

im

	2005-2006 # of Kiker EL Respondents	2006-2007 # of Kiker EL Respondents	2007-2008 # of Kiker EL Respondents	2007-2008 # of All EL Respondents
--	--	--	--	--

¹ Effect sizes (Cohen's *d*) were calculated using the means from 2006-2007 and 2007-2008. Effect sizes are a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two means. Mean differences were flagged as meaningful where $d \geq .18$.

Note: It is desirable to have an average response of at least 3.0, indicated in **bold** type. ^aItem was reverse-scored such that a response of “Rarely Occurs” was scored as a 4. ^á ^â indicate increases and decreases from the previous year.

Achievement Press. This subscale consists of 8 items that describe the extent to which the school has set high but achievable academic standards and goals. Achievement press is marked by students who persist, strive to achieve, and are respected by each other and teachers for their academic successes. In addition, this subscale measures the extent to which parents, teachers, and principals exert pressure for high standards and school improvement.

Table 6. Results for Achievement Press

	Kiker EL Avg 2005-06	Kiker EL Avg 2006-07	Kiker EL Avg 2007-08	All EL Average 2007-08
2. The school sets high standards for academic performance.	*	3.98	3.96	3.47
5. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.	*	3.93	3.94	3.40
6. Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.	*	3.67	3.48^a	2.38
7. Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.	*	3.77	3.92^a	3.26
12. Parents press for school improvement.	*	3.30	3.18	2.24
14. Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.	*	3.60	3.77^a	3.11
18. Students respect others who get good grades.	3.49	3.38	3.57^a	2.96
24. Students seek extra work good grades.		1.8	2.41	2.13

Note: It is desirable to have an average response of at least 3.0, indicated in **bold** type. ^aItem was reverse-scored from the previous

Frequency of Selected Student Behaviors. This subscale measures the frequency of selected undesirable student behaviors. The items were rated on a scale of 0 (*Never Happens*) to 4 (*Happens Daily*). Average scores for each item are shown in the table that follows.

Table 8. Results for Frequency of Undesirable Student Behaviors



Note: It is desirable to have an average response of *less than 2.0*, indicated in **bold** type. á â Indicate increases and decrease in the frequency of each behavior from the previous year.

Safety. The frequency and prevalence of undesirable student behaviors have been combined to form a score that indicates the overall staff perception of student behaviors. Scores have been converted to range from 1 (least desirable) to 4 (most desirable).

Table 10. Results for Safety Subscale Score

	Kiker EL Avg 2005-06	Kiker EL Avg 2006-07	Kiker EL Avg 2007-08	All EL Average 2007-08
Safety Subscale Score	*	3.57	3.50	3.17

Positive Student Behaviors and Staff Reinforcement of Positive Student Behaviors.

This subscale measures the frequency and prevalence of positive student behavior and staff reinforcement of positive behaviors. Average scores for each item are shown in the table that follows.

Table 11. Results for Positive Student Behavior and Behavior Support

To the best of your knowledge, how often do the following events occur at your school?	Kiker EL Avg 2005-06	Kiker EL Avg 2006-07	Kiker EL Avg 2007-08	All EL Average 2007-08
45. ^a Commendable student behavior	3.75	3.71	3.91 á	3.25
46. ^a Staff reinforcement of commendable student behavior	3.76	3.55	3.96 á	3.27
To the best of your knowledge, how many students or staff exhibit the following behaviors?				
54. ^b Commendable student behavior	3.93	3.81	4.08á	3.16
55. ^b Staff reinforcement of commendable student behaviors	4.58	4.52	4.75á	3.79
Positive Behavior Support Subscale Score*	*	3.57	3.78 á	3.19

Note: It is desirable to have an average response of *greater than 3.0*, indicated in **bold** type. á á Indicate increases and decrease in the frequency of each behavior from the previous year.^a Items were rated on a scale of 0 (*Never Happens*) to 4 (*Happens Daily*). ^b Items were rated on a scale of 0 (*None*) to 5 (*All*). *Subscale scores represent a combination of items and have been converted to range from 1 (least desirable) to 4 (most desirable).

UNDERSTANDING AND USING THE RESULTS OF YOUR STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

Campuses with higher Overall Climate scores, as represented by the table shown at the top of page 2, are characterized by more positive relationships among the administrators, staff, teachers, and students. Campuses with a strong climate are also better able to direct their energy toward the mission of setting high, achievable standards for students than campuses with lower climate scores. If your school’s Overall Climate score is over 3.0, it means that according to self-report by campus staff, your campus has a relatively positive school environment. Although this is a commendable position, campus administrators and leaders should be challenged to continue to improve the climate at their schools to create an even better environment for teaching and learning. If your school’s Overall Climate percentile is below 2.5, it means that your campus does not have a positive school climate. Scores between 2.5 and 3.0 indicate a fair school climate.

The first step in improving campus climate is to look at your school's score for each of the climate subscales (shown in Table 2 on page 2). These will help you to identify areas where