Appendix IV—Systemic Reform in MSAP Projects and Schools

Table A-IV-1
Emphasis MSAP Districts Place on Standards-based Reform Strategies

	MSAP districts[1]			Large high-poverty districts[2]
	Not focused at all	Moderate focus	Heavy focus	Heavy focus
Establish high standards	0%	9%	91%	85%
Design professional development linked to standards	0%	19%	80%	62%
Align curricula with standards	0%	18%	82%	81%
Integrate technology	2%	16%	82%	65%
Implement research-based models	9%	23%	68%	52%
Increase instructional time	4%	23%	73%	71%
Provide tutoring	5%	33%	62%	65%
Reduce class size	2%	43%	55%	60%
Involve parents	0%	41%	59%	55%
Coordinate social services	5%	46%	48%	60%

1 n varies from 53 to 56 districts.
2 The national results are reported in Turnbull, B., J. Hannaway, and S. McKay. (1999). *Local Implementation Study: District Survey Results.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, pp. 77-78.
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 17

Table A-IV-2
Percentage of MSAP Schools Adopting Research-based Models in Districts with Heavy or Moderate/No Emphasis on Research-based Models

District emphasis on implementing research-based models	Percentage of MSAP schools adopting research-based models			
	Pre-1998	1998-2000	Next Two Years	Never
Moderate/no emphasis	29.2	29.2	34.7	6.9
Heavy emphasis	50.0	25.8	14.7	9.5

n=262 schools
Sources: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 17j and Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 25_4

Table A-IV-3
Percentage of MSAP Schools Adopting Class Size Reduction Strategies in Districts with Heavy or Moderate/No Emphasis on Class Size Reduction

District emphasis on implementing class size reduction strategies	Percentage of MSAP schools adopting class size reduction strategies			
	Pre-1998	1998-2000	Next Two Years	Never
Moderate/no emphasis	27.7	25.5	25.5	21.3
Heavy emphasis	43.1	32.7	15.0	9.2

n=247 schools
Sources: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 17g; Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 25_5

Table A-IV-4
Extent of Familiarity with State Standards in Four Content Areas Reported by MSAP Project Directors

State Standards	Not at all Familiar (%)	Somewhat Familiar (%)	Familiar (%)	Quite Familiar (%)	Not Yet Developed (%)
Mathematics	0	4	27	70	0
Language	0	4	20	77	0
Science	4	14	21	61	0
Social Studies	4	12	23	59	2

n=55 projects
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 19

Table A-IV-5
Degree of Influence of State Frameworks and Assessments on MSAP Themes and Goals Reported by MSAP Project Directors

State Standards	Not at All (%)	Only Slightly (%)	Somewhat (%)	To a Great Extent (%)	Not Yet Developed (%)
Mathematics	2	4	12	82	0
Language	2	4	12	82	0
Science	5	9	20	64	1
Social Studies	7	11	27	55	0

n=54 projects
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 20

Table A-IV-6
Influence of State Frameworks and Assessments on MSAP Themes and Goals

Scale score	Extent of influence	%
1.00	Not at all	1.9
1.25		0.0
1.50		0.0
1.75		0.0
2.00	Only slightly	3.7
2.25		0.0
2.50		3.7
2.75		1.9
3.00	Somewhat	13.0
3.25		1.9
3.50		11.1
3.75		7.4
4.00	To a great extent	55.6

n=54 projects
Note: The influence scale was created by averaging the four influence variables: q20_1, q20_2, q20_3, and q20_4. "Not Yet Developed" cases were treated as missing data.
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 21

Table A-IV-7
Percentage of MSAP Schools Setting Quantifiable Goals for Student Advancement in Subject Areas

	Reading (n=266 schools)	Math (n=266 schools)	Other subject (n=224 schools)
Have goals	90.2%	89.5%	63.4%
No goals	9.8%	10.5%	36.6%

Source: Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 18

Table A-IV-8
Rewards and Sanctions That MSAP Schools May Receive as a Result of Student Performance, as Reported by MSAP Principals

Result	Percent	N
Cash	29.3	262
Other recognition	68.9	263
Technical assistance	78.4	263
Principal reassigned	55.9	260
School taken over	37.4	261
Reconstitution	41.5	259

