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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

In 2001, public high school graduation rates dipped to 49% and accrued a dropout rate of over 26% of the students who attended. At the turn of the century (O’Day, Bitter, & Gomez, 2011), the term dropout factories (Balfanz & Legtergs, 2004) constantly identified not only the public school system, but the experience that young people would more than likely have, if they were not able to overcome the gauntlet of city politics and marginal teaching that permeated the classrooms of public schools in New York City (NYC).

In 2002, Mayor Bloomberg took over the school system and appointed Joel Klein, a man who came from the world of law, as the Chancellor of the New York City School System (Childress & Clayton, 2010). The need for mayoral takeover of the NYC public schools stemmed from chronically underperforming student academic achievement levels, endemic corruption, mismanagement, and a lack of any coherent district-wide coordination (Wong, Sproul, & Kasok, 2008). This decision was the beginning of many changes that marked education reform in New York City, which is known as the Children First Movement (Childress et al., 2010). Mayor Bloomberg and Chancellor Klein implemented Children First in two phases.

The first phase of Children First included a restructuring of the NYC public schools in order to stabilize and coordinate a disorganized system of schools (Wong et al., 2008).
The 40 city-wide districts were consolidated into 10 instructional divisions. The NYC Board of Education was consolidated into the NYC Department of Education (NYCDOE). The NYCDOE took responsibility for the centralized oversight of the Children First reform (Wong et al., 2008).

New York City school achievement data reflected that the most vulnerable segment of the population, African American and Hispanic children, were in need of targeted support to address their academic, social, and emotional challenges (Allensworth & Easton, 2007; Neild, Stoner-Eby, & Furstenberg, 2008). Creating significant accountability at the school level resulted in the subsequent new empowerment reform movement that addressed past low graduation rates and high dropout rates in the New York City public schools. This new reform effort was unlike any of the prior reform efforts in New York City.

Chancellor Klein rolled out phase two of the reform. It consisted of three core principles of leadership, empowerment, and accountability as shown in Table 1.1 (Children First, 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Principle</th>
<th>Central Belief</th>
<th>Areas Impacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leadership    | Those closest to the students should make key decisions about what will best help students succeed | Education programs  
Choice of partners and supports  
Staffing  
Budgets, including more resources from central office |
| Empowerment   | Schools should be able to count on sufficient, fairer, and more transparent funding | Annual spending increase for each school up to nearly 60%, central offices cut 350 million dollars  
Fair student funding that meets individual student needs  
Expanded partnerships with community based organizations |
| Accountability| Empowered schools must be accountable for results | Fair and comprehensive evaluations of schools  
Timely and accurate data to principals and teachers  
Clear reports to parents and the public  
Rewards for success |

In the early years of New York City education reform, low-performing schools were closed and reopened as manageable campuses hosting small schools with fewer students. Principals were held accountable for their school’s success while given empowerment (freedom) to construct systems within their schools that supported academic rigor for improved and sustainable student success. Regional bureaucracies were dismantled and School Support Organizations (SSOs) were created to provide support services to principals with goal setting, and strategies for improvement/professional development (O’Day et al., 2010).

Chancellor Joel Klein introduced the concept of School Support Organizations to the New York City school system as a component of the Children First Initiative (CFI) in 2000. The CFI agenda focused on regaining control of a chaotic and dysfunctional organization structure (Childress et al., 2010). After a series of innovations, Chancellor Klein launched a pilot program in 2004 called the Autonomy Zone, which gave a selected group of schools autonomy from the traditional structure. These schools were given control over their budget and decision-making authority, which previously was the responsibility of the central offices. Schools that met their targets were left alone. The schools that did not meet their targets entered into a consequence structure, which included the removal of their principals.

Chancellor Klein gave principals ultimate authority and the ability to self-affiliate, or they were given the choice to join an SSO that would best support their perceived instructional goals, leadership development, and overall school improvement (O’Day et al., 2010). SSOs, referred to as networks, comprised 18 to 30 schools. The structure of each of the networks varied from elementary, middle, and high schools. Support for each
one of the schools also varied and was differentiated based on need. For example, an integrated team of instructors supported the SSO networks of self-affiliated schools and business staff selected by principals.

This structure enabled school leaders to exercise freedom and use their expertise to choose the approach or instructional philosophy and network affiliation that best met the needs of the students in each school (Children First, 2008). The success of the Autonomy Zone gave rise to 320 Empowerment Schools (ESOs). In 2007, the entire New York City Department of Education was restructured, which moved away from the regional model. This restructuring was built on three prongs as presented in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment School Organizations (ESO)*</td>
<td>Learning Support Organizations (LSO)*</td>
<td>Partnership Support Organizations (PSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consisted of schools that decided to operate totally apart from the traditional supports by choosing a network leader and a team</td>
<td>Consisted of schools connected to organizations that were similar to the old regional structure</td>
<td>Consisted of schools partnered with external non-profit organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of spring 2010, all NYC public schools received their primary support from a team of about 15 staff members called a Children First Network (CFN). Each CFN team provided expert support, technical assistance, and quality control for a group of approximately 25 schools: they offered training and coaching for principals and teachers, shared instructional resources to meet each school needs, and helped schools across the network collaborate with each other.

The researcher studied how network teams helped schools recruit and hire teachers, how they spent their budgets effectively, conducted all daily operations, used data and technology, and cultivated partnerships with community-based organizations and cultural institutions.

In addition, networks helped schools deliver effective services to students with disabilities and to English-language learners. Because the same team supported each school in all of these different areas, principals felt confident that every decision was strategically made, with the school’s instructional goals in mind (Our Structure for Supporting, n.d.).

Each principal, in consultation with the School Leadership Team (a group of teachers, school leaders, and parents), selected the network team that he or she believed would best meet the needs and goals of the school.

Some network teams supported groups of schools that shared a specific instructional philosophy or approach. For example, cohort schools may have had academic themes, such as science and math, theater arts, college readiness, or medicine, as a focus. Other networks supported mostly small schools, elementary schools, schools with large populations of English-language learners, or other schools sharing common
traits. Schools could change networks as often as once a year (Our Structure for Supporting, n.d.). However, the vast majority of New York City schools were affiliated with their network team for several years of partnership.

Instead of schools being required to work with a central office support staff, principals chose the SSO network team they believe best support their needs. The SSO structure and school affiliation were not bound geographically; ultimately, affording schools from different parts of New York City to align with schools and a network in ways that promoted the sharing of best practices (Our Structure for Supporting, n.d.).

Schools as near as across the street from each other, or as far as another borough, affiliated for the purpose of best supporting their school communities.

