

AISD



AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS 2008-2009

Survey Report LANIER HIGH SCHOOL

A healthy school climate is characterized by positive relationships among students, all campus staff, and the community. School climate is a key factor in several important outcomes including student achievement, reduced violence, higher morale, and faculty trust (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). More specifically, research in AISD indicates that staff climate survey results are related to student Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) performance in both math and reading (Bush-Richards, Cornetto, & Schmitt, 2008; Schmitt, 2006).

The AISD Staff Climate Survey was developed from the research-based Organizational Climate Inventory (OCI), which measures several dimensions of school climate (Hoy et al., 2002) including *Collegial Leadership*, *Professional Teacher Behavior*, and *Achievement Press*. In addition to these items from the OCI, the 2008-2009 AISD Staff Climate Survey included items developed by researchers to measure *Community Engagement* (Tschannen-Moran, Parish, & DiPaola, 2006); climate items designed for relevance to all campus staff; school safety items; and items measuring the implementation of Positive Behavior Support (PBS) on campus. Related items were grouped together in *subscales*, and the average across subscale items was computed as a *subscale score*.

In Fall 2008, 4,216 High school staff responded to the survey, representing approximately 64% of high school campus staff. Table 1 provides a summary of respondents from Lanier by position type for the past 3 years.

Table 1. Survey Respondents for Lanier and All High School Campuses by Position Type, 2006-2007 through 2008-2009

	2006-2007	Lanier 2007-2008	2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
Teachers	96	104	58	1,033 (72%)
Administrators and non-teaching professional	20	17	11	147 (66%)
Classified/support staff	54	42	15	248 (32%)
Unspecified	7	12	19	127
Total	177	175	103	1,555 (64%)

Source: Department of Program Evaluation survey records, district Human Resources data, and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) records.

RESULTS FOR LANIER HIGH SCHOOL

Survey results for Lanier for the past 3 years are summarized here. To indicate which changes are most meaningful from year to year, statistically significant changes are flagged with up or down arrows (↑↓).⁹ To help put results in context, 2008-2009 results also are provided for all AISD High School campus staff. Table 2 provides an overview of the results for Lanier by subscale for the past 3 years.

Campuses with higher Overall Climate scores are characterized by more positive relationships among administrators, staff, teachers, and students. If Lanier's Overall Climate score was over 3.0, the staff viewed the school environment positively. If Lanier's Overall Climate score was below 2.5, the campus did not have a positive school climate. Scores between 2.5 and 3.0 indicate a fair school climate. School Climate and Behavior Management subscale scores can be interpreted in a similar fashion (i.e., it is desirable to have scores at 3.0 or above). Lanier's PBS score represents the average percentage of respondents who indicated yes when asked about PBS-related knowledge and behaviors.

Table 2. Subscale Scores for Lanier and All High Schools for School Climate, PBS, and Safety

Subscale	2006-2007	Lanier 2007-2008	2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
School Climate subscales				
Community Engagement	n/a	n/a	2.35	2.93
Collegial Leadership	2.51	2.57	2.90	3.05
Professional Teacher Behavior	2.82	2.98	2.92	3.25
Achievement Press	2.28	2.23	2.38	2.87
General Climate	2.77	2.86	2.92	3.17
Overall Climate average	n/a	n/a	2.69	3.08
Behavior Management	n/a	n/a	2.74	3.23
PBS	n/a	n/a	68%	67%

Note: Changes were made to the items included in the computation of Overall Climate, PBS, and Safety for 2008-2009.

In the tables that follow, please review the individual items that make up each subscale with particular attention to how Lanier's averages changed or remained consistent over time. Please share the results of this report with all campus staff and Campus Advisory Council to inform campus improvement planning.

⁹ Effect sizes (Cohen's d) were calculated for changes from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 and 2007-08 to 2008-09. Effect sizes are a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two means. Mean differences were flagged as meaningful where $d \geq .18$.

SCHOOL CLIMATE DIMENSIONS

The first step in improving campus climate is to look at the score for each of the Climate subscales (Table 2). These scores can help in identifying areas in which staff ratings were higher or lower than the desired subscale scores.

For 2008-2009, **the highest Climate subscale for Lanier was General Climate**. Examine the individual items that make up General Climate and identify those that are particularly positive. Make note of any item that has a score marked by an arrow that indicates it is statistically higher than scores for that item in previous years. Discuss this area of strength with staff and note the ways in which initiatives on campus have addressed these issues in particular during the current school year.

