers regularly use student assessment results to modify and shape instruction.	6%	12%	40%	21%	21%
8. Within my department, teachers are using rubrics as part of classroom instruction.	4%	18%	42%	12%	24%
9. Within my department, multiple assessments are used to measure student progress.	4%	12%	46%	23%	15%

**Intervention**

10. There is a clear set of criteria for identifying students in need of intervention.	15%	36%	34%	4%	11%
11. There is a clear process for referring a student for intervention.	15%	32%	32%	8%	13%
12. Intervention is designed to address specific academic weaknesses and transition students back into regular classroom instruction.	13%	23%	42%	4%	19%
13. Teachers who refer students to intervention receive information on student progress from intervention staff.	17%	40%	25%	2%	17%
14. Teachers have input into intervention curricula and programs.	19%	30%	26%	4%	21%

**Professional Development**

15. Professional development is related to areas where student academic performance needs improvement.	8%	28%	38%	21%	6%
16. Professional development offerings are aligned with school-wide improvement goals.	6%	13%	47%	26%	8%
17. Professional development highlights effective teaching practices.	6%	17%	45%	26%	6%
18. Professional development promotes greater alignment of instruction with academic standards.	4%	15%	48%	23%	10%
19. Teachers have been trained to deliver instruction appropriate to EL students.	6%	15%	57%	13%	9%

## Appendix B – Staff Survey Frequencies

	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly agree	DK Don't Know			
20. New teachers are supported and encouraged by veteran staff.				8%	19%	34%	25%	15%
21. Demo lessons and/or peer observations are available to interested teachers.				10%	14%	44%	14%	19%

### Instructional Materials and School Resources

22. Every student in my classroom has access to a Board adopted textbook that is standards aligned.				4%	4%	26%	57%	10%
23. I have access to an adequate supply of supplemental instructional resources (e.g., curricular intervention materials).				6%	22%	43%	22%	8%
24. I have access to an adequate supply of basic classroom supplies (e.g., paper, pencils, etc.)				12%	14%	43%	26%	6%
25. The school library has an adequate supply of books and other educational resources.				24%	33%	18%	12%	14%

### Teacher Collaboration

26. Department meetings occur at least twice per month.				12%	10%	39%	40%	0%
27. Department meetings are well attended.				6%	23%	44%	21%	6%
28. The time during department meetings is focused on instruction.				15%	19%	46%	14%	6%
29. Department meetings include planning and reflection related to effective teaching strategies.				12%	29%	39%	15%	6%
30. Department meetings include the discussion and analysis of student work.				23%	33%	31%	8%	6%

### Student Guidance and Counseling

31. Counselors offer students guidance on class selection.				10%	14%	23%	4%	50%
32. Counselors provide students with access to health and human service needs (e.g., social services, mental health, etc.)				4%	6%	50%	12%	29%
33. Counselors assist students in planning for postsecondary education.				4%	15%	37%	2%	42%
34. Counselors assist students in identifying possible career/occupational interests.				4%	21%	21%	2%	52%

### School Culture/Climate

35. School improvement goals are well understood by staff.				4%	19%	48%	15%	14%
36. Results of major school decisions are communicated to all staff.				6%	27%	46%	17%	4%
37. Most staff at this school trusts one another.				12%	37%	29%	12%	12%
38. This school encourages teacher leadership and initiative.				6%	21%	48%	15%	10%
39. This school has a strong leadership team that guides instruction and the implementation of reform.				10%	27%	39%	14%	10%
40. Most staff at this school are committed to the principle that “all children can learn.”				4%	24%	49%	18%	6%

### Parent Involvement

41. Most parents feel comfortable interacting with teachers at this school.				4%	25%	42%	4%	25%
42. Parents receive communication from this school at least monthly.				2%	15%	50%	15%	17%
43. Parent education and training is focused on helping parents support learning at home.				2%	8%	56%	8%	27%
44. This school encourages parent leadership and initiative.				6%	15%	52%	6%	21%
45. There is a strong parental presence at school activities and events.				31%	46%	14%	6%	4%

## Appendix B – Staff Survey Frequencies

### Areas Most in Need of Improvement

Directions: Check the top three areas where you feel the school is most in need of improvement.

