

**Evaluation of the
Pomona Unified School District
Weingart Initiative**

**Final Evaluation Report
2009-2010**

June 2010

**Gail Grant, Ed.D.
Michael Butler
Mikala Rahn, Ph.D.
Arleene Rodriguez**

**Submitted By:
Public Works, Inc.
90 N. Daisy Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91107
(626) 564-9890**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction and Methods	1
	District Description	
	District Support and Oversight	
	Evaluation Methods	
	Report Organization	
II.	Principal Accountability in Relation to Leadership Exemplars	7
	Responsive Instruction: Classroom Walkthroughs and Feedback	
	Shared Leadership: Site-Based Professional Development	
	Student Work and Data: Data Analysis and Use of Data	
	Responsive Instruction: Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry	
	Shared Leadership: Professional Learning Communities	
	Shared Leadership: Modeling Integrity, Fairness, and Respect	
III.	District and Coaching Support	18
	Support from External Coaching	
	District Support	
	Evaluating the Principal Accountability System	
	Future District Support	
IV.	Conclusions	26
	Key Accomplishments	
	Challenges	
	Next Steps for Evaluation	
V.	Appendix A - Administrator Survey	A-1
VI.	Appendix B – Teacher Survey	B-1
VII.	Appendix C – Focus Group and Interview Protocols	C-1

I. Introduction and Methods

This progress report summarizes the activities undertaken to develop and implement a system for principal accountability in Pomona Unified School District (PUSD) during the 2009–2010 school year. This report focuses on survey and site visit data collected during 2009–2010, the third and the final year of the initiative funded by the Weingart Foundation.

District Description

The Pomona Unified School District (PUSD) is an urban school district in Los Angeles County comprised of 45 schools (29 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, 5 high schools, 2 alternative schools, 1 continuation school, and 1 community day school). In 2008–2009, 30,032 students attended PUSD schools. Demographically, the district was 82% Hispanic, 6% African-American, 6% White, 5% Asian, and 1% “other”. Of the total students enrolled, 41% were English Learners and 77% were eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), a proxy for the prevalence of students living in low-income households.

In 2008–2009, PUSD had 1,352 teachers, of which 1,284 (95%) were fully credentialed with an average of 14 years teaching experience (6% were first or second year teachers). Please see Table 1.1 for further detailed information.

Table 1.1 PUSD Student Demographic Data, 2008-2009 (N=30,032)

Ethnicity	% of Students
Hispanic	82%
African American	6%
White	6%
Asian/Filipino	5%
Other	1%
English Learner	41%
Special Education	11%
National School Lunch Program	77%

Source: California Department of Education

Based on the Adequate Yearly Progress reports¹ (AYP), PUSD has shown improvements from 2006 to 2009. There were significant net improvements amongst all subgroups at PUSD: African Americans (11%), Hispanics, Economically Disadvantaged (ED) and Special education students (9%), English Learner (8%), Whites (7%), and Asian (5%). In the area of Mathematics there was also improvement in AYP scores. Among the subgroups the most notable increase occurred with Special Education (7%), followed by African American, Economically Disadvantaged and English Learners (4%), Hispanics (3%), and Whites (1%).

¹ Federal accountability is defined as the percentage of students reaching the minimal threshold of scores at Proficient or Advanced on the California Standards Tests (elementary and middle schools) and the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE).

The Asian subgroup did not show improvement in AYP scores. See table 1.2 and 1.3 below for further detailed information.

Table 1.2 Adequate Yearly Progress Scores for ELA, 2006-2009

	English Language Arts						
	2006 AYP	2007 AYP	2008 AYP	2009 AYP	Net	Met 2009 Participation Criteria	Met 2009 AYP Criteria
District-wide	35.3	36.2	41.5	43.3	8	Yes	No
Subgroups							
African American	33.7	35.3	38.2	44.6	10.9	Yes	Yes*
Asian	73.8	75.4	79.3	78.6	4.8	Yes	Yes
Hispanic	30.0	31.0	36.9	38.8	8.8	Yes	No
White	61.9	64.2	64.8	68.4	6.5	Yes	Yes
Economically Disadvantaged	28.0	29.4	34.6	37.3	9.3	Yes	No
English Learner	22.5	22.7	27.4	30.7	8.2	Yes	No
Special Education	13.1	12.4	19.4	22.0	8.9	Yes	No

Source: California Department of Education

* Note Met AYP Criteria by Safe Harbor²

Table 1.3 Adequate Yearly Progress Scores for Mathematics, 2006-2009

	Mathematics						
	2006 AYP	2007 AYP	2008 AYP	2009 AYP	Net	Met 2009 Participation Criteria	Met 2009 AYP Criteria
District-wide	41.4	42.1	43.6	44.1	2.7	Yes	No
Subgroups							
African American	34.5	34.9	36.3	38.9	4.4	Yes	No
Asian	79.8	81.6	82.1	78.1	-1.7	Yes	Yes
Hispanic	37.4	38.2	39.6	40.8	3.4	Yes	No
White	60.7	62.4	63.6	62.0	1.3	Yes	Yes
Economically Disadvantaged	35.9	36.9	37.2	39.7	3.8	Yes	No
English Learner	32.7	32.9	33.5	36.6	3.9	Yes	No
Special Education	16.3	15.8	22.1	23.7	7.4	Yes	No

Source: California Department of Education

Table 1.4 below presents data on PUSD’s progress in meeting state accountability targets on the Academic Performance Index (API) for 2006-2009. In the past three years, district-wide scores improved 32 points. All targets district-wide and for all subgroups have been met. By subgroup, PUSD experienced a 50-point increase for African Americans, 38-points for Economically Disadvantaged (ED), 36-points for Hispanics and a 32-point increase for English Learner students.

² Safe Harbor means that 10% of the students in a given subgroup moved from Basic to Proficient or Advanced even if the AYP target was not met.

Table 1.4 Academic Performances Index (API), 2006-2009

	2006 Growth API	Met 2006 Target?	2006 Base API	2007 Growth API	Met 2007 Target?	2007 Base API	2008 Growth API	Met 2008 Target?	2008 Base API	2009 Growth API
District-wide	682	Yes	684	691	Yes	694	713	Yes	705	716
Subgroups										
African American	658	Yes	654	667	Yes	670	678	Yes	679	704
Hispanic	659	Yes	661	669	Yes	672	693	Yes	685	697
Economically Disadvantaged	652	Yes	654	664	Yes	667	681	Yes	678	692
English Learners	632	Yes	630	631	Yes	634	650	Yes	645	662

Source: California Department of Education

Description of the Weingart Initiative

In 2007, PUSD was awarded a three-year grant from the Weingart Foundation under the Urban School District Initiative. This initiative is focused on developing and implementing a principal accountability system to complement on-going district efforts to enhance school and district accountability. Specifically, the Weingart effort sought to define a multi-indicator accountability system that 1) ensures that the school principals are fairly assessed based on leadership performance; 2) links professional accountability to school progress; and 3) helps target leader development to further support the capacity of site administrators.

PUSD’s emerging principal accountability system is organized around three key elements. First, the principal accountability system is aligned with the district’s existing “umbrella” framework for reform based on Six Essentials: 1) Responsive Instruction; 2) Student Work and Data; 3) Professional Development; 4) Aligned Resources; 5) Shared Leadership; and 6) Family and Community. These Six Essentials have been the foundation for all district efforts and also guide the provision of professional development courses offered to principals and assistant principals through the PACE (Pomona Administrative Classified/Confidential Employees) program. Second, school accountability for improving student achievement is also embedded in PUSD’s Balanced Scorecard, a set of quantitative measures which document school progress in meeting federal, state, and district targets for improvement. Lastly, each school has developed a local plan for improvement called the Academic Plan for Student Achievement (APSA), which sets forth actions and activities to achieve school accountability targets. Taken together, the Six Essentials, the Balanced Scorecard, and the APSA are the “triad” which undergirds the development of PUSD’s principal accountability system.

As part of the development of a system for holding principals accountable, PUSD convened an ad hoc committee comprised of ten PUSD principals (5 elementary and 5 secondary) in January 2008. Facilitated by Public Works, Inc. and the Elementary/Secondary directors, the ad hoc committee met 1-2 times per month in an effort to define and focus the outlines of an emergent principal accountability system.

To initiate the committee’s work, a draft rubric developed by Pivot Learning (formerly known as Springboard, an external organization providing coaching to approximately half

of PUSD's principals) based on the 21 McRel leadership elements and "Seven Leadership Performance Standards" was presented to the committee. Early on, there was consensus on the need for adapting the rubric more directly to PUSD's Six Essentials. Committee members also were in agreement that a fair evaluation of principal performance would require triangulating data based on the Six Essentials, quantitative data from each school's Balanced Scorecard, and each school's local activities as set forth in the APSA.

In an effort to tie upcoming principal evaluations to clear goals, three "exemplars" were selected from a "Leadership Performance Assessment" rubric that had been revised by Springboard to incorporate the PUSD Six Essentials. The exemplars selected covered three of the six PUSD Essentials. These exemplars became the "narrowed" interim expectation for principals in terms of accountability while a broader accountability system was under construction. These descriptions below outline a four on a four-point rubric³ in each of these dimensions:

1. *Responsive Instruction*: The administrator conducts walkthroughs daily and assures at least weekly visits to all classrooms to support and monitor the implementation and effective use of site and district instructional initiatives; provides timely and specific feedback to teachers to assure that all students are engaged in rigorous, active learning with equal opportunities to meet high standards for all students especially English Learners, R-FEPs and Special Education students.
2. *Professional Development/Shared Leadership*: The administrator monitors a collaboratively created professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of site and district instructional initiatives, the APSA goals and site data/needs.
3. *Student Work and Data*: The administrator ensures that staff collaborates weekly (including late start Fridays) using a variety of data analysis tools and a protocol to analyze student work and teaching strategies to improve student performance and close the achievement gap for all subgroups.