Network teams were designed to solve problems for schools and to ensure quality of services. Principals evaluated the services they received from their network teams each year, and network teams were held accountable for both the principals’ satisfaction and the academic performance of the schools they supported. This structure allowed principals to spend more time working with teachers to improve instruction—again—with help from their network teams.

**Case Study of the Excel Network**

The NYCDOE’s transition to a city-wide system of network support was also designed to create significant cost savings, in order to reinvest the money directly into school budgets; since 2006, the cost of school support has decreased by 32% (Our Structure for Supporting, n.d.).
Throughout this study, Excel is used as a pseudonym to identify one school support network. The origins, structure of the team and school cohort, team functions, and data is authentic to the network, otherwise known as Excel.

Excel, a school support organization or network, was borne from this movement. This paradigm shift from the traditional external bureaucracy brought a greater amount of discretion to those in the schools who were actually doing the work of educating children by bringing the service support inside the schools to support teaching.

Schools supported by Excel are all in low socio-economic or poverty areas in New York City located in the four boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, and Brooklyn. The schools are located in 11 different school districts.

The demographic profile of the Excel network of schools, displayed in Table 1.3, shows that the entire network of schools falls below the poverty level, entitling them to free lunches.
Table 1.3

*Student Demographic Characteristics of Excel Networks (N = 10,057 Total Student Population)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English-Language Learners</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>16.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 1</td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>52.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>47.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>26.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6878</td>
<td>68.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excel consists of 17 members who provide affiliated schools with support in multiple functional areas as presented in Table 1.4. Every member must be flexible to perform multifunctional roles on the team for effective support of network schools.
Table 1.4

*Excel Network Functional Areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>To support schools in accountability initiatives, the use of data, and analysis of student achievement data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>To support schools in budgeting, purchasing, human resources, contracting vendors, grant proposals, and general operation issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education and English Language Learner Services</td>
<td>To provide support, advocacy, and intervention services for at-risk student populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>To support schools with all student attendance issues and attendance trends, safety and security, extracurricular activities, guidance and counseling, and community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>To support schools with planning instructional designs, analyzing students to target for individualized support, determining appropriate content for classroom instruction, and evaluating content effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional/Professional Development</td>
<td>To support schools in professional development for teachers, guiding them on effective strategies for teaching content to students and their peers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Network functional areas were chosen as a result of informal conversations with network principals as to the priority of their responsibilities.
Excel was established within the NYCDOE in the beginning of the empowerment movement in 2007. It was one of the original 11 network teams. Excel-affiliated schools were identified as disadvantaged and underperforming.

In 2008, the NYCDOE expanded its network model city wide, making the Excel network one of 22 networks. In 2009, the NYCDOE required every school within the system be affiliated with a network in the new CFN model, making the Excel network one of 60 networks serving New York City public schools (Urban Education Leadership Program, 2011).

The CFN was an initiative within the NYCDOE. It was designed to integrate operational and instructional staff and support schools within a network team. This model increased the number of team members from 6 to 15. The goal was to expand the philosophy of devolving as much decision-making power as possible to the school level: principals, teachers, and school staff. Similar to the former Empowerment network model, each CFN employed a small cross-functional team who was directly accountable to principals to deliver customized service to the schools. The ultimate goal was to streamline operations and build capacity within schools so school-based staff could focus their time on instruction and accelerate student achievement (Children First Network, n.d.).

In 2010, the Excel network team that supported 21 self-affiliated schools, helped advance their academic, operational, organizational, leadership, and professional growth. Cross-functional team members who were collectively accountable to principals and peer team members facilitated the Excel services.
Aligned with the CFN framework and structure, Excel provides services that include payroll, human resources, food and transportation, youth development, budget, special education, and instruction.

In July of 2011, the incoming cohort of the Urban Educations Leadership Program (UELP) at Columbia University Teachers College was invited to participate in a project with Excel. The cohort’s task was to create a proposal that would address key areas regarding the networks’ student achievement, professional development and internal support structures, each aligned to common areas of need, as identified by the cohort in their inquiry and analysis of the network and its schools. UELP doctoral students, during their study of the Excel network, cited its mission as “to provide superior customer service, innovation, commitment, and common sense” to their schools (UELP, 2011). The Excel network core values are presented in Table 1.5
Table 1.5

*Excel Network Core Values*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Values</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole school improvement</td>
<td>Comprehensive unified school design to transform all aspects of a school in an effort to improve the performance of each of its students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education as a foundation for future growth</td>
<td>Create initiatives that use educational successes as motivations for college and careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outreach and inclusion</td>
<td>Use every community resource to develop vested interests and shared values in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability in context</td>
<td>Be responsible for success; failure is not an option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional and social development</td>
<td>Develop capacities of every school community to recognize students’ diverse needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing the achievement gap</td>
<td>Create supports to shrink the access-to-resource gap, which will impact the achievement gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching across boundaries</td>
<td>Non-traditional means of education can be a useful tool to reach non-traditional learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education for all children</td>
<td>Academic rigor and high expectations for all students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for all</td>
<td>School communities become institutions of leadership for students and adults</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the functions of the networks is to provide professional development to teachers and school leaders. Donald Schön (1983) sought to provide an approach to the best epistemological practices based on careful examination of the activities of different practitioners.
Schön (1996) argued that organizations and individuals must be flexible and should incorporate into their interests life-long learning, a concept known as organizational learning. Teachers often acknowledge that the professional development they receive is of limited usefulness to their daily work and to their professional growth (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, n.d.).

Professional development programs should extend beyond traditional workshops to include activities such as peer observation, mentoring, the creation of teacher portfolios, action research projects, whole-faculty or team/department study groups, curriculum planning and development, literature circles, critical friends groups, data analysis activities, school improvement planning, shared analysis of student work, lesson study, or teacher self-assessment and goal-setting activities. Professional development activities should be collaborative but also differentiated to meet the individual needs of teachers (Chambers, Lam, & Mahitivanichcha, 2008). According to Joyce and Showers (2002) effective professional development includes on-going modeling, practice, feedback, and reflection over time. For example, Stover, Kissel, Haag, and Shoniker (2011) successfully implemented strategies to foster reflection and differentiated support with teachers.

Effective professional development should support teachers with a range of experience, knowledge, and skills. Differentiated support, based on teachers individual needs and learning styles is crucial. Learning happens within teachers not to them (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006).

Teachers are unique in their pedagogy, experience, and content knowledge. Therefore, learning should be differentiated to provide multiple options for taking in
information, making sense of ideas, and sharing information learned (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006).