46. Instructional quality and Consistency	26%	55. Parent Education	24%
47. Professional Development	8%	56. School Relationships with Parents and Community	20%
48. Serving the Needs of English Learners	8%	57. Relationships between parents and teachers	14%
49. Academic Support and Intervention for Students	31%	58. Curricular Access & Equity	6%
50. School Governance and Decision-Making	6%	59. Student Guidance & Counseling	6%
51. School Leadership and Vision	20%	60. School Safety	10%
52. Collaboration Among Staff	47%	61. School Cleanliness/Appearance	10%
53. Assessment Practices/ Evaluation	4%	62. School Homework Policies	6%
54. Instructional Materials	6%	63. School Discipline Policies	53%

### Personal Views on Teaching (teachers only, please)

	SD	D	A	SA	
64. I can handle most discipline problems that arise in my classroom.	2%	2%	44	50%	2%
65. When my students fail, it is because they do not apply themselves.	2%	17%	46	28%	7%
66. I have the ability to teach all students to high achievement levels.	4%	13%	44	37%	2%
67. My students' peers influence their motivation and performance more than I do.	2%	30%	41	17%	9%
68. I am making a difference in my students' lives.	0%	11%	59	24	7%
69. I am effectively integrating technology into my students' learning experience.	4%	33%	37	24%	2%
70. Most of a student's performance depends on home environment.	5%	23%	34	30%	9%
71. I am confident in my ability to effectively teach special education students in my classroom.	0%	37%	35	24	4%
72. I am confident in my ability to effectively teach EL students in my classroom.	0%	22%	44	33%	2%

### Respondent Characteristics

73. Stakeholder Group	74. Years at School	75. Years Teaching (Teachers Only)
6%a) Administration	23% a) 2 years or less	11%a) 2 years or less
88%b) Classroom Teacher	36% b) 3-5 years	11%b) 3-5 years
2%c) Coordinator/Coach	23%c) 6-10 years	23%c) 6-10 years
4%d) Counselor	17%d) More than 10	55%d) More than 10
0%e) Classified		
76. Subject (Teachers Only)		
a) English 27%	c) Math 9%	e) Special Education 16%
b) Social Studies 18%	d) Science 11%	h) P.E. 14%
f) 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Core(English/Social Studies) 5%	g) 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Core(Math/Science) 11%	
i) Visual/Performing Arts 7%		

**Appendix B – Staff Survey Frequencies**

Thanks again for your participation. Questions regarding the survey should be directed to Li Minot at Public *Works*, Inc. 90 North Daisy Ave., Pasadena CA. 91107 626-564-9890.

**Appendix C**  
**2005 Parent Survey**

## Appendix C – Parent Survey Frequencies

# Marina Del Rey Middle School Parent Needs Assessment (N=492)

**Directions:** We want your input on how to connect with parents and what kinds of services you would like to participate in. We also want to make sure that you remain informed about our progress. The survey should take 5-10 minutes to complete. Your responses will remain confidential. Please return the completed survey with your son/daughter by **Thursday, May 26th**. All classrooms that return 100% of parent surveys will receive a pizza party. Thank You!

### Home-School Communication

1. How often do you receive information about school programs and activities? (circle one)

- Once a week 12%
- Every 2-3 months 27%
- Once per year 4%
- Once per month 45%
- Every 4-6 months 8%
- Never 5%

2. What is the best way for you to receive school information? (circle one)

- Schools newsletter 13%
- Flyer sent home 28%
- Automated phone message 16%
- General parent meeting 3%
- Signs posted around school 1%
- Mailed information 35%
- Email 3%
- Other 1%

3. How often would you like to receive information from your child's classroom teacher? (circle one)

- Once a week 35%
- Once per month 33%
- Every 2-3 months 6%
- Each semester 15%
- End of year 11%

4. What is the best way for you to receive information about your child's progress in school? (circle one)

- In person 28%
- Home visit 1%
- Mail 21%
- Report Card 32%
- Telephone 16%
- Email 3%

5. If we were to call you at home, when would be the best time to call? (circle all that apply)

- Before school (7-8 a.m.) 12%
- Early afternoon (1-3 p.m.) 7%
- Early morning (8-10 a.m.) 12%
- After school (3-5 p.m.) 23%
- Mid morning (10-11:30 a.m.) 10%
- Evening (5-7 p.m.) 51%
- Lunch time (12-1 p.m.) 8%
- Saturday 15%