In July 2008, a Summer Institute was held with PUSD principals where three additional "Leadership Exemplars" were chosen to supplement the original three for 2008-09 and 2009-10. These included the following:

4. *Responsive Instruction*: Principal models and leads all teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry that results in improved student achievement. Principal creates an environment in which all staff including the principal is engaged in ongoing inquiry into practice related to student achievement.
5. *Shared Leadership*: Principal actively engages in developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department and leads a culture of dialogue and collaboration that results in teacher ownership of PLC dialogue at collaborative meetings. Principal establishes a culture in which student work, data,

³ The Leadership Stages rubric is designed for evaluating principals in terms of a four-point scale (1=directed toward the standard; 2=approaching the standard; 3=meets the standards; and 4=exemplifies the standard).

and lesson plans are reviewed frequently with teachers, used in a process of inquiry, and result in student mastery of standards.

6. *Shared Leadership*: Principal models integrity, fairness, and respect and infuses these standards in the school culture for other adults, students, and the community.

District Support and Oversight

Key district leadership for the Weingart initiative is comprised of Marilyn Ghirelli, Administrative Director Secondary Education and Rebecca Hedrick, Administrative Director Elementary Education. Additionally, Kandace Jones, an Eli Broad Foundation Fellow, joined the initiative in 2007-2008, and served as a liaison to the Weingart Foundation for one year.

The roles and responsibilities of the administrative directors are focused on oversight of the Pre-K–12 instructional programs and direct supervision and evaluation of school principals. The directors serve as the lead advisors to the Superintendent and the Chief Academic Officer for the administration and operation of the Pre-K–12 curriculum planning and development; staff development; instructional materials/services; and categorical and specially funded programs. In terms of the Weingart grant, the directors are charged with building the leadership capacity of all principals, and evaluating principals' progress in aligning their leadership practices around the Six Essentials.

Evaluation Methods

Public Works, Inc. (PW) serves as the local evaluator for PUSD's Weingart Initiative. PW is a Pasadena-based non-profit organization dedicated to working with schools, government, parents and communities in the areas of accountability, assessment and evaluation services. In Spring 2010, key evaluation activities with the PUSD Weingart Initiative focused on evaluating the impact of principal accountability in relation to the six Leadership Exemplars through:

- A survey of all site administrators about progress and self-rating in the six Leadership Exemplars, as well as participation in district professional development, external coaching, the annual performance evaluation process, and perceived extent of district support (a copy of the administrator survey is included in **Appendix A** of this report). A total of 61 administrators submitted surveys for analysis including 30 principals, 24 assistant principals. This represents a response rate of 95%. Cross-tabulations were run to examine statistically significant differences between elementary and secondary responses, as well as differences between principals assigned to an external coach. Where relevant, these differences are noted in Section II and Section III of this report.
- An in-depth analysis of principal accountability at a case study sample of six schools (three elementary, two middle, and one high school) chosen to represent the "typical" PUSD school in terms of student and staff characteristics (see Table 1.5 below).

Table 1.5: Characteristics of Case Study Schools

School	Students				Staff	
	Enrollment	% Hispanic	% African American	% EL	% NCLB Highly Qualified	% 1 st & 2 nd year teachers
School A	544	85%	9%	50%	96%	4%
School B	528	84%	8%	50%	92%	4%
School C	597	91%	3%	44%	100%	4%
School D	785	92%	4%	47%	87%	13%
School E	595	79%	14%	32%	93%	7%
School F	1,788	92%	5%	37%	81%	16%
District	30,032	82%	6%	41%	95%	6%

- Survey of all site-based staff at case study schools which mirrored the administrator survey (see **Appendix B** for copy of the staff survey). A total of 165 surveys were submitted for analysis, which represents a response rate of 84% of certificated staff. Cross-tabulations were run to examine statistically significant differences between elementary and secondary responses. Where relevant, these differences are noted in Section II of this report.
- Focus groups and interviews were conducted with 7 site administrators, 124 certificated teachers, 25 parents, and 49 students at case study schools. A copy of the focus group and interview protocols are included in **Appendix C** of this report.
- Observation and documentation of selected school-based activities tied to the “Leadership Exemplars” (e.g. site-based professional development).

Report Organization

This progress report summarizes survey and site visit data collected in PUSD during 2009-10. Section II is organized around the six “Leadership Exemplars” those principals were held accountable for in 2009-10. It integrates survey and site visit findings by exemplar. Section III details coaching and district support. Section IV provides a summary of key accomplishments and challenges.

II. Principal Accountability in Relation to Leadership Exemplars

This section of the report focuses on describing the impact of principal accountability organized around six “Leadership Exemplars” that formed the focus of performance evaluation in 2009-10. Drawing on surveys of 60 PUSD administrators, surveys of 165 teachers and other staff at six case study schools, and interviews and focus groups at six case study schools, this portion of the report presents evaluation findings about progress in the six exemplars.

Responsive Instruction: Classroom Walkthroughs and Feedback

Data from the survey of PUSD administrators indicates that administrators are spending more time observing classroom instruction. Nearly half (46%) of the administrators reported they conducted classroom walkthroughs on a weekly basis. This was 5% less than the previous year (51%). Nearly half (44%) reported at “least monthly classroom walkthroughs.” Consistent with previous years’, more than half (57%) of site administrators rated themselves “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their ability to conduct classroom walkthroughs (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1: Perceptions of Classroom Walkthroughs and Feedback

Administrator	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you in terms of conducting daily classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning?	59%	57%	-2%
How satisfied are you in terms of providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following classroom walkthroughs?	64%	64%	0%
Teacher	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=193)	2009-2010 (N=165)	Net Change
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of conducting daily classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning?	53%	61%	8%
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following classroom walkthroughs?	48%	54%	6%

According to teachers surveyed at the six case study schools, the frequency of classroom observations increased by 7%; teachers reported being observed by a principal or another school administrator three to four times in 2009-10, and an additional 28% of the teachers reported being observed more than five times. More than half (61%) of teacher survey respondents reported satisfaction with administrative classroom walkthroughs, a 6% increase from the previous year (see Table 2.1 above).

Teacher focus group interviews indicated that there was variation among the teachers regarding the frequency of classroom walkthroughs. Some reported more walkthroughs

than last year, while others reported fewer. According to both administrators and teachers, walkthroughs were often dependent upon the needs of the teachers. For instance, if a teacher changed grade level or had concerns about his/her class, the administrators would conduct more walkthroughs. Similarly, administrative concerns generated more frequent walkthroughs. If there is an additional administrator on site, (s)he will provide a “second set of eyes” by also visiting the classroom. Administrators will often give suggestions to the teacher and re-visit the classroom to ensure the suggestions have been implemented.

As was the case last year, administrators indicated the need to make a concerted effort making walkthroughs a priority since they can easily get distracted with other issues at the site. Several administrators block their calendars in order to be able to do walkthroughs first thing in the morning. Others block their calendars at different times of each day in order to be in classrooms when instruction is related to the specific site focus or specific needs of a teacher. Some administrators use the information from walkthroughs to help determine school-wide department/grade level trends and to shape the professional development focus for the site.

Administrators indicated that feedback is not consistently given after classroom walkthroughs, but when feedback does occur, the most prevalent forms of feedback included using PUSD’s observation form (72%), followed by verbal (32%) and written (14%) feedback. If teachers did not receive any feedback, they often sought out the administrator and asked about the walkthrough.

All administrators reported having a system in place to keep a copy of the feedback form for future reference and to support professional development planning. Furthermore, they used information from walkthroughs to determine trends and often referenced those trends to staff at STPT, grade level/ department meetings, school-wide staff meetings, forms placed in mailboxes or through bulletins. In several cases, the administrators shared trends with their site-based Leadership Team and together discussed their next steps.

Survey results from teachers at the case study schools showed 54% reporting satisfaction with the timeliness and specificity of feedback following classroom walkthroughs, an increase of 6% (see Table 2.1). On the teacher survey at case study schools, 32% of the teachers reported the feedback information was “most useful,” a 3% increase from the previous year.

In focus groups, most teachers said that they appreciated receiving feedback quickly and that they purposefully incorporated suggestions from administrators into future lessons. Teachers also reported an increase in the frequency of conversations with site administrators as a result of the walkthroughs. They appreciated opportunities to clarify aspects of lesson delivery during formal and informal debriefing sessions with site administrators. Some teachers expressed concern that if the administrators do not share this information directly with them, either verbally or in writing, then the information gets filtered through others (e.g. Leadership Team) and possibly skewed by that person’s own interpretation. A limited number of teachers at the case study schools indicated that they felt “attacked” or believed the comments were too “generic” to be of much use. On the other hand, many of the teachers had positive and encouraging comments such as “*very positive/constructive*” or “*If it’s valid, I use it*”.

Student focus group interviews also revealed that the principal/assistant principal observed classrooms instruction regularly. As in the previous year, students felt that teachers were accustomed to having an administrator observing them and continued with lesson delivery as usual. Students noted that student behavior improves during administrative walkthroughs, with comments such as “*kids are more respectful and more quiet*”.

In addition to walkthroughs, administrators conducted formal observations with them spending more time in the classroom and requiring a detailed lesson plan in advance. Sometimes a pre-meeting was held to review the administrator’s expectations of the observation, but administrators were not consistent in holding a post observation meeting in a timely manner. This was a concern for several of the teachers who had not received any feedback from observations from weeks to months previous. In those cases where teachers did receive prompt feedback, they felt the administrators focused on the positives of the lesson and they appreciated when suggestions were given. Teachers indicated a desire to try to implement these suggestions if they were appropriate in the eyes of the teacher.

Walkthroughs were consistently said to be much less threatening than formal observations and both administrators and teachers feel they get more information from a walkthrough than from the advanced/well-planned formal lesson.

Shared Leadership: Site-based Professional Development

The vast majority (82%) of administrative survey respondents noted that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the integration of site and district instructional initiatives during site-based professional development. This represented a 12% increase from the previous year (see Table 2.2). When asked about alignment, 49% of administrators said that school and district priorities were “mostly” aligned, with 39% stated there was “definite” alignment. Administrators said that they were clearer on which initiatives were district-driven in 2009-10.