Source: Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 16

Table A-IV-9
Average Number of Sanctions Reported by MSAP Principals

Scale score	Percent	Frequency
0.0–0.25	3.6	2
0.26–0.75	9.1	5
0.76–1.25	16.4	9
1.26–1.75	21.8	12
1.76–2,25	23.6	13
2.26–2.75	7.3	4
2.76–3.0	18.2	10

n=55 districts
Note: The scale was created in two steps. First, the number of rewards reported by each principal was computed, but summing q16_1, q16_2, and q16_3. Then, the results for the MSAP principals in each district were averaged to produce a district-level value.
Source: Principal Survey, 1999-2000, Item 16

Table A-IV-10
Interaction of MSAP Project Directors with Other District Administrators

	Position in District				Position Held by MSAP Project Director			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
Administrative Role and Position	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
Coordinator of Curriculum	54	96.4%	2	3.6%	2	3.7%	52	96.3%
Coordinator of Professional Development	46	82.1	10	17.9	2	4.35	44	95.7
Coordinator of Testing	47	85.5	8	14.5	1	2.17	45	97.8
Title I Coordinator	46	83.6	9	16.4	3	7.0	40	93.0
Federal Programs Coordinator	29	53.7	25	46.3	5	18.5	22	81.5
Coordinator of Magnet Programs	32	59.3	22	40.7	21	65.6	11	34.4
Other Administrators	9	100	0	0.0	2	22.2	7	77.8

n=57 projects
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 11

Table A-IV-11
Extent of Interaction of MSAP Project Director and Other District Staff in Planning and Implementing MSAP Activities

	Extent of Interaction					
	Not at All		To Some Extent		A Great Extent	
Administrative Role and Position	freq	%	freq	%	freq	%
Coordinator of Curriculum	1	2.0	16	31.4	34	66.7
Coordinator of Professional Development	0	0	28	65.1	15	34.9
Coordinator of Assessment/Testing	2	4.6	22	50.0	20	45.5
Title I Coordinator	8	19.5	24	58.5	9	22.0
Federal Programs Coordinator	1	4.6	11	50.0	10	45.5
Coordinator of Choice/Magnet Programs	0	0.0	4	40.0	6	60.0
Other Administrators	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5

N varies from 8 to 51 projects with prior response.
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 11

Table A-IV-12
Scale Indicating Extent of Coordination between MSAP Project Director and Other District Staff

Scale score	Extent of coordination	Percent	Freq
1.0–1.25	Not at all	1.9	1
1.26–1.75		7.6	4
1.76–2.25	To some extent	32.1	17
2.26–2.75		37.7	20
2.76–3.0	To a great extent	20.8	11

N=53 projects
Note: The coordination scale was created by combining 6 variables indicating the degree of interaction of an MSAP Project Director with other positions: q11a_3, q11b_3, q11c _3, q11d_3, q11e_3, and q11f_3. . Please redraw the figure by entering the above correct information. A change in this coordination scale was made as a result of corrections on the original survey items.
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 11

Table A-IV-13
Type and Frequency of Technical Assistance Provided in 1999-2000 by MSAP Project Directors and Other District-level MSAP Staff

	Once a month	Every two weeks	Once a week
Planning	20%	18%	62%
Budgeting	24%	13%	58%
Recruiting students	19%	24%	41%
Recruiting teachers	9%	6%	9%
Designing curriculum	26%	32%	32%
Planning professional development	38%	22%	26%
Developing theme	32%	17%	35%
Designing assessments	26%	9%	15%
Interpreting test scores	32%	15%	7%
Helping principals lead	32%	22%	37%
Keeping teachers motivated	31%	15%	46%
Working with parents	33%	15%	35%
Establishing community links	33%	15%	18%
Locating consultants	40%	18%	11%

N=55 projects
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 13

Table A-IV-14
Provision of Technical Assistance Focused on Curriculum and Instruction by MSAP Project Directors and Other District-level MSAP Staff

Scale score	Frequency of provision	Percent	freq
1.0–1.25	Never	0.0	0
1.26–1.75		3.6	2
1.76–2.25	Less than once a month	5.5	3
2.26–2.75		5.5	3
2.76–3.25	About once a month	29.1	16
3.26–3.75		12.7	7
3.76–4.25	About once every 2 weeks	18.2	10
4.26–4.75		10.9	6
4.76–5.0	Once a week or more	14.6	8

n=55 projects
Note: The technical assistance scale was created by averaging five technical assistance variables: Q13e, Q13f, Q13g, Q13h, and Q13k.
Source: Project Survey, 1999-2000, Item 13