Linda Darling Hammond (2006) stated that the enterprise of teacher education must venture out further and further from the university and engage ever more closely with schools in a mutual transformation agenda with all the struggles and messiness that it implies (Osborne & Piver, 2011). The realities of today’s classrooms go beyond the universities and require faculties to train teachers to be better acquainted with conditions of schools and the divergent needs of children, as well as to be reflective in their own development.

Professional development has been paramount in national education reform, so much so that the United State Congress (H.R. 3006 S.1362) acknowledged the importance of providing professional development and coaching to school leaders, teachers, and other school personnel in addressing the needs of diverse learners and in using challenging and relevant researched based on best practices and curriculum (Success in the Middle, n.d.).

Principals, along with their colleagues all along the educational spectrum, are feeling more than ever before pressures in their jobs as they lead their schools. Presented in Table 1.6 are various daily challenges/pressures experienced by educational leaders cited by researchers Osborne and Priver (2011).
Table 1.6

*Principals’ Daily Pressures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements of Daily Pressures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with specialists, complete paperwork and create the individual education plans entailed in meeting those need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to changing cultural attitudes about learning and changing definitions of what it means to be learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve their own content knowledge, and leadership independently and through coursework designed to give them highly qualified status required by No Child Left Behind (NCLB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become familiar with a wide array of instructional program being marketed to districts and with guidelines of sometimes competing philosophies of teaching represented by them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discover what it means to meet demands of high stakes testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to criticism from public figures who are disappointed in the schools, but don’t understand the pressures that principals fact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Osborne & Piver, 2011.

**Problem Statement**

The researcher measured network principal perceptions of satisfaction of the Excel network by examining three functions of service delivery: operations, student achievement, and instruction/professional development. Although there is significant research on customer and employee satisfaction, there is a dearth of research on principal perception of satisfaction.

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine and make a contribution to the understanding of School Support Organizations, otherwise known as SSOs or networks that were created in New York City for the purpose of improving public schools by
increasing student performance, enhancing graduation/promotion rates, improving teacher pedagogy, and improving school leadership.

This study does this by an examination of the history of education, education reform, and New York City reform in the year 2001. This study does not prove that the findings are evident in every case but does serve as an entry point for practitioner and researcher debate about the role of network efficacy in New York City education. The terms SSO and networks will be interchangeable.

**Theoretical Rationale**

The means-ends chain theory of satisfaction is rooted in the work of Herbert A. Simon (1964), who argued that makers (consumers) act in order to achieve desired outcomes or end states. Simon’s main contribution in the field of public administration has been to analyze how individuals make decisions in bureaucratic organizations. Simon discussed their physiology. The basic assumption is that goals predominate in determining choice patterns and customers select products and services to achieve desired goals (Gutman, 1982; Reynolds & Gutman, 1988).

This study used satisfaction theoretical platforms to look at the efficacy of the school support organization or network structure designed by the New York City Department of Education. Initially, this study examined the structure of the network teams, purpose, functions, and services. Also, the study examined the Excel network schools’ profiles and levels of engagement with the support team as a model for school support.
Theoretical Framework

The education reform in 2001 was either a societal change or situational change in New York City that was deemed as needed to address school failure. Nevid (2009) stated that social cognitive theory illustrates how individuals do not simply respond to environmental influences but actively seek and interpret information.

The network structure was created to improve education in New York City by influencing the behavior of school leaders and teachers to improve student achievement. Bandura (1999) stated that individuals function as contributors to their own motivation, behavior, and development within a network of reciprocating interacting influences.

Critics of the social-cognitive and self-efficacy theories believe that organizations are seeking to foster individual creativity (Shalley, Zhou, & Oldham, 2004). Research states that managers often face challenges of identifying employees with creative potential and being able to manage team context to render it more conducive for employee’s creativity (Hirst, Knippenberg, & Zhou, 2009).

Examining satisfaction research, Pieters, Botschen, and Thelen (1998) used the means-end chain theory to reveal three orientations in customers’ desired expectations regarding products and services, which covered the process, outcome, and relational aspects of the service encounter. Customers, in the case of this study network, principals, enter into service agreements with goals in mind (Pieters, Botschen, & Thelen, 1998). The extent to which principals achieve these goals depends, in part, on the attributes of the service experience. These attributes are the means by which they achieve their goals. If they achieve their goals, they experience satisfaction. During the service encounter, customers use a feedback-seeking Principal Satisfaction Survey process to monitor the
extent to which the characteristics of the service experience help the principals achieve their goals (Austin & Vancouver, 1996)

Statement of Purpose

New York City public schools are self-affiliated to SSOs or networks that provide school support services. It is now the modus operandi for the nation’s largest educational system. The purpose of this study is to examine the level of network principals’ satisfaction with the network support over a three-year period from 2009 through 2012. The new education reform was created to address low-graduation and high-dropout rates in New York City public schools. Professional development of teachers and administrators is critical to the improvement of student achievement (Desimone, 2011).

Network (SSO) support teams are, in part, evaluated by results from the Principal Satisfaction Survey administered to every New York City public school principal. The purpose of this study is to analyze perceptions data of principals’ satisfaction over a three-year period. The results of this study will be useful in determining if the school support provided can, in fact, address graduation rates over a three-year period. This study also lays the groundwork to assess what principals do in order to address low graduation rate. Also determined is if the Survey was useful in forming a more significant analysis for a feedback tool

Research Questions

The following research questions are addressed in the present study:

1a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of

    instruction professional development?
1b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to *instructional professional development* over a three-year period among network principals?

2a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of *operations*?

2b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to *operations* over a three-year period among network principals?

3a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of *student achievement*.

3b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to *student achievement* over a three-year period among network principals?

**Potential Significance of the Study**

As the nation has embraced the need to graduate every student ready for college and careers, high school reform has emerged at the top of the education agenda (“New York City,” 2010). Many local and state leaders have implemented strategies to address low performance and achievement gaps. New York City reform has caught the attention of advocates, policymakers, and educators for the breadth of changes implemented by the Children First reform.

The significance of this study includes how principal satisfaction is evaluated in overall school performance and how well schools perform annually.
School support can be shaped by portions of the PSS to determine type, intensity, and focus of network support provided to schools that address student achievement and graduation. Administrative and pedagogical (instructional) needs can be determined and can help provide significant analysis for feedback.

Trend data of principal satisfaction can inform the NYCDOE reform policy in the areas of how network support will look in the future, how principals and school communities will be provided support, and how a modified evaluation tool can be institutionalized to highlight specific areas of school needs. This study evaluates the network structure by conducting an internal analysis of one network, the Excel network, and reviewing several functions performed to support network schools.