When asked about their site-based professional development priorities, administrators were most likely to cite services for EL students/ELD instruction (46%), Response to Intervention (39%), Literacy strategies (34%), *Write from the Beginning* (21%), School Climate (14%), Data Analysis (13%), and Differentiation (11%). Consistent with last year, focus group interviews revealed administrators are very clear on what is district driven, and what they can select as a focus, so they make it priority to mesh the two. Some administrators indicated that the focus on the Six Essentials is the driving force behind all the initiatives in PUSD yet this is still not a universal belief. There is clear evidence of the Six Essentials on posters and notebooks throughout nearly all the sites, but it was not universally referenced.

The vast majority (82%) of administrative survey respondents were also positive about involving teachers and other stakeholders in the development of site-based professional development priorities. Moreover, these positive perceptions increased 13% between 2008-09 and 2009-10. When queried on how they developed school-based professional development priorities, 66% of site administrators reported relying on site-based leadership teams (a 2% decrease), 52% relied on other site administrators (a 14% increase), 43% noted

consultation with lead teachers (a 9% decrease), and 49% named district administrators (an 11% decrease).

Only one survey item on this exemplar showed a statistically significant difference in comparing administrative responses by years of experience, assigned to external coach, elementary vs. secondary, and principal vs. assistant principal. Principals with four or more years of experience were more likely to list more satisfaction with their ability to develop site-based professional development plans that ensured integration of both site and district instructional initiatives.

Teachers at the case study schools were much less likely to express a positive opinion of the integration of site and district priorities in school-based professional development. Only 56% of teacher survey respondents were satisfied with the integration of district and site-based priorities for professional development, although this represented a 7% increase from the prior year. Similarly, only 58% were satisfied with the level of teacher involvement in developing their school’s professional development plan, although again this represented an increase of 11% from 2008-09.

Table 2.2: Perceptions of Site-based Professional Development

Administrator	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you in terms of developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports the implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives?	70%	82%	12%
How satisfied are you in terms of involving teachers and other school stakeholders in the development of the school’s professional development plan?	70%	83%	13%
How satisfied are you in terms of monitoring your school’s professional development plan in terms of meeting agreed upon goals?	64%	76%	12%
Teacher	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports the implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives?	49%	56%	7%
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of involving teachers and other school stakeholders in the development of the school’s professional development plan?	47%	58%	11%
How satisfied are you in terms of monitoring your school’s professional development plan in terms of meeting agreed upon goals?	NA	NA	NA

Teacher focus groups indicated a clear understanding of the district's focus on English Learners (EL) and Response to Intervention (RTI). Both teachers and administrators were aware of the need to address ELs and the RTI model. Many teachers expressed concerns about lack of appropriate curriculum materials for EL instruction, citing use of Pathways to Proficiency (a variant of Thinking Maps) to Avenues (an adopted ELD curriculum) and others indicated they "*use whatever we can get our hands on*".

Despite their agreement on the need for focused professional development to implement EL and RTI, most teachers felt they had limited input on how their school integrated these focus areas for site-based professional development. More troubling was the contention expressed by some teachers that the district's expectations for professional development were unrealistic. To a large extent, these feelings were attributed to feeling "*overwhelmed*" along with a widely held belief that failure to get immediate improvements results in the elimination of programs and initiatives. Both administrators and teachers wanted assurances that professional development, such as Thinking Maps (TM) and *Write From the Beginning* (WFTB), would be continued and strengthened prior to the addition of new district priorities. As such, there is a fear that teachers may not have adequate time to perfect new initiatives such as TM and WFTB. Teachers clearly do not want the district to move away from these programs yet they also want to be sure there is always professional development on them so they can stay, as one respondent said, "*refreshed regularly*".

Although 76% of administrators were satisfied with their monitoring of professional development in relation to school goals (an increase of 12%), many teachers said that they would like a more focused approach to evaluating professional development to determine what is working/not working, and then make decisions for "*selective abandonment*" (i.e., strategically selecting what not to focus on) based on staff input.

To improve site-based professional development, both teachers and administrators felt that the most effective professional development occurs when there are opportunities for teachers to be in job-alike/level-alike groups with structured time to share best practices and/or when they have choices about which professional development to attend. Both administrators and teachers also reported they would benefit from collaboration and sharing of best practices at meetings with specific guidelines for the process and not just "*show up and talk*". In addition to helping teachers develop more craft expertise, administrators felt that keeping the same focus would help persuade teachers that the district is committed to reforms in these areas. It is important to note that the State budget crisis and impending cuts to public education have been a huge distraction for staff, resulting in a high level of anxiety and uncertainty about future school planning.

Student Work and Data: Data Analysis and Use of Data

Analysis and use of data on student achievement and school performance has been prioritized at PUSD schools. Focus groups with administrators and teachers revealed that school-wide data is reviewed at the start of the year and at ongoing points throughout the year. Site administrators reported focusing on collaboration tied to the examination of data monthly (46%) or weekly (36%). By contrast, teachers reported data analysis occurring quarterly (39%), monthly (27%), or each semester (20%).

As shown in Table 2.3 below, 78% of administrators were satisfied with the allocation of time for collaboration tied to data analysis compared to 64% of teachers (it is interesting to note that these perceptions did not change among administrators but 22% more teacher survey respondents noted satisfaction in 2009-10 compared to 2008-09). Similarly, 75% of administrators expressed satisfaction with the use of protocols for analyzing data compared to 69% of teachers (increases of 5% and 11%, respectively).

Table 2.3: Perceptions of Data Analysis

Administrator	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you in terms of allocating <i>weekly</i> time for staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps?	78%	78%	0%
How satisfied are you in terms of ensuring that staff collaboration uses data analysis tools and protocols?	70%	75%	5%
Teacher	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of allocating <i>weekly</i> time for staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps?	42%	64%	22%
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of ensuring that staff collaboration uses data analysis tools and protocols?	58%	69%	11%

Site administrators were most likely to cite the California Standards Tests (89%), district-wide benchmark assessments (64%), and student work analysis (41%) as “important” data for school planning, followed by the California English Language Development Test (39%) and report cards/grade distribution (23%). Teachers ranked data in order of importance as follows: report cards/grade distribution (56%), California Standards Tests (50%), district-wide benchmark assessments (33%), student work (33%), student attendance (29%), student behavior data (28%), CAHSEE (17%) and the California English Language Development Test (17%).

The data analysis process used by most administrators centered on examining students in terms of proficiency (52%), identifying trends in data (36%), using data to plan next steps (25%), focusing on vertical articulation of results (20%), and using data for designing re-teaching (16%). In order to assist staff in the understanding of the data, some principals prepared spreadsheets for each teacher with students highlighted according to proficiency levels and even have ‘data dialogues’ between students and teachers. Most teachers have a targeted group of students to focus on moving into the next proficiency band throughout the year. Last year several schools were de-privatizing instruction in the classroom with UCLA Walkthroughs but for 2009-10, this seems to have been put on hold.

In nearly all of the principals and teachers focus groups, participants reported that while they have sufficient access to data, there is an insufficient use of data to alter instruction. They expressed a need for professional development as to how to ‘*make the data talk*’ so it truly impacts the classroom, as well as in creating time for teachers to learn how to move from data analysis to best instructional practices.

As in the previous year, focus groups consistently revealed intense concerns about the use of the district-wide benchmark assessments. Concerns focused primarily on a lack of alignment between these district assessments and the high-stakes summative assessments mandated by the State. In particular, district-wide benchmark scores were seen as an inadequate “predictor” of student success on the California Standards Tests (CSTs). Many also questioned the use of the district-wide benchmarks as a valid measure for English Learner (EL) reclassification.

Responsive Instruction: Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Cycle of Inquiry and Shared Leadership: Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Teachers are having more conversations about instruction linked to the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Cycle of Inquiry and many principals reported they have made both a focus this school year. The survey results in Table 2.4 indicate that 63% of administrators were satisfied with their modeling and leadership on PDCA (an increase of 6%). Fewer teachers (54%) reported satisfaction with PDCA but these ratings improved 17%.

Administrators tended to use PDCA as a tool for self-evaluation (30%) and maintaining organization and focus of site-based instructional priorities (25%). However, 25% of administrators acknowledged “inconsistent use” of PDCA.

Table 2.4: Perceptions of PDCA Cycle of Inquiry

Administrator	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you principal in terms of modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry?	57%	63%	6%
Teacher	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry?	37%	54%	17%

While 39% of administrators said that the PDCA Cycle of Inquiry was useful, it is interesting to note that principals were more likely (statistically significant) to consider PDCA to be useful and beneficial compared to assistant principals. Teacher responses were significantly lower than those of administrators. Only 39% of teachers agreed that PDCA was useful and only 31% agreed that PDCA was beneficial in terms of guiding professional development and teacher collaboration.

Similar results were found for administrative and teacher satisfaction with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). As shown in Table 2.5, 64% of surveyed administrators and 58% of surveyed teachers expressed satisfaction with the development of PLCs. These levels of satisfaction represented a 4% decrease and a 16% increase, respectively.

Administrators reported that PLCs were organized at their sites by grade level (62%) or department (21%), with smaller numbers organized as vertical teams (10%) or cross-curricular teams (7%). A portion of the principals indicated that only some grade levels are doing PLCs and acknowledged that some grades/ departments were more successful with PLCs than others. It is interesting to note that principals with more experience, as well as elementary principals were most likely to report satisfaction with development of PLCs at each grade level or department (statistically significant at 0.05 level). Teacher survey respondents reported PLCs as organized by grade level (52%), department (25%), cross-curricular teams (16%) and vertical teams (7%).

Both teachers and administrators reported in focus groups that there was a basic understanding of the goal of PLCs and what they are expected to accomplish. According to school administrators, PLCs were seen primarily as a vehicle for enhanced collaboration (66%), improving instructional delivery (45%), focusing on student achievement (36%), and setting common grade level or department goals (20%). Teachers identified collaboration as the overarching PLC goal, followed by examination of student work. In a few cases, common assessments have been developed at PLC meetings. However, more than half (53%) of administrators characterized PLCs as their “most important effort” when designing site-based professional development compared to only 11% of teachers.

