



Table 3. Respondents' Child's Grade Level Compared to Paredes Population

	Paredes Survey Respondents	Paredes Population
6 <sup>th</sup>	----	33%
7 <sup>th</sup>	----	36%
8 <sup>th</sup>	----	32%

Note. Some parents chose not to report their child's grade level; thus, percentages may not sum to 100%. Student population data are based on January enrollment, and may differ from the official AEIS report.

### RESULTS FOR PAREDES

Survey results for Paredes for the past 3 years are summarized here, along with 2008-2009 results for all AISD middle schools. To indicate which changes are most meaningful from year to year, statistically significant changes are flagged with up or down arrows ( ).<sup>17</sup>

The survey questions were grouped by topic into seven subscales. Table 4 on the following page provides an overview of the results by subscale, and subsequent tables provide the results for every question subscale. Parents responded to each statement by indicating their level agreement on a four-point scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree," with the option of indicating "Don't know/NA" or of skipping any item. It is desirable to have an average of **3.0 or higher** for each item and subscale, indicated in **bold**.

Carefully examine the results for your campus to determine areas of strength and opportunities for improvement. Areas of strength can be identified by subscale averages at or **above 3.0**. Opportunities for improvement can be identified by subscale or item averages below 2.5. If the averages for Paredes are very different from those reported by parents district-wide, consider potential reasons for discrepancies. Likewise, it is important to look at the responses from year to year with particular attention to any that are flagged by arrows. Keep in mind that when response rates are low, means may appear to fluctuate more without necessarily signaling a serious shift in perception. Staff should consider how representative the parent respondents are of the students at Paredes, and should think about any changes in campus policies and practices that may have resulted in positive or negative changes.

Table 4. Subscale Averages for Paredes

	Paredes 2008-2009	All MS 2008-2009
<b>Respectful School Community</b>	----	<b>3.26</b>
<b>Support for Parent Involvement</b>	----	<b>3.23</b>
<b>Academic Planning Information</b>	----	<b>3.09</b>
<b>Student-Focused Parent Achievement Press</b>	----	<b>3.72</b>
<b>School-Focused Parent Achievement Press</b>	----	2.35
<b>Communication about Student Progress and Expectations</b>	----	<b>3.30</b>

<sup>17</sup> Effect sizes (Cohen's d) were calculated for changes from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008 and 2007-2008 to 2008-2009. Effect sizes are a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two means. Mean differences were flagged as meaningful where  $d \geq .18$ .





***Adequacy of Communication about Student Expectations and Progress.*** This scale consists of 7 items that measure the adequacy of communication with parents about staff expectations for their child and their child's academic progress. The individual item and subscale averages are provided in Table 7.

Table 7. Adequacy of Communication about



Table 11. Percentage of Parents Reporting That They Participate in School Activities

Activity	Paredes 2008-2009	All MS 2008-2009
<b>22a. General school meetings (e.g., open house, Back to School Night, Choice Sheet night, etc.).</b>	----	61%
<b>22b. Regularly scheduled parent-teacher conferences.</b>	----	51%
<b>22c. School leadership opportunities (e.g., Campus Advisory Council, event committees, etc.)</b>	----	14%
<b>22d. Parent-Teacher Association (PTA)/ Parent-Teacher-Student Association (PTSA)</b>	----	27%
<b>22e. Sports or performance events.</b>	----	45%