To improve campus climate, it is beneficial to focus on subscales with the lowest scores. For example, **for 2008-2009, the lowest Climate subscale for Lanier was Community Engagement**. Examine the individual items contributing to Community Engagement in the table below. Examine these individual items and their average responses to determine possible areas for campus improvement. Often, improving climate in one dimension will have a positive effect on other dimensions.

Each of the climate items was rated on a scale from **1** (*rarely occurs*) to **4** (*very frequently occurs*). Respondents also had the option of marking *N/A*; these responses were not used to compute the item averages.

Community Engagement. This subscale was new in 2008-2009 and consisted of 7 items that described the extent to which the school is responsive to and supported by outside influences, such as parents or citizen groups. The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Community Engagement for Lanier and All High School Campuses

Community Engagement	Lanier 2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
5. Our school makes an effort to inform the community about our goals and achievement.	2.72	3.24
9. Our school is able to enlist community support when needed.	2.25	2.87
20. Teachers feel pressure from the community.	2.44	2.97
26. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.	1.92	2.63
31. Community members attend meetings to stay informed about our school.	1.90	2.60
38. Organized community groups (e.g. PTA, PTO) meet regularly to discuss school issues.	2.49	3.19
39. School staff are responsive to the needs and concerns expressed by community members.	2.64	3.05
Community Engagement subscale	2.35	2.93

Note. It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold.

Collegial Leadership. Collegial Leadership involves treating teachers and staff as professional colleagues, and with openness, egalitarianism, and friendliness, but at the same time setting clear expectations and standards for performance. This subscale consisted of 7 items that addressed the degree to which the principal met the social needs of the faculty and worked toward achieving the goals of the school. The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Collegial Leadership for Lanier and All High School Campuses

Collegial Leadership	Lanier			All HS
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
2. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.	2.40	2.54	2.80↑	3.05
10. The principal puts suggestions made by faculty into operation.	2.07	2.21	2.57↑	2.81
11. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal.	2.17	2.17	2.94↑	2.98
16. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them.	3.00	2.96	3.09	3.30
18. The principal is willing to make changes.	2.58	2.58	2.80↑	2.99
22. The principal maintains definite standards for performance.	2.80	2.95	2.96	3.29
35. The principal is friendly and approachable.	2.41	2.54	3.28↑	3.23
Collegial Leadership Subscale	2.51	2.57	2.90↑	3.09

Note. It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold.

Professional Teacher Behavior. This subscale consisted of 8 items that addressed the degree to which respondents indicated respect for colleagues’ competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgment, and mutual cooperation and support among the faculty. The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Professional Teacher Behavior for Lanier and All High School Campuses

Professional Teacher Behavior	Lanier			All HS 2008-2009
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	
4. Teachers help and support each other.	2.88	3.12↑	3.04	3.29
12. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	2.73	2.89	2.88	3.14
14. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.	2.69	2.92↑	2.94	3.14
17. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.	2.86	2.95	3.00	3.26
21. Teachers “go the extra mile” with their students.	3.07	3.27↑	3.18	3.41
23. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	2.51	2.79↑	2.63↓	3.10
33. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	2.66	2.73	2.80	3.05
36. Teachers show commitment to their students.	3.08	3.21	3.14	3.47
Professional Teacher Behavior subscale	2.82	2.98	2.92	3.22

Note. It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold.

Achievement Press. Achievement press is marked by students who persist, strive to achieve, and are respected by each other and teachers for their academic successes. This subscale consisted of 8 items that described the extent to which Lanier has set high but achievable academic standards and goals. In addition, this subscale measured the extent to which parents, teachers, and principals exert pressure for high standards and school improvement. The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Achievement Press for Lanier and All High School Campuses

Achievement Press	Lanier			All HS 2008-2009
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	
3. The school sets high standards for academic performance.	2.96	3.03	3.02	3.53
6. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.	2.75	2.87	2.95	3.40
7. Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.	1.51	1.43	1.63↑	2.44
8. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.	2.74	2.90	2.92	3.27
13. Parents press for school improvement.	1.50	1.39	1.62↑	2.38
15. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.	2.47	2.60	2.63	3.13
19. Students respect others who get good grades.	2.14	2.23	2.39	3.02
25. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.	1.76	1.85	2.02↑	2.25
32. Students try hard to improve on previous work.	1.98	1.98	2.06	2.72
34. The learning environment is orderly and serious.	2.33	2.50	2.54	3.12
Achievement Press subscale	2.28	2.23	2.38	2.94

Note: It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold.