Table 2.5: Perceptions of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

Administrator		Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change	
How satisfied are you in terms of developing professional learning communities at each grade level and/or department?	68%	64%	-4%	
Teacher		Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change	
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of developing professional learning communities at each grade level and/or department?	42%	58%	16%	

The general perception of both the administrators and the teachers is that PLCs and PDCA are “one” initiative. Where implementation has occurred, teachers mostly noted that they had done the Plan and Do sections but not the Check or Act components. For the minority of schools that had completed a Cycle of Inquiry, teachers indicated that they were asked to submit a paper or minutes of their meetings and/or a product indicating they had completed the task/focus directed by the administration. In some cases, teachers felt that the product was not relevant to the PDCA cycle but rather ‘busy work’ just to show that they did something. When a product does not have to be turned in after each session, teachers generally feel “*treated as professionals, trusted to do the work we need to do*”.

Shared Leadership: Modeling Integrity, Fairness, and Respect

School Climate

As shown in Table 2.6, 93% of administrators expressed satisfaction with their role in positively impacting school culture, compared to only 60% of teachers. These levels of satisfaction represented increases of 9% among administrators and 19% among teacher survey respondents.

Table 2.6: Perceptions of Modeling Integrity, Fairness, and Respect

Administrator	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you in terms of positively impacting school culture?	84%	93%	9%
How satisfied are you in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to staff?	100%	100%	0%
How satisfied are you in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to students?	100%	100%	0%
How satisfied are you in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to parents?	100%	100%	0%
Teacher	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
Survey Item	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
How satisfied are you in terms of positively impacting school culture?	41%	60%	19%
How satisfied are you in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to staff?	51%	63%	12%
How satisfied are you in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to students?	58%	69%	11%
How satisfied are you with your principal in terms of modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to parents?	63%	72%	9%

When asked about improvements to school climate, principals cited decreases in discipline referrals, establishment of community programs, increased respect among school stakeholders, and better adult: student interactions. In focus groups, teachers tended to feel that school climate had not changed. Perception of student discipline appeared to be the key litmus test for whether teacher believed school climate was improving. At some sites, teachers blamed the lack of a ‘*strong hand*’ from the principal in ensuring school-wide adherence to behavior/ discipline policies. One of the case study schools formed a School Climate Committee to address the issue.

As in 2008-09, teachers at the case study schools in 2009-10 indicated that a lack of clear and focused communication left too much open to interpretation, creating a culture of distrust and uncertainty. They indicated that decision-making processes were either not known or transparent, with often too much left in the hands of site-based leadership teams. Another possible contributing factor to this perception was the impending layoffs related to budget cuts. Last year the vast majority of administrators teachers interviewed were dismayed by the way in which potential and actual layoffs were communicated to staff from

site administrators and especially by district spokespersons. However, this year administrators appreciated that they were not responsible for delivering this information to staff and that it was handled by district personnel. Further, teachers expressed concerns about the amount of money spent to have so many teachers out of the classroom to be present at several days of hearings.

Staff Interactions

All (100%) administrators felt satisfied by their efforts to model integrity, fairness, and respect with staff, compared to only 63% of staff survey respondents. When asked to rate the integrity of staff, 84% of administrators checked this as “good” or “exemplar” compared to 79% of teachers. On the issue of fairness, the figures were 90% of administrators compared to 81% of teachers. On the question of mutual respect, the percentages were 88% administrators and 72% among teacher survey respondents.

The lower ratings from teachers may be attributed to intra-staff dissention. For example, focus group participants often noted a lack of respect and professionalism among staff members and that staff were “*split into factions*” and “*very distrusting of the district*”. Some principals indicated that they do not celebrate often enough with their staffs and struggle with the teachers who want use the collective bargaining contract to contradict the principal on many issues.

Student Interactions

All (100%) of the administrators felt satisfied with their efforts to model integrity, fairness, and respect with students, compared to only 69% of staff survey respondents. It is interesting to note that elementary principals were more likely (in a statistically significant manner) to give themselves higher ratings on modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to students. When asked to rate the integrity of students, 71% of administrators checked this as “good” or “exemplar” compared to 34% of teachers. On the issue of fairness, the figures were 84% of administrators compared to 46% of teachers. On the question of mutual respect, the percentages were 74% administrators and 29% among teacher survey respondents. Clearly, the survey data show a large discrepancy between the perceptions of school administrators and teachers on these items.

As in the previous year, students generally felt that their administrators and teachers were fair and showed respect to them. Students interviewed were generally happy at their school. They believed the teachers cared about them and that students and teachers generally get along with each other. They indicated that if an issue arises, they are given the opportunity to tell their side of the story. However, students admitted that if they were to give themselves a letter grade for behavior, it would be a ‘C’, noting that some students were disrespectful to staff and to each other. Students indicated they were recognized for successes at all the schools in areas ranging from attendance to advancing from Basic to Proficient on the CST to being on time for testing week.

Parent Interactions

All (100%) of the administrators felt satisfied with their efforts to model integrity, fairness, and respect with staff, compared to 72% of teacher survey respondents (see Table 2.6).

Administrators with more experience (4 years and more) tended to be more positive (in a statistically significant manner) in terms of their self-reported ability to demonstrate fairness and respect to parents, compared to administrators with three or fewer years of experience. When asked to rate the integrity of parents, 85% of administrators checked this as “good” or “exemplar” compared to 65% of teachers. For the issue of fairness, the figures were 89% of administrators, compared to 68% of teachers. On the question of respect, the percentages were 84% administrators and 67% among teacher survey respondents.

Statistically significant results were obtained comparing principals in terms of years of experience and comparing principals to assistant principals. Specifically, administrators with four or more years of experience were more likely to report that parents demonstrated fairness and respect. Similarly, principals were more likely than assistant principals to say that parents demonstrated integrity.

Based on focus groups with parents, they were generally aware of the Parent Centers that exist at most sites. Parents noted that parent participation varied widely from school-to-school. Some parent groups met weekly and were very visible on their campus. At these schools, parents were involved in organizing special events for students, campus beautification activities, potlucks for teachers, translating for teachers, and more. In addition, overall the parents believed that their opinion counted. At one site, they mentioned the issue of school uniforms which they voted for and now have. At another site, parents requested computers for first grade and that request was also granted. Parents are satisfied with the communication among administrators, teachers and parents and have high praise for the hard work that the teachers and administrators do with their students.

II. District and Coaching Support

Support from External Coaches

Pivot Learning (formerly known as Springboard) coaches were assigned to 18 PUSD principals (nine elementary and nine secondary) and provided coaching throughout 2009-10 (a reduction from 28 principals in 2008-09 due to budgetary constraints). Coaches were former principals, many with district level administrative experience, and were matched with each PUSD principal. Individual coaching plans were developed collaboratively for each of the principals. PUSD's Superintendent and the Administrative Directors of Elementary and Secondary Education selected the participating principals, prioritizing newer principals and principals assigned to schools struggling to meet state/federal accountability targets. To guide principal coaching, coaches relied upon the McRel leadership elements⁴ and Hargrove's transactional coaching reserve,⁵ using a rubric of the McRel leadership standards adapted to align with PUSD's Six Essentials.

Coaching focused on helping principals make growth in the six "Leadership Exemplars" selected to guide principal accountability. In 2009-10, coaches continued to guide principals on classroom walkthroughs, demonstrating how to reallocate time to get into classrooms, how to stay focused on the instructional aspects of walkthroughs and how to provide feedback to teachers based on walkthroughs. Coaches also worked with principals to structure teacher collaboration and professional development, including newer exemplars on PDCA Cycle of Inquiry and PLCs. Coaches focused on strategies for principals to use in order to conduct analysis of student assessment data. Coaching also focused on building leadership capacity in instructional strategies, including coaching on Thinking Maps, appreciative inquiry and other research-based instructional strategies. Lastly, coaches collaborated and provided feedback to principals in parent communication, student discipline, school governance, homework policies and interventions for struggling students.

Based on data from a survey of all PUSD site administrators, interaction with coaches occurred twice a month (50%) or monthly (21%). Interactions were most likely to happen at the school site (60%), with additional follow-up via telephone or email. On average, coaching sessions lasted 1-2 hours (50%) or 2-3 hours (43%).

As shown in Table 3.1 below, principals were overwhelmingly positive about their coaching experiences (average of 88% satisfaction). The highest ratings centered on helping clarify assumptions and beliefs, analyzing actions, identifying problems/issues, and support in maintaining a focus on student learning (all 100% satisfaction in 2009-10). Principals also expressed high levels of satisfaction with coaching in terms of participation in classroom walkthroughs (93%), setting and prioritizing goals (88%), facilitating alignment of school goals with district goals (88%), and guidance in assessing school culture (88%).

⁴ Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) examines the effects of leadership practices on student achievement. McREL identified 21 specific leadership responsibilities significantly correlated with student achievement.

⁵ Hargrove, R. (1995). *Masterful Coaching; Extraordinary Results by Impacting People and the Way They Think and Work Together*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The “lowest” satisfaction ratings for external coaching support were centered on observing and providing feedback and debriefs on interactions with staff (67%), setting up monitoring systems to achieve goals (68%), and helping provide feedback tied to classroom walkthroughs (74%).

In terms of growth from 2008-09 to 2009-10, more principals assigned to a coach expressed satisfaction with fostering overall professional growth as a school leader (14% gain), support in maintaining a focus on student learning (12%), helping analyze actions (10%), and helping identify problems and issues (10%). By contrast, there were declines in principal satisfaction with observing and providing feedback on interactions with staff (-14%), setting up monitoring systems to achieve goals (-8%), helping provide feedback tied to classroom walkthroughs (-7%), and helping set and prioritize goals (6%).