This researcher studied network principals’ perceptions of satisfaction of network school support in three functional areas of instructional/professional development, operations, and student achievement over a three-year period. Turner and Krizek (2006), in their research on satisfaction, stated that customer satisfaction is a serious matter with far reaching intra- and extra-organizational ramifications beyond the bottom line. The methods of assessing satisfaction must be continually challenged, while moving away from the singular construct of cognitive or attitudinal modalities. This means that satisfaction assessment must move away from the single meaning of satisfaction and into multiple dimensions of service that members can draw from.

Definitions of Terms

Autonomy zone was designed to give principals a greater degree of autonomy and flexibility in decision making in exchange for greater accountability regarding student achievement.
**Children First** is the name of the New York City education reform.

**Cohort** is a group of students who work through a curriculum together to achieve the academic degree together. A cohort forms when the students begin the curriculum and typically does not admit new members afterward.

**Dropout rate** represents the percentage of 16- through 24-year-olds who are not enrolled in school and have not earned a high school credential (either a diploma or an equivalency credential such as a General Educational Development [GED] certificate) (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2011).

**Effectiveness** is the capability of producing a desired result. When something is deemed effective, it means it has an intended or expected outcome, or produces a deep, vivid impression.

**Efficacy** is the power or capacity to produce a desired result (Wikipedia, n.d.).

**Efficient** is the extent to which time or effort is well used for the intended task or purpose (Wikipedia, n.d.).

**Empowerment movement** was designed in 2007 to provide customized school support.

**Networks** are teams of about 15 people who provide support, technical assistance, and quality control for approximately 25 New York City schools.

**Programs** for the operational purposes of this study programs are defined as services or initiatives provided by networks.

**School Support Organization** (SSO) is a teams of educators and administrators who provide instructional and profession development to the NYC public schools.
Title 1, Part A is a federal program that provides financial assistance to local school systems and schools with high percentages of poor children to support the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Title I funds are distributed to high-poverty schools within their districts so the schools can provide additional academic support and learning opportunities to help low-achieving children master challenging curricula and meet state standards in core academic subjects. Title I funds support extra instruction in reading and mathematics, additional teachers, materials of instruction, as well as after-school and summer programs to extend and reinforce the regular school curriculum.

Chapter Summary

The researcher chose to explore, as foundational to this study, the means-ends chain theory of satisfaction, which is rooted in the work of Herbert Simon (1972) who argued that makers (consumers) act in order to achieve desired outcomes or end states. The basic assumption is that goals predominate in determining choice patterns, and that customers select products and services to achieve their desired goals (Gutman, 1982; Reynolds & Gutman, 1988).

This study used satisfaction theoretical platforms to look at efficacy of the school support organization or network structure designed by the New York City Department of Education. Initially, this study examined the structure of the network teams, purpose, functions, and services. Also, the study examined the Excel network schools’ profiles and levels of engagement with support team as a model for school support.

As a framework, the researcher used Albert Bandura’s Social Cognitive theory (1999), which illustrates that individuals do not simply respond to environmental
influences but actively seek and interpret information. Individuals function as contributors to their own motivation, behavior, and development within a network of reciprocally interacting influences (Bandura, 1999, p. 169).

Support services provided to network schools by Excel are executed to build capacities of staff at the school level in all functional areas. Modeling behaviors and problem solving in the operational areas at the school level is a method intended to stimulate and foster expertise, ultimately reducing dependency on Excel by school staff.

Robert K. Merton (2007), who first coined the term “role model” in his research, hypothesized that individuals compare themselves with reference groups of people who occupy the social role to which the individual aspires. For example, when conducting instructional/professional development workshops aimed at helping participating teachers enhance the quality of their teaching, Excel staff use research-tested strategies and theories to model best practices in teaching. Professional development is expected to assist teachers enhance their skills in the classroom. In the grand scheme, Albert Bandura (1999) offers extensive resources for framing how social cognition brings to light individuals’ adaptations to situations and the development of empowerment; the ability to give authority or ability; and to interpret information.

In the analysis of efficacy, Bandura (1999) states that an agent, who in this case is Excel, is someone who intentionally influences one’s functioning and life circumstances. This grand theory correlates to the purpose of Excel as it directly relates to influencing practitioners’ leadership and teachers’ practice, which ultimately impact school communities. It is key to note that Bandura emphasizes how cognitive, behavioral, personal, and environmental factors interact to determine motivation and behavior.
All of the aforementioned factors, in many ways, synthesize to affect efficacy and effectiveness of individuals.

The researcher has determined that Donald Schön’s (1975) organizational learning theory, the way an organization learns and adapts, aligns not only with Excel organizational structure but also with the goals, values, and practice of the network team.

Reflective practice, the capacity to reflect on actions so as to engage in a process of continuous learning, is a significant tool used by Excel when providing support to teachers and administrators of the network school communities.

Donald Schön’s (1975) work in organizational thinking can serve as the frame of reference for the study of organizational experiences such as how Excel was organized, how external services are delivered to practitioners in education, how Excel was evaluated, how internal teams operated, the level of commitment(s) to network schools, and special initiatives in support of school improvement. Also it is the researcher’s belief that Donald Schön’s theories of flexibility have not only formalized but also characterized how Excel accomplishes its work.

Examining satisfaction research, the work of theorist Herbert A. Simon (1957) is rooted in the studies of Pieters, Botschen, and Thelen (1998) as they use the means-end chain theory to reveal three orientations in customers’ desired expectations regarding products and services that covered the process, the outcome, and the relational aspects of the service encounter. In marketing, the means-end chain framework has been used to evaluate brands and services. This researcher uses the means-end chain theory to analyze principal satisfaction using the results of the Principal Satisfaction Survey over three years from 2009 through 2012. In Chapter 2 the researcher provides literature review that
supports theoretical framework and rationale for the study. In Chapter 3 the researcher will provide method for the study. In Chapter 4 the researcher discusses results of the study. In Chapter 5 the researcher discuss study implications and conclusion for this study.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

The literature review provides a background of education reform in America and addresses the complexities within the educational system that impact teaching and learning. Topics discussed in this chapter include: beginnings of education in America, school reform, concepts of school districts and school networks, organizational theory, and the New York City education reform. Although there is limited research available on the school network structure characterized by the New York City education reform of the last decade, there are studies on the evolution of education reform and critical components that address the need of improvement of student achievement in New York City schools (urban education). School networks or “networks” will be most closely defined as school districts. Significant research has examined school reform and its affect on school districts, schools, and student achievement.

Reform in education can be beneficial to the individual student if it enhances learning, increases opportunities for graduating, or increases the likelihood of them entering or completing post-high school education. School reform is beneficial to teachers and students if it improves instruction and the daily interactions in classrooms. School reform is effective to schools if it creates cultures for collaboration.