General Climate. These items measure the extent to which all campus staff are friendly towards each other and work towards clear, common goals. The individual item and subscale averages for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. General Climate for Lanier and All High School Campuses

General Climate	Lanier			All HS
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
24. Campus staff are friendly to each other.	2.92	3.05	3.02	3.28
27. Campus staff exhibit pride in their affiliation with the school.	2.61	2.65	2.84↑	3.17
28. Campus staff are willing to go out of their way to help.	2.86	2.98	3.00	3.18
29. Campus staff accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	2.67	2.70	2.79	3.05
30. Campus staff are committed to their jobs.	2.86	2.97	2.98	3.30
37. The goals of my school are made clear.	3.04	3.08	3.07	3.32
General Climate subscale	2.77	2.86	2.92	3.21

Note. It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold.

SCHOOL SAFETY, BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT, AND POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT

The next section of the survey addressed the safety of the school environment for students and staff, including the prevalence of undesirable student behavior on campus, staff satisfaction with how student behavior was managed on each campus, and staff familiarity with issues related to PBS.

Undesirable Student Behaviors. These items measured staff reports about the frequency of selected undesirable student behaviors on campus. The items were rated on a scale of 0 (*never happens*) to 4 (*happens daily*). The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and for all High Schools are shown in Table 8. Items with *high* average responses (above 2.0) should be prioritized for improvement.

Table 8. Undesirable Student Behaviors for Lanier and All High School Campuses

To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following events occur at your school?	Lanier			All HS 2008-2009
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	
40. Student racial tension	1.48	1.40	1.35	.82
41. Student bullying	1.91	1.74	1.69	1.65
42. Widespread disorder in classrooms	1.76	1.61	1.66	.90
43. Student acts of disrespect for Teachers	2.48	2.44	2.35	1.54
44. Student acts of disrespect for Nonteaching Professional or Administrative Staff	2.15	2.23	2.00↓	1.42
45. Student acts of disrespect for Classified or Support Staff	2.06	2.10	1.93↓	1.37
46. Gang activities	2.00	2.06	2.03	.38

Note: It is desirable to have a response of less than 2.0; responses of 2.0 or greater are noted in **red**.

Behavior Management. These items measured staff satisfaction with the way that student behavior was managed on your campus. The items were rated on a scale of 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 4 (*very satisfied*). The individual item and average subscale scores for Lanier and all High Schools are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Behavior Management for Lanier and All High School Campuses

How satisfied are you with the way your campus addresses:	Lanier 2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
47a. Student Behavior	2.60	3.13
47b. Classroom Management	2.84	3.31
47c. Common Area Management	2.71	3.35
Behavior Management subscale	2.74	3.23

Note. It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0; responses of at least 3.0 are noted in bold. These items were asked for the first time in 2008-2009.

PBS. These items were new to the survey in 2008-2009 and addressed staff knowledge and behaviors related to PBS. Response options included *yes*, *no*, *don't know*, and *N/A*. For each item, the percentage of staff who answered *yes* and *no* are provided in Table 10, along with the average percentage of *yes* and *no* responses across the 4 items.

Table 10. Positive Behavior Support for Lanier and All High School Campuses

Positive Behavior Support	Lanier 2008-2009		All HS 2008-2009	
	No	Yes	No	Yes
56. I have taught students the guidelines for success in the form of rules/expectations for one or more settings.	18%	63%	10%	72%
57. I know how to refer students to campus resources such as IMPACT, behavior support specialists, School to Community Liaisons, etc.	7%	80%	8%	75%
58. I feel there is consistent reinforcement of commendable student behavior on my campus.	29%	47%	14%	69%
59. I know how to refer students to external agencies such as Communities in Schools, Safe Place, etc.	9%	83%	23%	51%
Average percentage	16%	68%	14%	67%

REFERENCES

Bush-Richards, A., Cornetto, K., & Schmitt, L. (2008). Summary of 2005-2006 through 2007-2008 AISD staff climate survey results (Publication 07.23). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District Department of Program Evaluation.

Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86, 38-49.

Schmitt, L. (2006). *E-Team report: How does school climate related to academic achievement in AISD, and what can we learn from these relationships?* (Publication 06.02). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District Department of Program Evaluation.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Parish, J., & DiPaola, M. F. (2006). School climate: The interplay between interpersonal relationships and student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16, 386-415.