Table 3.1: Administrator Perceptions of External Coaching Support

Administrator Survey Item	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
Collaborating with me to set and prioritize goals	94%	88%	-6%
Helping me clarify my assumptions and beliefs	93%*	100%	7%
Helping me to analyze my actions	90%*	100%	10%
Helping me identify problems/issues	90%*	100%	10%
Facilitating alignment of school goals with district goals (Six Essentials)	90%*	88%	-2%
Supporting me in maintaining a focus on student learning	88%*	100%	12%
Participating with me in classroom walkthroughs	88%*	93%	5%
Fostering my overall professional growth as a school leader	86%*	100%	14%
Encouraging me to develop instructional leadership in others (distributive leadership)	84%*	87%	3%
Helping me provide timely, specific feedback to teachers following classroom walkthroughs	81%	74%	-7%
Observing me and providing feedback and debriefs on my interactions with staff	81%	67%	-14%
Assisting me in helping teachers understand and use assessment (data) results to improve their teaching	80%*	80%	0%
Helping me to guide teachers in developing PLCs	80%*	81%	1%
Providing guidance in assessing school culture	79%	88%	9%
Assisting me in the analysis of data and/or protocols for how to present data to staff.	78%*	87%	9%
Setting up a monitoring system for achieving my goals	76%*	68%	-8%
Average	85%	88%	3%

* Statistically significant difference between elementary and secondary principal respondents

It is important to note that twelve of the survey items on external coaching support had statistically significant differences (see asterisks in Table 3.1) in 2008-09 comparing elementary to secondary principals. In 2009-10, none of the survey item generated statistical significance comparing elementary to secondary administrators.

Interviews with the case study sample of principals indicated that principals continued to see external coaching support as immensely helpful. Fewer principals had coaches this but those who had coaches felt they benefited greatly from their experience, citing their coaches as “*someone to talk things through with*”.

District Support

In September–October 2009, principals were asked to summarize their major accomplishments, strengths, and skills. District level elementary and secondary directors then evaluated each principal in three dimensions:

1. Extent to which the school met quantitative targets for student achievement and overall school performance from the Balanced Scorecard
2. A review of school progress in meeting goals in the school APSA
3. A formal rating of 1-4 on the three leadership exemplars tied to three (classroom walkthroughs and feedback to teachers, development of site-based professional development, and data analysis and use of protocols with staff) of the Six Essentials

In debriefs with each principal, the elementary and secondary administrative directors then provided feedback to principals. Principals were most commonly urged to:

- Focus on instructional differentiation for student subgroups (English Learners, Special Education, etc.)
- Set aside time for regular classroom walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers. Classroom walkthroughs were seen as an opportunity for principals to concretely assess teacher performance and highlight strengths and areas for improvement. Walkthroughs were also recommended in order to re-evaluate expectations that principals have for their teachers.
- Implement PLC Action Teams focused on data analysis and professional reflection. PLCs were recommended for use in all grade levels and subject areas in order to share best practices and support the ongoing analysis of student data.
- Guide staff in the use of data to design timely interventions during the regular school day and in extended learning settings.

Elementary principals also received direction on how to focus on the use of Thinking Maps and refinement of instructional strategies targeting literacy. Secondary principals were asked to build the capacity of assistant principals to support and monitor instruction and/or to enlist the support of assistant principals in running the operational aspects of the school so that the principal could focus on instructional leadership.

Following this feedback, the administrative directors and principals worked on developing a set of priorities for 2009-10. These priorities functioned as a task list for what principals felt they should focus on based on school/student needs and for their own professional development.

Table 3.2: Administrator Perceptions of District Support

Administrator Survey Item	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
Leadership Exemplars/Accountability			
Aligning school goals to the Six Essentials	83%	89%	6%
Analyzing student achievement data; using data to drive school improvement	79%	79%	0%
Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect	78%*	85%	7%
Developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives.	65%	86%	21%
Fostering a collaborative school culture	65%	81%	16%
Modeling facilitation of effective school meetings	65%	81%	16%
Structuring staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps.	62%	73%	11%
Developing my school plan (APSA)	62%	76%**	14%
Providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following my classroom walkthroughs.	60%	74%	14%
Conducting daily classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning.	59%	76%**	17%
Developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department.	59%	72%	13%
Aligning school resources to school plan goals	56%	79%	23%
Modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry.	55%	63%**	8%
Average	65%	78%	13%
Student Achievement/Instructional Capacity			
Utilizing Thinking Maps to scaffold teaching and learning	86%	83%*	-3%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of writing skills	68%	74%	6%
Employing lesson design as part of teacher planning	63%	58%	-5%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of reading comprehension	61%	61%	0%
Re-designating eligible English Learners	61%	73%	12%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of word analysis and vocabulary development	60%	60%	0%
Meeting the needs of English Learners in mainstream instruction (e.g., CELDT levels 4 and 5, as well as re-designated students)	57%	59%	2%
Focusing on instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (e.g., SDAIE methods)	55%	74%	19%
Focusing on instruction on opportunities for students to demonstrate and discuss their mathematical reasoning	50%	56%*	6%
Ensuring that English Learners improve one CELDT level annually	48%	66%	18%
Focusing on mathematical concepts rather than procedures as part of instruction	47%	58%	11%
Average	60%	66%	6%

* Statistically significant difference between elementary and secondary principal respondents

** Statistically significant difference between administrators with 0-3 vs. 4 or more years of experience

As shown in Table 3.2 above, in the area of Leadership Exemplars and Accountability, principals were most satisfied with district support tied to the alignment of school goals to the Six Essentials (89%). Principals also rated district support very high for: a) developing a site-based professional development plan (86%); b) the modeling of integrity, fairness, and respect (85%); c) fostering a collaborative school culture (81%); d) modeling facilitation of effective school meetings (81%); and e) aligning school resources to school plan goals (79%). On average, administrators were 13% more likely to be satisfied with district support tied to the leadership exemplars in 2009-10 compared to 2008-09.

On average, administrators were 6% more likely to be satisfied with district support tied to student achievement and instructional capacity in 2009-10 compared to 2008-09. District support of Thinking Maps to scaffold student learning was rated highest (83%) by principals. Principals also provided high ratings for district support of writing skills (74%), focusing on instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (74%), and re-designating eligible English Learners (73%).

Administrators rated district support lowest in terms of helping them: a) provide opportunities for students to demonstrate mathematical reasoning (56%); b) reorganize teaching of Mathematics to teach mathematical concepts rather than procedures (58%); c) incorporate lesson design into teacher planning (58%); and d) provide services for English Learners in mainstream instruction (59%).

Only two survey items showed statistically significant differences comparing elementary to secondary administrators. Elementary administrators were more likely to report satisfaction with district support on a) focusing instruction on opportunities for students to demonstrate and discuss their mathematical reasoning, and b) utilizing Thinking Maps to scaffold teaching and learning.

None of the survey items showed statistically significant differences comparing assignment to an external coach, or principal versus assistant principal. However, three survey items showed significant difference based on administrative years of experience, with those with four or more years of experience more positive (see Table 3.2).

As shown in Table 3.3, teacher satisfaction improved slightly to 63% (increase of 1% from 2008-09) on survey items about district support for school instructional programs. In 2009-10, teachers at the case study schools gave the highest ratings to their schools implementation of Thinking Maps (78%) and delivering instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (78%). Teachers also rated their satisfaction with the emphasis on word analysis and vocabulary development (69%), re-designating EL students (69%), meeting the needs of EL students in mainstream settings (67%), and ensuring that EL students show CELDT improvement (66%).

Teacher responses did not change very much between years with the exceptions of a) more teachers satisfied with district support of word analysis and vocabulary development (8% improvement); and b) ensuring that EL students improved at least one CELDT level annually (6% increase). Conversely, teacher perceptions diminished for a) meeting the needs of EL students in mainstream instruction (decrease of 7%); and b) district prioritization of lesson design (decline of 21%).

Table 3.3: Teacher Perceptions of School Instructional Programs

Teacher Survey Item	Very Satisfied/Satisfied		
	2008-2009 (N=63)	2009-2010 (N=61)	Net Change
Student Achievement/Instructional Capacity			
Utilizing Thinking Maps to scaffold teaching and learning	74%	78%	4%
Focusing on instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (e.g., SDAIE methods)	74%	78%	4%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of word analysis and vocabulary development	61%	69%	8%
Re-designating eligible English Learners	71%	69%	-2%
Meeting the needs of English Learners in mainstream instruction (e.g., CELDT levels 4 and 5, as well as re-designated students)	74%	67%	-7%
Ensuring that English Learners improve one CELDT level annually	60%	66%	6%
Focusing on instruction on opportunities for students to demonstrate and discuss their mathematical reasoning	63%	64%	1%
Focusing on mathematical concepts rather than procedures as part of instruction	65%	63%	-2%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of reading comprehension	56%	60%	4%
Focusing instruction on the teaching of writing skills	46%	54%	8%
Employing lesson design as part of teacher planning	42%	21%	-21%
Average	62%	63%	1%

District Principal Meetings

To build the collective capacity of principals, PUSD holds a monthly principal meeting. This meeting is organized as an administrative PLC, exploring a range of different topics related to leadership development, instructional priorities, and district foci.

Principals offered some suggestions for these monthly principal meetings. For example, principals felt that the meetings had an overly didactic quality with too many *‘talking heads’* talking at them. Many principals felt that the agendas were overly ambitious and questioned the inclusion of all topics and activities. While administrators appreciate the time and effort that goes into planning the meetings, they would like *“more depth and less breadth”* and, while they know why it is done, many suggested *“less of the fluff and fun stuff.”* Others asked for more differentiated training. As one of the principals said, *“We expect teachers to differentiate instruction, so our meetings should also be differentiated.”* It was suggested by some principals that PUSD be more strategic in its focus and hone its efforts on providing principals with demonstrated practices to exit Program Improvement.

Evaluating the Principal Accountability System

The administrator survey also asked principals to rate the extent to which the overall accountability system for evaluating principal performance was helpful to their development as school leaders. To this question, 50% said it had “mostly” helped them, with another 27% reporting that it “somewhat” helped them and 21% said “definitely”, helped them.

Principals were more likely to agree that the evaluation process had helped them compared to assistant principals (statistically significant at the 0.05 level).

The primary administrative concerns hinged on the need for a more succinct summary of what they should prioritize based on evaluation feedback, as well as a desire that the evaluation process link more directly to the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CaPSELs) used as part of the completion of Administrative Credential programs.

In interviews at the case study schools, principals were complimentary about the creation of the Leadership Exemplars, which they felt has greatly clarified professional expectations and accountability. They also appreciated the fact that the focus on principal accountability funded through the Weingart initiative began with an ad hoc committee of principals. In other words, the principal accountability system that is emerging in PUSD gained credibility because a group of principals was involved in the design of what the system would look like.