The role of school reform as a vehicle for social change is addressed and a short history of the New York City network structure is presented.
A review of the social cognitive theory and research regarding the effect of school reform follows. This chapter will first discuss the establishment of education in America, its origins, and systemic structures that were sustained over time within the American education system.

The relevance of this study is in pointing to the paths of intended school improvement, while discussing research that has been conducted to determine the factors that impact education reform in New York City including the perceived effectiveness of school support in education reform.

**The beginnings of education in America/the common (public) school.** The American education system was built on the structures indigenous to the Eastern European cultures in America of the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} century. The European examples provided an impetus to America’s common (public) school movement. Researchers determined that the egalitarian and democratic origin of the common (public) school lies on the foundational structures of what currently exist in the American common school system (Gutek, 1986). Although England, France, and Germany (Prussia) can all be considered as contributing nations to the primary school model, American schools are grounded in the roots of the Prussian/German model of education (Talbott, 1969). The Age of Enlightenment was a cultural movement of intellectuals in the 17th and 18th centuries, first in Europe and later in the American colonies. Its purpose was to reform society using reason, challenging ideas grounded in tradition and faith, and to advance knowledge through the scientific method.

Germany’s (Prussia) dominance over Europe during the period of the Age of Enlightenment, a cultural movement of intellectuals in the 17th and 19th century between
the years of 1600-1800 united European territories under an enlightened system of public education (Bott, 1868).

Authors have detailed how state- or government-supported schools in Prussia dispatched government inspectors to schools to make certain that schools were reaching standards (Gutek, 1986; Midwinter, 1970; Talbot, 1969). However, reaching levels of satisfactory standards of school excellence were and are still equated with economic and political growth (Gutek, 1986). Researchers have examined how education was used to maintain political and economic control over all of Prussia’s consolidated nations as a principle of national progress (Katz, 1972; Mann, 1842; Vinovskis, 1970). Studies have demonstrated the economic value of education as a benefit to the community (Schultz, 1961). Therefore, during the early evolution of the European school system, every child was provided seven years of government-sponsored education, creating what was known as the common school (Bowman, 1966; Blaug, 1966; Schultz, 1961). The inception of common (public) schooling provided opportunities for many citizens of industrialized 17th and 18th century Europe to attend school and to ultimately support their country’s economy in various ways, whether by supporting an agrarian economy or one of an industrial nature (Schultz, 1961). Early political and educational leaders who wanted to achieve nationwide elementary schooling in their native countries often looked to other countries for successful models.

Although Prussian educators examined the Swiss education and national regeneration reform, many countries, including America, were attracted to Prussia for education administration and organizational models (Gutek, 1986; Talbott, 1969). In the early 1800s America’s common school movement sought to establish tax-supported,
locally controlled elementary schools that would be open and available to both boys and girls living in various school districts (Urban et al., 2004).

Much of the literature on the history of American education indicates that the Industrial Revolution was the catalyst that transformed the United States from an agrarian/rural society into an urban, industrial, and increasingly modern society. Although industrialization increased the gross national product and brought economic growth, it also generated complex social and economic problems while creating an increased need for more schools (Gutek, 1986).

Studies also acknowledge Horace Mann, a public servant and then secretary of Massachusetts Board of Education, as a staunch advocate and statesman of the common school model, visited Prussia and returned to America with a model he felt would train children to be responsible citizens in a republic society (Gutek, 1986; Urban & Wagoner, 2004). He admired the accomplishments of Prussia’s centralized school system and sought to emulate it in Massachusetts (Urban & Wagoner, 2004).

However, this American common school movement would be designed as an egalitarian institution to cultivate citizenship and nationalistic loyalty to the United States. Major components of the American common school movement, such as language, curricula, and teaching, were instruments of social control over the lower socio-economic classes by the dominant English-speaking, upper-class Protestants (Nasaw, 1979). Social control, in this context, it meant imposing—by institutionalized education—the language, beliefs, and values of the dominant group on outsiders, especially on the non-English speaking immigrants. Common (public) schools were
expected to create conformity to American life by imposing the language and ideological outlook of the dominant group.

For example, by using English as the medium for instruction, the common (public) schools were expected to create an English-speaking citizenry: by cultivating a general value orientation based on Protestant Christianity, the religions of the settlers, the common (public) schools were expected to create a general American ethic. Some researchers claim the common (public) schools were to be agencies of Americanization, which meant the imposition of prescribed values on an increasingly heterogeneous, multicultural population (Fuller, 1982; Nasaw, 1979).

The legal framework of the common (public) school movement is found in the U.S. Constitution’s Tenth Amendment reserved-powers clause, which delegated power over education and school to each of the states (Urban & Wagoner, 2004). Today, every state in the union is to provide equal access to a free and public education.

While acknowledging that every child in America is afforded an opportunity to attend public school, there is still a social, economic, and moral effect to public education. While using education to control socio-economic classes in the early years of the common (public) school, American educators infused moral lessons of American nationalism into every subject matter (Urban et al., 2004). There was a sure and unmistakable view that if people were educated to know what was right, then they would do what was right. The common (public) school movement sought not only to educate but to also to uplift and reform society (Gutek, 1986).

Education was compulsory for both sexes for seven years, starting from a child’s sixth or seventh year. This was true only for elementary school. The state prepared
children for a vocation based on their status. Children who were privileged went to private schools after elementary school, where they were trained in the sciences, writing/penmanship, and languages.

The higher-level academies or universities specialized in architecture, forestry, commerce, military, agriculture, music, naval studies, veterinary, and surgery. Upper-class students attended these academies, while the children of the poor left after elementary school to work in factories and in the fields. Bott (1868) stated that the Germans sought to establish institutions in New York and one in every state in the United States.

Early management of public school administration (which will be discussed later) was centralized, based on the German model using structures similar to the German Ministry of the Interior, where ecclesiastical and educational matters were regulated (Bott, 1868; Tyack, 1974). In each province of Germany (Prussia), a deputation regulated all of the internal affairs of the church and the school, determining the general objective of the institution, examining the statutes, designing the textbooks, proposing plans of improvement, and appointing or removing teachers. Tyack (1974) stated that coalitions of the late 1800s pushed education reform to perpetuate the realities of class and power in American society. At the turn of the 20th century, business and professional elites planned a shift to control urban education, which would vest political power in a small committee, composed of successful men, to adapt school to the social stratification (Tyack, 1974). This school board structure is analogous to the current structure of American education systems where central administrative agencies or local districts manage public schools.
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School boards. New England formed the first school committees of citizen volunteers not only to govern their local schools, but also to run them. Researchers have observed that the school boards, which provided local control of schools, were generally performed by town officials since 1642. It would become an American tradition of elected citizens to be caretakers and policy makers for local schools (Amundson, Ficklen, Maatsch, & Zakaria, 1996; Seifert 2009).

