

## **2009-2010 AISD Campus Staff Climate Survey**

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,

In Fall 2009, 88% of teachers from Clayton responded to the survey. Figure 3 represents the percentage of respondents at Clayton (depicted in dark green) and across all Elementary Schools (light blue) who identified themselves as teachers, classified/support staff, or administrators and non-teaching professionals, plus the number who did not specify a staff role. This information will help you to generalize the findings to the rest of your campus community.









Staff results for Clayton for the 2009-10 school year year are highlighted on the next page. Please pay close attention to the call-out boxes that appear in red and green as they highlight specific campus climate areas that Clayton can improve, as well as areas in which

The graphs below depict Clayton's staff climate ratings over time, as well staff climate ratings across all Elementary Schools in 2009-10. Scores over 3.0 are desirable, as indicated by the red dashed line in the graphs below. The first step in improving campus climate is to examine the score for each area (Figure 2).













For 2009-10, Clayton staff rated **Community Engagement** the highest of all climate areas. Alternatively, Clayton staff rated **Collegial Leadership** the lowest of all climate areas. In the appendix, you will find the individual items that make up **Community Engagement** and **Collegial Leadership**. Examine these items and consider possible areas for campus improvement. Make note of any item with an arrow, which indicates an average rating that is meaningfully higher or lower than that of the previous year. Discuss these areas of strength and challenge with staff, and note the ways in which initiatives on campus have addressed or could address these



## APPENDIX


Achievement Press Subscale Items	2007-08	Clayton 2008-09	2009-10	All Elementary Schools
3. The school sets high standards for academic performance.	3.9	3.7	3.8	3.5
6. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.4
7. Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.	3.4 	3.6 	3.8	2.4
8. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.3
13. Parents press for school improvement.	2.8 	3.0 	3.3 	2.4
15. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.	3.6	3.5 	3.5 	3.1
19. Students respect others who get good grades.	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.0
25. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.	2.7	2.9 	2.8	2.3
32. Students try hard to improve on previous work.	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.7
34. The learning environment is orderly and serious.	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.1
<b>Achievement Press Subscale</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>

*Note:* It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0.

Professional Teacher Behavior Subscale Items	2007-08	Clayton 2008-09	2009-10	All Elementary Schools
4. Teachers help and support each other.	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.3
12. Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.	3.0 	2.9 	3.2 	3.1
14. The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.	3.1 	3.0	3.1	3.1
17. Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.	3.3 	3.2	3.4	3.2
21. Teachers go the extra mile with their students.	3.7 	3.7	3.7	3.4
23. Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.	2.9 	3.0	3.1	3.1
33. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.	3.3 	3.1 	3.3	3.1
36. Teachers show commitment to their students.	3.7 	3.5 	3.6	3.5
<b>Professional Teacher Behavior Subscale</b>	<b>3.3</b> 	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.2</b>

*Note:* It is desirable to have a response of at least 3.0.



- 
- 50. Student racial tension
  - 51. Student bullying
  - 52. Widespread disorder in classrooms
  - 53. Student acts of disrespect for Teachers
  - 54. Student acts of disrespect for Nonteaching Professional or Administrative Staff
  - 55. Student acts of disrespect for Classified or Support Staff

## APPENDIX

To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following events occur at your school?	Clayton				All Elementary Schools	
	2008-09		2009-10		No	Yes
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
58. There is a behavior support team (other than PBS or IMPACT) on my campus.	n/a	n/a	6%	95%	25%	75%
59. I am regularly updated about PBS activities/progress.	n/a	n/a	19%	81%	27%	73%
60. I have used PBS strategies in the classroom/common area.	n/a	n/a	4%	97%	15%	86%
61. I know how to refer students to campus resources such as IMPACT, behavior support specialists, School to Community Liaisons, etc.	11%	76%	6%	92%	8%	92%
62. I feel there is consistent reinforcement of commendable student behavior on my campus.	13%	78%	14%	86%	21%	80%
63. I know how to refer students to external agencies such as Communities in Schools (CIS), Safe Place, etc.	36%	42%	52%	48%	27%	73%
Average Percentage	17%	69%	17%	83%	26%	74%

**Data Vision.** These two items were new to the survey this year and addressed the extent to which teachers utilize student data in their work. Response options ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). High scores indicate higher levels of data vision.

Data Vision	Clayton 2009-10	All Elementary Schools
40. There are clear goals and structures for teaching and learning in AISD.	3.2	3.2
41. There is a clear vision for the use of data to inform education in AISD.	3.2	3.1
Total Data Use Subscale	3.2	3.2

Note: It is desirable to have a response of 3.0 or higher.

**Teacher Support.** These eight items were new to the survey this year and addressed the extent to which teachers feel valued for their contributions on campus, for their hard work and generally supported on their campus. Response options ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4). High scores indicate higher levels of appreciation.

Teacher Support	Clayton 2009-10	All Elementary Schools
42. My school values my contribution to its well-being.	3.2	3.2
43. My school appreciates my extra effort.	3.2	3.1
44. My school does not ignore my complaints.	3.1	3.0
45. My school really cares about my well-being.	3.3	3.1
46. My school acknowledges my good work.	3.2	3.1
47. My school cares about my general satisfaction at work.	3.1	3.0
48. My school shows a lot of concern for me.	3.2	3.0
49. My school takes pride in my accomplishments at work	3.2	3.0
Total Teacher Support Subscale	3.2	3.1

Note: It is desirable to have a response of 3.0 or higher.

---

## 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.
- Schmitt, L., Cornetto, K., & Lamb, L. (2009). Austin ISD 2008-09 board level reports (No. 08.86, 08.87, 08.88). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District
- 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.

### Austin Independent School District

**Superintendent of Schools**  
Meria Carstarphen, Ed.D.

**Office of Accountability**  
William Caritj, Ed.D.

**Department of Program Evaluation**  
Holly Williams, Ph.D.

**Authors**  
Lindsay M. Lamb, Ph.D.  
Lisa N. T. Schmitt, Ph.D.



**Board of Trustees**  
Mark Williams, President  
Vincent Torres, M.S., Vice President  
Lori Moya, Secretary  
Cheryl Bradley  
Annette LoVoi, M.A.  
Christine Brister  
Robert Schneider  
Karen Dulaney Smith  
Sam Guzman