Additionally, principals appreciated the process of self-reflection and collaborative goal setting with the directors. Reflections/reflective discussions now occur on a regular basis and have become *“part of who we are now”*. Principals feel they are more focused and stronger in their leadership role and are now *“clear on the expectations-I know my mission”* and *“without Weingart I would not be this effective.”*

Principals were grateful to have a consistent monitoring tool. They have a great deal of trust and respect for their directors. They feel valued and supported and were not hesitant to share concerns and issues with them.

Future District Support

Overwhelmingly, administrators indicated a need for more district support in the area of Human Resources, particularly documenting the performance of ineffective employees from progressive discipline to the final step of termination. Principals also wanted more autonomy with the hiring of staff. There are also concerns at some sites about the hostility of the teachers collective bargaining unit and principals needing effective strategies in dealing with reluctant implementers of school and district initiatives.

Principals also expressed the need for a stronger focus on Curriculum and Instruction at their school sites. They would like more district guidance and support around ensuring that faculty implement agreed upon instructional practices matched to the district focus on English Learners and RTI. Principals also noted a need for further refinement of the systems for accessing data. They want a more streamlined process for monitoring student progress with timely access to individual data. Elementary administrators and teachers still acknowledge a need for support with the new Math textbooks.

Administrators appreciate having more control over their site professional development with fewer directives from the district. However, many principals expressed a desire for more opportunities to observe experts at other sites and learn from districts showing improvement. Principals also would like more opportunities for assistant principals to participate in leadership development targeting their professional growth needs and knowledge base.

Principals were frustrated with lack of streamlined procedures at the district central office. The consensus is that *“there’s too much red tape”* and repeated phone calls to the district requesting information are simply transferred from person-to-person. Some principals stated that the district is always asking them for something or misplacing documents that have already been turned in.

Lastly, again this year, while some of the administrator interviews indicated a definite desire to continue with the coaching, many principals want more support from therapists, psychologists, and counselors. They feel students are in very precarious situations at this time and professional help and support is required to address barriers to learning.

IV. Conclusion – Accomplishments and Challenges

Key Accomplishments

In 2009-10, the third and final year of the Weingart grant, PUSD has made progress in holding principals accountable for specific leadership exemplars developed as part of an overall principal accountability system. Based on a survey of all PUSD administrators and an in-depth examination of six case study schools chosen to represent district staff and student demographic, key accomplishments include:

- Principal Evaluation System: The principal evaluation process has provided an opportunity for professional learning, goal setting, and prioritization tied to clear Leadership Exemplars and well-aligned with PUSD's Six Essentials. Moreover, the principal evaluation process has encouraged more dialogue and interaction between district directors and principals aimed at fostering school-wide improvement.
- District Support: District support is perceived positively and has grown. Principals rated district support highest in terms of helping them a) develop site-based professional development plan; b) model integrity, fairness, and respect; c) foster a collaborative school culture; d) model facilitation of effective school meetings; and e) align school resources to school plan goals.
- Classroom Walkthroughs: Classroom walkthroughs are becoming a more regular feature of principals' responsibilities. An administrative presence in the classroom is frequent and increasingly targeted to address the needs of teachers. Teachers largely perceive administrative feedback from walkthroughs as timely (although more could be done in this regard) and beneficial. Moreover, data from the classroom walkthroughs is informing school-based leadership planning and professional development.
- Designing Professional Development: Principals are very satisfied with and confident in their ability to organize and coordinate site-based professional development. Administrators are largely in agreement that site-based professional development helped them focus on academic improvement organized around PUSD's Six Essentials.
- Analysis and Use of Data: Data analysis has become a common feature of site-based professional development and teacher collaboration. Data analysis, paired with feedback from classroom walkthroughs, has helped enhance the quality of teacher collaboration by generating conversations about what works and helping target instruction based on data-derived student needs.
- Principal Coaching: External coaching has been extremely beneficial to principals. Pivot Learning coaches received the highest ratings in helping principals with maintaining a consistent focus on student learning, examining underlying assumptions and beliefs about school change, analyzing actions implemented as part of school improvement, identifying problems/issues, and aligning leadership to the

PUSD Six Essentials. Principals also expressed high levels of satisfaction with coaching in terms of goal setting, assessing school culture, participating in classroom walkthroughs, fostering overall professional growth, and aligning school and district priorities.

- District Instructional Priorities: District-wide focus on English Learners and Response to Intervention, as well as initiatives such as Thinking Maps and *Write from the Beginning* are perceived as clear and appropriate instructional priorities. In addition, both site administrators and school staff desire continuity of these priorities in order to deepen and infuse these aspects of instructional reform into everyday teaching and learning.
- Teacher Collaboration: Schools are developing Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and have made progress around the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) Cycle of Inquiry. Each school now has PLC action teams organized by grade level and/or department to enhance collaboration and organize the collective analysis of student work. Some PLCs have also made strides in developing common formative assessments.

Challenges

The construction of a comprehensive accountability system for evaluating principal performance is still in an early implementation phase. On-going challenges and areas for improvement include:

- Principal Evaluation: As our report indicated last year, principals feel that the evaluation process and accompanying feedback documents are “daunting.” It may be helpful to develop a one-page summary document of suggested priorities that is posted and shared with teachers and also serve as a way for Assistant Principals to understand more of the ‘big picture’. Administrators would also likely benefit from an evaluation feedback form that connects more directly to the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CaPSELs) referenced in Administrative Credential Programs.
- Teacher Collaboration: Schools would like more time for the sharing of promising/best instructional practices during site-based professional development, including teacher collaboration in PLCs. School administrators also desire more guidance and direction on the implementation of the PDCA Cycle of Inquiry and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Some teachers view work in these Leadership Exemplars as compliance activities, rather than authentic professional development. Moreover, PDCA and PLCs have been insufficiently linked to the district’s prioritization of improving instruction for EL students and developing a systematic approach to Response to Intervention. Setting a common expectation as to what principals should share with their staffs after their monthly PLC meeting with a simple script or talking points and list of “to do’s” with timelines may help to strengthen implementation of these exemplars.
- District Support on Instruction and Data: Both administrators and teachers wanted assurances that professional development tied to Thinking Maps and WFTB would

be continued and strengthened prior to the addition of new district priorities. Moreover, principals want more district guidance and support around how to move from data analysis to use of data for designing instruction for the district foci of English Learner support and development of systems for Response to Intervention. Lastly, principals desire district support in the areas of Mathematics instruction, lesson design, and meeting the needs of English Learners in mainstream instruction. Developing a *district-wide* consensus on the provision of English Language Development (ELD) based on research-based instructional strategies and protocols for universal access versus strategic intervention would likely help in this regard.

- Assessment Alignment: Addressing staff concerns regarding the perceived lack of alignment between district-wide benchmark assessments and summative assessments such as the California Standards Test. Teachers are beginning to analyze and use data to guide and modify instruction but principals are not confident in their abilities to lead this effort so it truly impacts instructional practices. Their concerns about alignment reflect a willingness to consider how best to balance different assessment data in reaching conclusions on how to use data for instructional change.
- Distributive Leadership and Transparency: Both assistant principals and teacher leaders (e.g., grade level and department chairs) need to be better connected to the school improvement priorities and efforts to align with PUSD's Leadership Exemplars. This second tier of leaders requires more opportunities to participate in shaping site-based professional development and leading teacher collaboration forums, with subsequent allocation of time for reflection and sharing of experiences. There is also a need for going further in terms of involving teachers in setting school plans for professional development and addressing concerns about school climate. The discrepancy between the perceptions of site administrators and the perceptions of school staff (primarily teachers) in the areas targeted for principal accountability stem largely from a perception that staff "voice" has not been adequately taken into account. In addition, the focus on increased collaboration has heightened intra-staff factionalism. Continued efforts to showcase transparency and communicate decisions (and the rationale for these decisions) to all staff may go a long way toward improving staff perceptions and narrowing the gap.
- District Support on Human Resources: Principals continue to seek assistance with human resource issues, particularly those related to unsatisfactory employee performance and contractual disputes.
- District Principal Meetings: Principals would like a revamping of the format of monthly principal meetings to include more opportunities for differentiated training, exposure to evidence-based strategies that have helped schools exit Program Improvement, and opportunities to observe experts at other sites and learn from other districts that have been successful in improving student achievement among demographically similar students. Also, principals appreciate having time to directly interact with the Superintendent and feel that opportunities for direct dialogue have been beneficial and should continue.

Appendix A

Pomona USD

Administrator Survey

Pomona USD Site Administrator Survey (N=61) Creating a System for Leadership Development and Principal Accountability

Pomona USD is receiving a grant from the Weingart Foundation to deepen the construction of a coherent and meaningful internal accountability system that measures and tracks the role of administrative leadership in producing school improvement. As required by the grant, a third-party external evaluator, Public Works, Inc. (PW), has been contracted to evaluate the district’s progress and to prepare reports to the Weingart Foundation.

We would appreciate your help in completing the survey below. Your answers to this survey will be treated as confidential and will only be reported in aggregate (i.e., no individual data will be reported) and individual survey data will not be shared with district staff. The survey should take you approximately 30 minutes to complete.

I. About You

- 1. I am a... **59%** principal **39%** assistant principal **2%** other administrator
- 2. I am assigned to... **57%** elementary school **16%** middle school **26%** high school
- 3. I have been an administrator for a total...**14%** 0-1 years **22%** 2-3 years **22%** 4-5 years **41%** 6+ years

II. Principal Accountability

<i>Please rate your satisfaction with your own 2009-10 performance in...</i>	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4. Conducting daily classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning.	5%	38%	48%	10%
5. Providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following my classroom walkthroughs.	5%	30%	51%	15%
6. Developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives.	2%	15%	54%	30%
7. Involving teachers and other school stakeholders in the development of the school’s professional development plan.	2%	13%	57%	28%
8. Monitoring my school’s professional development plan in terms of meeting agreed upon goals.	3%	20%	62%	15%
9. Allocating <i>weekly</i> time for staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps.	2%	20%	41%	38%
10. Ensuring that staff collaboration uses data analysis tools and protocols.	3%	21%	51%	25%
11. Modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry.	2%	34%	43%	21%
12. Developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department.	3%	32%	38%	27%
13. Positively impacting school culture.	0%	9%	41%	51%
14. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to staff.	0%	0%	20%	80%
15. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to students	0%	0%	18%	82%
16. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to parents.	0%	0%	25%	75%

Classroom Walkthroughs

17. How often do you complete a walkthrough on each teacher at your school?

46% Weekly (25-36x/year) **44%** Monthly (9-10x/year) **7%** Quarterly (4x/year) **2%** Semesterly (2x/year)

18. Describe your process for conducting classroom walkthroughs. How do you provide feedback to the teacher you observe?

19. How do you utilize the information from the observation with the individual teacher? To what extent are you able to identify grade level/department/school-wide trends?