The current concept of school boards in America sprang from the Prussian Provincial boards, which managed the property of church and school where religious instruction, was core content or essential instructional material (Bott, 1868). Board appointed supervisors dissuaded persons they deemed incompetent from entering the teaching profession. They also encouraged the youth of superior pedagogy that no dismissal can take place without a testimonial of mental and moral character (Bott, 1868). Similar to the now defunct Board of Examiners of the 1980s in the New York City Department of Education, candidates for licensure took an exam that was scored by the New York City appointed examiners.

Satisfaction. Means-ends chain theory is rooted in the work of Herbert Simon who argued that makers act in order to achieve desired outcomes or end states. The basic assumption is that the goal predominates in determining choice patterns, and customers select products and services to achieve desired goals (Gutman, 1982; Reynolds & Gutman, 1988).

Turner and Krizek (2006) state the assessment and monitoring of customer satisfaction provides organizational members with valuable feedback about their
company’s performance. This feedback, in turn, provides managers and other organizational stakeholders with information that has the potential for helping them retain current customers as well as develop new customers. Contemporary business practices such as initial contact point surveys, time lag surveys, feedback cards, and frequent-shopper monitoring programs are a few of the ways that organizations collect this feedback.

Researchers and organizational stakeholders alike ask customers to respond to Likert-type questions that indicate their agreement with statements regarding individual service dimensions such as wait time, product performance, or overall experience.

The New York City Department of Education following this model of assessing satisfaction has created a tool called the Principals Satisfaction Survey, which is distributed to every principal in New York City public schools. Administration of this satisfaction feedback survey is on a voluntary basis designed to provide information to central administration executives’ levels of satisfaction that principal’s experience throughout the school year.

The assessment of customer/patient satisfaction is a serious matter with far-reaching intra- and extra-organizational ramifications beyond the bottom line. Because of this, we need to continually challenge the ways we assess customer/patient satisfaction. The current mechanisms for assessing customer satisfaction predominately operationalize satisfaction as a single factor, a relatively stable cognitive or attitudinal construct (Turner et al. 2006). Although this summative form of assessment provides organizations with data that is easily captured, stored, and cross-referenced, it simultaneously sustains a single meaning of satisfaction, obscures potential relationships
between service dimensions, and constrains the strategies upon which organizational members can draw.

Specifically, we argue that satisfaction has been conceptually, theoretically, and methodologically delimited such that alternative meanings and the process by which individuals understand their experiences are moved out of frame.

Researchers Orsingher, Marzocchi, and Valentini (2011) contend that if customers feel satisfied after a service experience it is because, among other things, they have achieved their goals. Goals are the internal representation of desired states that a customer seeks to attain, as well as the reference standards by which he or she evaluates service performance.

If school principals are aware of their goals, understand what is needed to attain their goals, and ultimately reach their goals they would experience a level of satisfaction. Service managers (SSOs), therefore, need to know which goals customers (principals) use to evaluate a service experience, and must help them achieve these goals.

The extent to which customers achieve their goals depends in part on the attributes of the service experience, which can be thought of as the means by which they achieve their desired goals.

Theories that lead to perception. Despite the egalitarian (belief that all people are equal politically, socially, and economically) foundational structure of the common (public) school system, principals, teachers, and students came together to learn from what some may call a social learning environment (a place where people can learn and work together collaboratively).
However, researchers have examined the behaviors of student and teacher using the social learning theory with significant results concurring that people in fact do learn from modeling behaviors in a social environment. In fact, Rebecca Wiseman (1994) examined the perceived importance of faculty role modeling behaviors on high school juniors and seniors. Bandura's Social Learning Theory provided the theoretical framework for her research. A questionnaire, composed of 28 role model behaviors, was constructed to correspond to the three research questions. The overall alpha coefficient for the questionnaire was .95. The findings of this study indicate that students consider their faculty members as role models. Students perceived themselves as practicing the role model behaviors, but they also perceived that the faculty was inconsistent in rewarding them for their attempts to emulate those behaviors considered important.

Kretchmar (2008) suggested that theorist Albert Bandura’s social learning theory generated significant amounts of healthy academic debate among psychologists and educators. Edward Krug (1964) stated that the theory of “social efficiency” defines the school’s role as one of preparing students for adult life. Wood and Bandura (1989) discussed that, while it may seem that one factor, “social efficiency,” is the definitive measure of changes in behavior within learning environments, there are numerous factors that play a role in human behavior.

Mazur (1994) highlights behaviorist Albert Bandura as he argued that reinforcement is not essential for learning but essential in performance of learned behaviors. Therefore, reinforcement by way of administrator and teacher professional development will be essential for school improvement and student achievement.
As administrators and teachers develop greater confidence, improvement in student proficiency, pedagogy and instructional leadership occur. Researchers Goddard, Hoy, and Woolfolk (2000) stated that better teaching and improved student achievement occurs through both perception of collective efficacy and perception of levels of behavior.

**Development of self-efficacy.** Albert Bandura (1982) identified four information cues that influence self-efficacy. From most to least influential, they are enactive mastery, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and emotional (physiological) arousal. These cues provide important data, but according to Bandura it is the cognitive appraisal and integration of these data that ultimately determine self-efficacy.

How people feel about their jobs and how they learn their work is important to their performance. For the purpose of this study, network leaders will be synonymous and interchanged with superintendents, along with their working environment and Bandura’s cues of self-efficacy will be integrated to determine influences on network principals’ perception of their work.

First, enactive mastery, defined as repeated performance accomplishments (Bandura, 1982), has been shown to enhance self-efficacy more than the other kinds of cues (Bandura, 1977, 1982; Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977). Mastery is facilitated when gradual accomplishments build the skills, coping abilities, and exposure needed for task performance.

Second, when enactive mastery is not possible, vicarious experience (modeling) may be beneficial, although slightly less influential (Bandura, 1977). Modeling enhances educational practices for teachers and learning in the classrooms for students. Modeling
is more effective when the models succeed after overcoming difficulty than when they exhibit initially facile performances (Bandura, Adams, Hardy, & Howells, 1980; Kazdin, 1974).

Third, another source of efficacy information is verbal persuasion, which is aimed at convincing a person of his or her capability of performing a task. Verbal persuasion is believed to influence efficacy perceptions in some situations, but it is viewed as less effective than modeling or enactive mastery (Bandura, 1982).

