AISD Survey Report

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS 2008-2009

ANDERSON 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 Anderson by position type for the past 3 years.

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

Anderson

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

RESULTS FOR ANDERSON HIGH SCHOOL

Survey results for Anderson 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 ().² 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 Anderson 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 Anderson's Overall Climate score was over 3.0, the staff viewed the school environment positively. If Anderson'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

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 Anderson was Collegial Leadership. Examine the individual items that make up Collegial Leadership 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 Anderson was Achievement Press**. Examine the individual items contributing to Achievement Press 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 Anderson and for all High Schools are shown in Table 3.

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

Community Engagement	Anderson 2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
5. Our school makes an effort to inform the community about our	3.31	3.24
goals and achievement.		
9. Our school is able to enlist community support when needed.	3.39	2.87
20. Teachers feel pressure from the community.	3.38	2.97
26. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.	3.10	2.63
31. Community members attend meetings to stay informed about	3.03	2.60
our school.		
38. Organized community groups (e.g. PTA, PTO) meet regularly	3.41	3.19
to discuss school issues.		
39. School staff are responsive to the needs and concerns expressed	3.19	3.05
by community members.		
Community Engagement subscale	3.25	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 Anderson and for all High Schools are shown in Table 4.

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

Collegial Leadership	2006-2007	Anderson 2007-2008	2008-2009	All HS 2008-2009
2. The principal explores all sides of topics	3.15	3.05	3.30	3.05
and admits that other opinions exist.				
10. The principal puts suggestions made	2.55	2.73	3.02	2.81
by faculty into operation.				
11. The principal treats all faculty	2.81	2.84	3.21	2.98
members as his or her equal.				
16. The principal lets faculty know what is	3.47	3.21	3.32	3.30
expected of them.				
18. The principal is willing to make	2.86	3.06	3.27	2.99
changes.				
22. The principal maintains definite	3.31	3.16	3.28	3.29
standards for performance.				
35. The principal is friendly and	3.22			
approachable.				

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 Anderson has set high but achievable academic standards and goals. In addition, this s

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 Anderson and for all High Schools are shown in Table 7.

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

General Climate	Anderson			All HS
General Chinate	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2008-2009
24. Campus staff are friendly to each other.	3.27	3.07	3.27	3.28
27. Campus staff exhibit pride in their affiliation	3.32	3.23	3.31	3.17
with the school.	3.32	3.23	3.31	
28. Campus staff are willing to go out of their	3.24	3.14	3.20	3.18
way to help.		0111	0.12 0	
29. Campus staff accomplish their jobs with	3.03	2.93	3.04	3.05
enthusiasm.		2.50		
30. Campus staff are committed to their jobs.	3.28	3.15	3.19	3.30
37. The goals of my school are made clear.	3.41	3.07	3.22	3.32
General Climate subscale	3.19	3.02	3.19	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