Professional Development Planning

20. Who helped you develop your professional development plan for 2009-10? (check all that apply)

32% I do this myself **62%** Other site administrators **47%** District administrators
17% External coaches **57%** Lead teachers **20%** Other Consultants
0% Site-based Leadership Team **0%** Other: _____

21. What have your goals/priorities been for professional development in 2009-10?

Goal #1: _____

Goal #2: _____

Goal #3: _____

22. How well were you able to align school and district priorities/initiatives this year?

51% Definitely **46%** Mostly **3%** Somewhat **0%** Not at all

Why or Why not?

I. Data Analysis Tools/Protocols

23. Do you work with a collaborative staff?

43% Definitely **39%** Mostly **18%** Somewhat **0%** Not at all

Why or Why not?

24. How often is staff involved in collaboration tied to the examination of student data?

33% Weekly (25-36x/year) **46%** Monthly (9-10x/year) **18%** Quarterly (4x/year) **3%** Sem. (2x/year)

25. What is the most important data for you when analyze student achievement trends? (check top three)

89% CSTs **13%** CAHSEE **36%** CELDT **66%** District Benchmark data **44%** Student Work
18% Attendance **18%** Behavior **23%** Report Card Data/Grade Distribution **16%** Other: _____

26. What is the most important data for your teachers when analyze student achievement trends? (check top three)

75% CSTs **8%** CAHSEE **21%** CELDT **59%** District Benchmark data **62%** Student Work
15% Attendance **15%** Behavior **30%** Report Card Data/Grade Distribution **10%** Other: _____

27. What is your data analysis process with staff? How do you examine student performance? What do you look for in achievement gap trends? How does this data affect your plans?

Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry

28. How useful is the Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry to you?

39% Definitely **32%** Mostly **25%** Somewhat **4%** Not at all

Why or Why not?

29. How useful is the Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry to your teachers?

9% Definitely **40%** Mostly **47%** Somewhat **4%** Not at all

Why or Why not?

30. How do you select focus/foci and collect data as part of the Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry?

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

31. How are PLCs organized at your school?

74% Grade Level **28%** Departments **15%** Vertical (grade span) teams **13%** Cross-curricular teams

32. What is the goal of the PLC at your school? What do you expect a PLC to accomplish? How do PLCs fit into the overall school-wide professional development plan?

33. How important has PLCs been to your overall professional development plan in 2009-10?

53% Most Important Effort **35%** Important **8%** Somewhat Important **3%** Not at all Important

Why or Why not?

School Culture

<i>How would you rate your school culture in terms of integrity, fairness, and respect</i>	Not Good	Needs Work	Good	Exemplar
34. Staff demonstrate integrity	0%	15%	59%	26%
35. Staff demonstrate fairness	0%	9%	71%	20%
36. Staff demonstrate respect	0%	12%	59%	30%
37. Parents demonstrate integrity	0%	13%	72%	15%
38. Parents demonstrate fairness	0%	10%	79%	12%
39. Parents demonstrate respect	0%	15%	75%	10%
40. Students demonstrate integrity	2%	28%	64%	7%
41. Students demonstrate fairness	2%	16%	74%	8%
42. Students demonstrate respect	2%	25%	65%	8%

43. How are integrity, fairness and respect manifested in your school culture/climate? Please provide examples.

44. What cultural/climatic aspects of your school need the most improvement?

III. Principal Coaching

45. Were you assigned to a Springboard or other external coach during 2009-10?
30% Yes (please answer Questions 46-65) **70%** No (Skip to Question 66)

46. How often are you in contact with your coach?
6% Weekly **53%** Twice a Month **24%** Once a Month 18% Other _____

47. In which venues does the coaching take place?
 School site (check one) **60%** Always **27%** Usually **13%** Sometimes **0%** Never
 Telephone (check one) **9%** Always **45%** Usually **45%** Sometimes **0%** Never
 Email (check one) **15%** Always **8%** Usually **61%** Sometimes **15%** Never

48. Length of time of each coaching session:
0% < 1 hour **59%** 1-2 hours **35%** 2-3 hours **6%** Other _____

<i>Please rate your satisfaction with principal coaching services in terms of....</i>	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
49. Collaborating with me to set and prioritize goals	0%	11%	16%	74%
50. Setting up a monitoring system for achieving my goals	0%	26%	37%	37%
51. Facilitating alignment of school goals with district goals (Six Essentials)	0%	11%	37%	53%
52. Supporting me in maintaining a focus on student learning	0%	0%	42%	58%
53. Encouraging me to develop instructional leadership in others (distributive leadership)	0%	11%	22%	67%
54. Assisting me in helping teachers understand and use assessment (data) results to improve their teaching	0%	18%	35%	47%
55. Helping me to guide teachers in developing professional learning communities.	0%	16%	42%	42%
56. Participating with me in classroom walkthroughs	0%	6%	39%	56%
57. Helping me provide timely, specific feedback to teachers following classroom walkthroughs	0%	22%	33%	44%
58. Observing me and providing feedback and debriefs on my interactions with staff	0%	12%	41%	47%
59. Assisting me in the analysis of data and/or protocols for how to present data to staff.	0%	12%	41%	47%
60. Providing guidance in assessing school culture	0%	11%	28%	61%
61. Helping me clarify my assumptions and beliefs	0%	0%	42%	58%
62. Helping me to analyze my actions	0%	0%	42%	58%
63. Helping me identify problems/issues	0%	0%	37%	63%
64. Fostering my overall professional growth as a school leader.	0%	0%	26%	74%

65. What aspect of coaching has had the greatest effect on you? Why?

IV. District Professional Development and Support

Please rate your satisfaction with 2009-10 district professional development and/or district support (oversight from Directors or other district staff) in ...	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
<i>Leadership Exemplars/Accountability</i>				
66. Developing my school plan (APSA)	5%	17%	52%	26%
67. Aligning school goals to the Six Essentials	0%	10%	49%	41%
68. Aligning school resources to school plan goals	2%	17%	50%	31%
69. Conducting daily classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning.	5%	17%	53%	25%
70. Providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following my classroom walkthroughs.	6%	20%	60%	14%
71. Developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives.	3%	10%	60%	27%
72. Structuring staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps.	3%	24%	53%	20%
73. Modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry.	5%	31%	54%	10%
74. Developing PLCs at each grade level and/or department.	5%	20%	59%	15%
75. Fostering a collaborative school culture	5%	12%	59%	24%
76. Analyzing student achievement data; using data to drive school improvement	3%	15%	48%	34%
77. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect	0%	13%	50%	37%
78. Modeling facilitation of effective school meetings	0%	19%	56%	25%
<i>Student Achievement and Instructional Capacity</i>				
79. Focusing instruction on the teaching of word analysis and vocabulary development	8%	30%	52%	10%
80. Focusing instruction on the teaching of reading comprehension	9%	29%	53%	10%
81. Focusing instruction on the teaching of writing skills	3%	20%	59%	17%
82. Utilizing thinking maps to scaffold teaching and learning	2%	15%	66%	17%
83. Employing lesson design as part of teacher planning	15%	25%	52%	8%
84. Focusing on mathematical concepts rather than procedures as part of instruction	10%	30%	53%	7%
85. Focusing on instruction on opportunities for students to demonstrate and discuss their mathematical reasoning	8%	32%	53%	7%
86. Focusing on instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (e.g., SDAIE methods)	5%	18%	65%	12%
87. Ensuring that English Learners improve one CELDT level annually	5%	25%	58%	12%
88. Re-designating eligible English Learners	3%	24%	48%	25%
89. Meeting the needs of English Learners in mainstream instruction (e.g., CELDT levels 4 and 5, as well as re-designated students)	9%	31%	50%	10%

90. Which district-provided professional development session do you feel was most beneficial to you in terms of developing your leadership skills and capacity? Why?

91. What kinds of professional development for school administrators would you like to see PUSD offer in 2009-10?

V. Principal Evaluation Process

92. To what extent has the system for monitoring principals (i.e., evaluation system to track your expertise in key leadership exemplars) been helpful to your development as a school leader?

27% Definitely 46% Mostly 25% Somewhat 2% Not at all

93. Which aspects of the principal evaluation system do you feel are most beneficial to your leadership development?

94. Which aspects of the principal evaluation system do you feel should be changed or modified to benefit your leadership development?

95. What district supports do you need next year?

96. What site-based support do you need next year?

Thank you for your responses. Data from this survey will be used to improve the overall system of principal accountability, professional support, and leadership development in PUSD.

Appendix B Pomona USD Teacher Survey

Pomona USD Teacher Survey (N=165) Creating a System for Leadership Development and Principal Accountability

Pomona USD is receiving a grant from the Weingart Foundation to deepen the construction of a coherent and meaningful internal accountability system that measures and tracks the role of administrative leadership in producing school improvement. As required by the grant, a third-party external evaluator, Public Works, Inc. (PW), has been contracted to evaluate the district's progress and to prepare reports to the Weingart Foundation.

We would appreciate your help in completing the survey below. Your answers to this survey will be treated as confidential and will only be reported in aggregate (i.e., no individual data will be reported) and individual survey data will not be shared with school or district staff. The survey should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete.