Fourth, an individual’s perceptions of his or her physiological state may be used in assessing performance capability. Thus, an individual in an aroused state (e.g., high visceral anxiety while giving a presentation) may interpret the arousal as debilitating fear and feel excessively vulnerable to failure. Bandura and Adams (1977) found that, in these anxiety-inducing situations, modeling yielded higher self-efficacy and performance than psychological desensitization.

Reflective practitioner. As Schmidt (2000) notes, Schön was an inspiring lecturer, adviser, and musician, but also a very productive author. His sixth book, The Reflective Practitioner (1983), has become his best-known work, together with its sequel, Educating the Reflective Practitioner (1987). The Reflective Practitioner is considered of particular importance because it was the first one in which he comprehensively unfolded his overall epistemology of professional practice, based on the concepts of knowledge-in-action and reflection-in-action. In 1983 the book was innovative in two aspects. First, it represented recognition of the importance of practitioners’ special kind of knowing. Second, it gave an enlightening view of how we, real people, solve problems in the real world and how we simultaneously apply and create our knowledge in the process. This
study will observe real people views and examine possible solutions to poor school performance.

**Self-efficacy and social learning theory.** Researchers van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett (2002) stated that the basic theory behind self-efficacy is that individuals are more likely to engage in activities they have high self-efficacy for and less likely to engage in those they do not. Self-efficacy, a key element in Bandura’s (1977, 1978) social learning theory refers to one's belief in one's capability to perform a specific task. Self-efficacy arises from the gradual acquisition of complex cognitive, social, linguistic, and/or physical skills through experience (Bandura, 1982).

Individuals appear to weigh, integrate, and evaluate information about their capabilities; they then regulate their choices and efforts accordingly (Bandura, Adams, Hardy, & Howells, 1980).

Self-efficacy has three dimensions. Magnitude applies to the level of task difficulty that a person believes he or she can attain. Strength refers to whether the conviction regarding magnitude is strong or weak. Generality indicates the degree to which the expectation is generalized across situations (Bandura, 1977).

For the purpose of this study of the SSO effectiveness will be analyzed in the areas of operations, professional development/instruction and student achievement, which are critical to support of student achievement. The quality of school leaders matters greatly for school success. A large number of studies spanning the past three decades link high quality leadership with positive school outcomes, including student achievement (Hallinger & Heck, 1998; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Recognition of the importance of principals has led to increased policy attention on
attracting and preparing school leaders (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Hale & Moorman, 2003). Unfortunately, existing research does not tell us enough about the skills principals need to promote school improvement, making the design of policies geared towards recruiting and preparing effective school leaders challenging.

Researchers face at least two major obstacles in identifying important skills for principals: data availability and the complexity of principals’ work.

Bandura and Adams (1977) emphasized that behavior must be measured precisely in the analysis of efficacy and that measures should be tailored to the domain (environment) being studied.

**Self-efficacy and choice.** Self-efficacy arises from the cognitive appraisal of one's capabilities. Bandura (1982) indicated that self-efficacy affects one's choice of settings and activities, skill acquisition, effort expenditure, and the initiation and persistence of coping efforts in the face of obstacles. Those with moderate to high self-efficacy tend to engage more frequently in task related activities and persist longer in coping efforts; this leads to more mastery experiences, which in turn enhances self-efficacy.

Clearly, the role of self-guiding thought is a key element in self-efficacy theory as it applies to how school leaders facilitate administration and how teachers perform in their roles as teachers. Brief and Aldag (1981) argued that self-management and self-efficacy are related to other concepts in organizational behavior, but their treatment of the topics is limited. This section complements Brief and Aldag’s work by suggesting specific theoretical links between self-efficacy and other concepts pertaining to work
motivation and performance. The relevance of self-efficacy in explaining variability in
task performance is emphasized.

Bandura & Cervone (1983) asserts that feedback is important in formulating
efficacy perceptions that interact with goal setting to enhance performance motivation.

The New York City Department of Education surveys principals through a tool
called the Principal Satisfaction Survey in which school administrators evaluate their
perceptions of school support received from their network (district).

School support staff, and to some degree the school principal, have not been
formally trained to perform their duties. Researchers posit that administrators are not
generally trained for the daily challenges of their job and therefore learn and enhance
their capacities while on the job. This Pygmalion effect refers to enhanced learning or
performance resulting from the positive expectations of others. This phenomenon has
been observed in organizational as well as classroom settings with additional variables
that enhance interest and attraction to the job. These results include preferential
treatment, increased visibility, more explicit goals or standards, and increased attention to
training (Eden & Shani, 1982; Rubovits & Maehr, 1973).

Self-efficacy has been compared to internal locus of control. Rotter (1966)
defined internal locus of control as a perception that rewards are contingent on individual
behavior, while external locus of control is the notion that rewards are controlled by
outside factors, such as chance. However, two important distinctions can be made
between self-efficacy and internal locus of control.
First, internal versus external locus of control is a generalized construct covering a variety of situations, whereas self-efficacy is task specific, examining the individual's conviction that he or she can perform a specific task at a specific level of expertise.

Bandura (1977) stated that individuals may show strong internal locus of control in general, but believe they have low skill levels in certain areas, which would lead to low efficacy perceptions on relevant tasks.

A second difference is that locus of control as measured by Rotter’s (1966) I-E scale includes outcome expectancies in addition to behavior expectancies. Collective efficacy beliefs are a “group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments” (Bandura, 1997).

Collective teacher efficacy constitutes a powerful factor affecting different arenas of the school organization, influencing attitudes, affective, motivational, and behavioral aspects of teacher functioning within the school. Collective teacher efficacy is significantly affected by the collaboration of the staff as they develop their beliefs and social systems within the school (Bandura, 1997).

Most school organizations require a high level of coordination to provide a rich school climate and high student achievement. Not only must teachers work interdependently, they must also manage the instructional, motivational, and interpersonal aspects of the school organization.

Their perceived collective efficacy influences how well the staff performs their work (Little & Madigan, 1994). Collective teacher efficacy has been linked to school processes that promote teacher ownership in school decisions (shared school goals,
shared decision-making, positively perceived school change history, and empowering principal leadership) (Ross, Hogaboam-Gray, & Gray, 2004).

Researcher Roger Goddard stressed the importance of collective efficacy, a shared belief among teachers that all students can learn (a notion sometimes referred to as the Pygmalion effect) and that, by working together they can help all students in their school succeed. Stated simply, it’s a “can-do” attitude that permeates staff (Eck & Goodwin, 2010).

Several sources of collective efficacy, including mastery experiences (helping people experience initial successes or “quick wins”), social persuasion (relying on influential individuals to create high expectations and encourage others to meet those expectations) and group enablement (providing individuals and groups with opportunities to offer input or develop their own responses to identified challenges) prepare teachers, counselors, and administrators for work in our nations urban schools. (Eck et al., 2010; Henderson, Jones, & Self, 1998).