### Involvement and Priorities for Improvement

6. Which of the following school activities have you attended in the last year? (circle all that apply)

- Back to School 42%
- Parent-Teacher Conferences 62%
- Open House 54%
- Student Performances 19%
- Volunteer Program 3%
- Holiday Programs 12%
- Parent Teacher Student Association 8%
- Meeting with the Principal 6%
- School Site Council 4%
- Title I or Bilingual Advisory Council 1%
- Other 13%

## Appendix C – Parent Survey Frequencies

7. What are your priorities for improvement (circle your top 3 choices)

- School safety 68%
- School cleanliness/appearance 17%
- Parent-teacher relationships 40%
- Parent-counselor relationships 11%
- School relationships with parents/community 14%
- Student guidance services 26%
- Student reading skills 27%
- Student math skills 38%
- Student writing skills 16%
- School governance/decision-making 7%
- School homework policies 19%
- School discipline policies 24%

## Parent Education

8. The parent workshops/training that I am most interested in are: (check your top 3 choices)

Curriculum and Instruction	Assessment
What is Standards-based instruction <input type="checkbox"/> 9%	Interpreting standardized test results <input type="checkbox"/> 9%
LAUSD Literacy reforms <input type="checkbox"/> 6%	Reading the student report card <input type="checkbox"/> 18%
LAUSD Math reforms <input type="checkbox"/> 14%	Understanding school accountability <input type="checkbox"/> 6%
Specialized Educational Programs	School Governance and Decision-Making
After school classes and tutoring <input type="checkbox"/> 27%	Title I and Bilingual Advisory councils <input type="checkbox"/> 4%
Saturday academic intervention <input type="checkbox"/> 11%	School Site Council <input type="checkbox"/> 7%
Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) <input type="checkbox"/> 12%	Understanding school budgets <input type="checkbox"/> 7%
Special Education <input type="checkbox"/> 3%	
Parent Involvement	Counseling and Student Guidance
Becoming a parent volunteer <input type="checkbox"/> 9%	Preparing students for high school <input type="checkbox"/> 38%
Dealing with my teenager <input type="checkbox"/> 26%	College and career preparation <input type="checkbox"/> 25%
Helping with reading and math at home <input type="checkbox"/> 27%	Choosing course electives <input type="checkbox"/> 8%
School Policies	Community Resources
School safety policies <input type="checkbox"/> 29%	U.S. Citizenship classes <input type="checkbox"/> 3%
School homework policies <input type="checkbox"/> 15%	English as a Second Language (ESL) <input type="checkbox"/> 11%
School discipline policies <input type="checkbox"/> 18%	Spanish as a Second Language <input type="checkbox"/> 5%
School attendance policies <input type="checkbox"/> 7%	Keeping youth away from drugs/gangs <input type="checkbox"/> 37%

9. The times that would be best for me to attend a parent workshop or school meeting are: (circle your top 2 choices)

- Before school (7-8 a.m.) 8%
- Early morning (8-10 a.m.) 12%
- Mid morning (10-11:30 a.m.) 8%
- Lunch time (12-1 p.m.) 8%
- Early afternoon (1-3 p.m.) 11%
- After school (3-5 p.m.) 27%
- Evening (5-7 p.m.) 48%
- Saturday 29%

## Respondent Characteristics

10. My child is in grade (check all that apply)

- 6<sup>th</sup> grade 29%
- 7<sup>th</sup> grade 50%
- 8<sup>th</sup> grade 27%

11. My ethnicity is...

- African-American 17%
- Native American 1%
- Hispanic/Latino 70%
- Caucasian/White 3%
- Asian/Pacific Islander 5%
- Other 3%



**Appendix C – Parent Survey Frequencies**

12. Please let us know if you might be able to share your skills, talents, and expertise with the students at in the following areas:

- Talk about your career with students 20%
- Teach a music class 4%
- Work on the school newsletter to parents 10%
- Serve as a tutor or mentor to a child 8%
- Help set up school computers and technology 8%
- Teach a visual arts class 3%
- Phone other parents about school activities 29%
- Teach conversational Spanish to teachers 12%
- Work on campus gardening/beautification 21%
- Teach a performing arts class 4%
- Help with school supervision before or after-school 15%
- Other 17%

13. If you answered question 12, please give us your name and phone number so we can contact you.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

**Thanks again!**