I. About You

1. I am a... **90%** classroom teacher **10%** Other _____
2. I am assigned to... **41%** elementary school **24%** middle school **35%** high school
3. I have been a teacher for a total ... **4%** 0-1 years **11%** 2-3 years
15% 4-5 years **70%** 6+ years

II. Principal Accountability

<i>Please rate your satisfaction with your principal's 2009-10 performance in...</i>	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
4. Conducting classroom walkthroughs to observe classroom teaching and learning.	14%	25%	39%	22%
5. Providing teachers with timely and specific feedback following classroom walkthroughs.	22%	23%	35%	19%
6. Developing a site-based professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of both site and district instructional initiatives.	13%	30%	38%	18%
7. Involving teachers and other school stakeholders in the development of the school's professional development plan.	19%	24%	35%	23%
8. Allocating <i>weekly</i> time for staff collaboration tied to the improvement of student performance and closing achievement gaps.	13%	22%	32%	32%
9. Ensuring that staff collaboration uses data analysis tools and protocols.	8%	23%	43%	26%
10. Modeling and leading teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry.	21%	25%	39%	15%
11. Developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department.	12%	29%	38%	20%
12. Positively impacting school culture.	19%	21%	30%	30%

13. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to staff.	22%	14%	32%	31%
14. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to students	15%	15%	35%	34%
15. Modeling integrity, fairness, and respect to parents.	14%	14%	36%	36%

Classroom Walkthroughs

16. How often were you observed by your principal or another school administrator(s) during 2009-2010?

4% never **16%** 1 time **18%** 2 times **33%** 3-4 times **28%** 5+ times

17. How helpful was the feedback that you received following the classroom observation/walkthrough?

21% Very helpful **32%** Mostly Helpful **30%** Somewhat helpful **17%** Not at all helpful

Professional Development

18. What were the top goals/priorities for professional development at your school in 2009-10?

Goal #1: _____

Goal #2: _____

Goal #3: _____

19. Which site-based professional development session(s) do you feel were most beneficial to you in terms of developing your skills and capacity as an educator? Why?

20. What kinds of professional development would you like your school to focus on in 2010-11?

I. Data Analysis Tools/Protocols

21. How often are staff involved in collaboration tied to the examination of student data?
14% Weekly (25-36x/yr) **27%** Monthly (9-10x/yr) **39%** Quarterly (4x/yr) **20%** Semesterly (2x/yr)

22. What is the most important data for you when analyzing student achievement trends? (check top three)

50% CSTs **20%** CAHSEE **17%** CELDT **33%** District Benchmark data
33% Student Work **29%** Attendance **28%** Behavior **56%** Report Card Data/Grade
 Distribution **18%** Other: _____

23. What do you think is the most important data for your principal/administrators when analyzing student achievement trends? (check top three)

80% CSTs **20%** CAHSEE **17%** CELDT **33%** District Benchmark data **33%** Student
 Work **29%** Attendance **28%** Behavior **56%** Report Card Data/Grade Distribution
18% Other: _____

24. Provide an example(s) of how data has been used to guide or modify what happens at your school?

25. Provide an example(s) of how the analysis of data has resulted in you making changes in your classroom teaching practices?

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)/ Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry

26. How are PLCs organized at your school?

52% Grade Level **25%** Departments **7%** Vertical (grade span) teams **16%** Cross-curricular teams

27. What is the goal of PLCs at your school? What are PLCs expected to accomplish?

28. How useful is the Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle of Inquiry to you?

13% Definitely 30% Mostly 39% Somewhat 20% Not at all
Why or Why not?

29. How important has PLCs been to your school’s professional development plan in 09-10?

11% Most Important Effort 39% Important 38% Somewhat Important 12% Not at all Important
Why or Why not?

School Culture

<i>How would you rate your school culture in terms of integrity, fairness, and respect</i>	Not Good	Needs Work	Good	Exemplary
30. Staff demonstrate integrity	0%	21%	54%	25%
31. Staff demonstrate fairness	1%	18%	57%	24%
32. Staff demonstrate respect	4%	24%	44%	28%
33. Parents demonstrate integrity	4%	31%	53%	12%
34. Parents demonstrate fairness	2%	29%	55%	13%
35. Parents demonstrate respect	5%	28%	50%	17%
36. Students demonstrate integrity	18%	48%	28%	6%
37. Students demonstrate fairness	12%	42%	40%	6%
38. Students demonstrate respect	21%	51%	22%	7%

39. How are integrity, fairness and respect manifested in your school culture/climate? Please provide examples.

40. What cultural/climatic aspects of your school need the most improvement?

IV. School Instructional Program/Priorities

Please rate your satisfaction with your school’s instructional program in terms of its focus and/or prioritization of...	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
41. Word analysis and vocabulary development	3%	28%	57%	12%
42. Reading comprehension	8%	31%	52%	8%
43. Writing skills	12%	35%	44%	10%
44. Thinking maps to scaffold teaching and learning	6%	16%	55%	23%
45. Lesson design	2%	21%	6%	15%
46. Mathematical concepts rather than procedures	6%	30%	53%	10%
47. Opportunities for students to demonstrate and discuss their mathematical reasoning	8%	30%	53%	11%
48. Instructional strategies relevant to English Learners (e.g., SDAIE methods)	4%	17%	57%	21%
49. Ensuring that English Learners improve one CELDT level annually	5%	29%	48%	18%
50. Re-designating eligible English Learners	5%	26%	45%	24%
51. Meeting the needs of English Learners in mainstream instruction (e.g., CELDT levels 4 and 5, as well as	8%	25%	49%	18%

re-designated students)				
-------------------------	--	--	--	--

Thank you for your responses. Data from this survey will be used to improve the system of principal accountability, professional support, and leadership development in PUSD

Appendix C
Public Works
Focus Group and
Interview Protocols

Principal Interview Questions:

Conducting daily classroom walkthroughs and providing teachers with timely and specific feedback

1. What is your process for conducting classroom walkthroughs? How do you provide feedback to the teacher you observe?
2. What form/instrument do you use when you are conducting walkthroughs? How do you keep track of the information you gather?
3. How do you utilize the information from the observation with the individual teacher? To what extent are you able to identify grade level/department/school-wide trends?
4. How often do you observe teachers? How do you make time for walkthroughs in your busy schedule?
5. How are walkthroughs different than your formal evaluation observation? How are they the same?

Monitoring a collaboratively created professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of site and district instructional initiatives

1. What has your professional development plan been this year with staff? What is it next year?
2. What have your goals/priorities been for professional development this year?
3. How do you balance school and district initiatives?
4. What works and what does not in professional development at this school?
5. How has district professional development been helpful to your school's priorities? How have they not?

Ensuring that staff collaborates weekly using a variety of data analysis tools/protocols to improve student performance and close achievement gaps

1. What is your data analysis process with staff? Administration? Grade level/Department chairs? When do you examine data and what type of data do you prioritize?
2. How do you examine student performance? What do you look for in achievement gap trends? How does this data affect your plans?
3. How does staff collaborate? What data tools/protocols do they use and when?

Modeling and leading all teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry that results in improved student achievement

1. When and how are you looking for the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry?
2. How do you collect that information? What do you look for?

Developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department

1. What does the reorganization of grade levels/departments into PLCs look like at your school? How have staff dealt with the transition to PLCs?
2. How do PLCs fit into the overall school-wide professional development plan?
3. What is the goal of the PLC? What do you expect a PLC to accomplish?

Modeling and infusing the school culture with integrity, fairness, and respect

1. How would you characterize/describe your school's staff culture/climate? Student culture/climate? Parent culture/climate?
2. How does integrity, fairness and respect manifest itself in your school culture/climate? Provide examples.
3. What cultural/climatic aspects of your school need improvement?

General

1. How has the Weingart initiative improved internal accountability system that measures and tracks the role of administrative leadership?
2. What do you like about the new principal monitoring system? What don't you like?
3. How has the district been supportive in your role?
4. How have you benefited from coaching by the District or Springboard?
5. What supports do you need next year?

Grade Level/Department Chair and Teacher Focus Groups

Conducting daily classroom walkthroughs and providing teachers with timely and specific feedback

1. What is the process used by site administration for classroom walkthroughs? How often are you observed?
2. Who observes? How does the observer provide feedback to the teacher?
3. What form/instrument is used when a walkthrough is conducted? Do you see written feedback or is it only verbal?
4. How do you utilize the information given?
5. Do you receive school-wide or grade level/dept trends from classroom walkthroughs?
6. How are walkthroughs different than your formal evaluation observation? How are they the same?

Monitoring a collaboratively created professional development plan that ensures and supports implementation of site and district instructional initiatives

1. What has the school's professional development plan been this year with staff? What is it next year?
2. What have the goals/priorities been for professional development this year? What have your goals been?
3. How does the school balance school and district initiatives?
4. What works and what does not in professional development at this school?
5. How has district professional development been helpful to your priorities? How have they not?

Ensuring that staff collaborates weekly using a variety of data analysis tools/protocols to improve student performance and close achievement gaps

1. How does the school analyze data at the school-wide level? Grade level? Departments?
2. What types of data do you feel provide the best or most useful information from the standpoint of teacher collaboration and planning?
3. How do you examine student performance? What do you look for in achievement gap trends? How does this data affect your plans?
4. How does staff collaborate? What data tools/protocols do they use and when?

Modeling and leading all teachers in the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry that results in improved student achievement

1. How do you use the plan-do-check-act cycle of inquiry? What does it look like at your school?
2. Who checks that you are using it? How do they check? How do you get feedback?

Developing professional learning communities (PLCs) at each grade level and/or department

1. How would you describe the rollout of professional learning communities (PLC) at your school? How are PLCs organized?
2. What is different or distinctive about teacher collaboration under PLCs?
3. How do PLCs fit into the overall professional development plan?
4. What is the goal of the PLC? What is your PLC expected to do or produce as a result of this kind of collaboration?

Modeling and infusing the school culture with integrity, fairness, and respect

1. How would you characterize/describe your school's staff culture/climate? Student culture/climate? Parent culture/climate?
2. How does integrity, fairness and respect manifest itself in your school culture/climate? Provide examples.
3. What cultural/climatic aspects of your school need improvement?

General

1. How does site administration support your growth in teacher practice? How could this improve?
2. How does district administration support your growth in teacher practice? How could this improve?