**Perceptions.** In its basic form perception is defined as the knowledge people have of objectives or of movements by direct and immediate contacts (Piaget, 1981). Psychologists analyzed perception as a selection model where messages are filtered and information is processed for meaning (Broadbent, 1958). Perceptions are often associated with memory processes and theorists believe perception was strongly selective along the lines of the perceiver interest (Bartlett, 1932). Other perception concepts, such as schemas describe how we interpret and organize information.

According to Piaget (1977), schemas are conceptual models used to assimilate or accommodate new information.
The researcher defines perceptions as causal views that are conceptual interpretations of information. This definition aligns with all of the aforementioned theorists. School principals’ perceptions are impacted by their educational environment, which may influence the way that they behave or respond to what they perceive to be their reality.

Education reform: Districts, centralization, decentralization, and networks. In the 1920s, leaders assumed that opportunities to quality education should be reserved for the relatively privileged few who “have an aptitude for such learning” (Schlecty, 1990). This thought was just one of the many reasons for education reform. Over the years quality education has been viewed as a right afforded to privileged few. Silberman (1970) posed questions like “What is education for? What kind of human beings and what kind of society do we want to produce? What methods of instruction and classroom organization as well as what subject matter do we need to produce these results? What knowledge is of most worth?” to remind us that school reform had not address what may be considered fundamental theoretical questions about the purpose of reform.

Many researchers believe that the purpose for educational changes is to help schools accomplish their goals more effectively by replacing some structures, programs, and /or practices to better ones.

Researchers have viewed transformational leadership as a tool that can effect significant school changes. Transformational leadership helps school principals’ to frame their attitudes to move their schools forward. It has four major characteristics. Of these, idealized influence is defined as leader’s behavior and the follower’s attributions about the leader. Inspirational motivation refers to the ways by which transformational leaders
motivate and inspire those around them. Individualized consideration represents the leader’s continuing effort to treat each individual as a special person and act as a mentor who attempts to develop his or her potential. Finally, intellectual stimulation represents the leader’s effort to stimulate followers to be innovative and creative to define problems and approach them in new ways (Balyer, 2012).

Despite the perceptions that leadership in whatever style may appear to come from one person, it may very well be reflective of an organization, institution, or agency. We may interchange districts and networks as all of the above entities. According to Northouse (2001), in the simplest terms, transformational leadership is the ability to get people to want to change, improve, and be led. It involves assessing associates' motives, satisfying their needs, and valuing them. Besides, some researcher claim that transformational leadership is the leader’s ability to increase organizational members’ commitment, capacity, and engagement in meeting goals (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Chew & Chan, 2008; Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1997; Geijsel, Sleegers, Stoel, & Krüger, 2009; Jung & Avolio, 2000; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1998; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Marks & Printy, 2003; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993).

While leadership styles, programs, structures and practices are seen as being integral for change they may still fall short of what is expected of schools. Sarason (1990) stated, as part of their goals, schools could be vehicles for social change. Schools were not only expected to address problems that were within the system but also address issues that were external impacting the students who attended. However, the reality of schools being environments of social change, as well as, providing quality education to all children who attended was considered by some to be virtually unrealistic.
Michael Fullan (1999) saw schools as instruments of moral purpose, which in fact could provide improvements designed to make differences in the lives of students. Reform is usually prompted by conflict in the intricate balance of too little or too much structure. Educators and school administrators have harnessed in government-directed politics rather than education reform in some aspects. According to Fullan (1999), centralized schools do not address moral purpose reforms designed to impact the lives of students that would lead to promoting social capital.

In de-centralization as noted later in this chapter that school sites are the basis for authority, where individual schools can make their own decisions related to finances and curriculum.

However, the main locus of authority is at the central level. Researchers Bryk, Thum, Easton, and Luppescu (1998) focused on local capacity building, policymaking to support decentralization, commitment to rigorous accountability, and stimulating innovation as a medium to rigid centralized structures (Fullan, 1999). Decentralization by definition means a break from central authority. However, it was still viewed by the authors that it was necessary from time to time to use bureaucratic intervention in very troubled schools.

This would allow for a stronger base in professional norms of practice for educating all children well, coupled with a supportive parent and community involvement toward the same end (Bryk et al., 1998).

Over the past century education reform was designed to address what schools were, what they should have been, who should share or not share responsibility for them, what intellectual or vocational functions they would serve for young people, and how
teachers would be trained to support their students amongst the changes. Sarason and Klaber (1985) stated that once again schools had become a social issue given top priority on the national agenda, inferring that school reform was a social reoccurrence. In “The School as a Social Situation,” Sarason and Klaber (1985) stated that the United States Federal government began to play a significant role in education reform with the Brown v The Board of Education case. This Supreme Court decision highlighted social-interpersonal-moral consequences of the “separate but equal” that ensured the educational system challenging times for years to come.

Government intervention had a marked influence on the social climate of schools. Researchers Sarason and Klaber (1985) further stated that many Americans felt the federal government should not have authority regarding what happened in state schools. Also, there were a number of factors that magnetized public attention to social factors within schools that were considered adverse to quality education.

The population explosion that followed World War II brought overcrowded conditions to the nation’s forefront. Questions about how students were able to have a productive education career in cramped spaces had risen in urban areas. Delinquency, a major factor in the dropout rate of American youth, was significantly high became a platform of the social movements of the 1960s. Social movements of the 1960s impacted schools with Vietnam War demonstrations, civil rights and women’s movements, and the growth of militant teachers unions.

Sarason and Klaber (1985) stated that the falling birth rates also had negative social consequences on schools. Decreasing budgets, school closings, conflicts between teachers unions and school boards, and the elimination of various school programs
influenced school climate and student achievement. It is viewed by the authors’ public education had three revolutions, the first was the legitimating of compulsory education by the end of the 19th century, secondly was the 1954 desegregation decision, and thirdly in 1975 the passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children’s Act otherwise known as “the mainstream law.” This law stated that all handicapped children should be integrated into a regular classroom and routine school activities.

Discussion regarding the effect of school reform has taken on many shapes. Over the past fifty years, three major movements, aimed at promoting equity, increasing school choice, and using academic standards to leverage improvement, have dominated U.S. school reform. These reforms are equity-based reform, school choice, and standards-based reform.

While all three have changed schooling in notable ways, none has brought about the needed level of general improvements because they mostly sought to improve education from the outside rather than the inside. To make real progress, individuals will have to think and act much more audaciously (Jennings, 2012).

In 1988, U.S. Secretary of Education William Bennett proclaimed Chicago’s public schools to be the worst in the nation. Since that time, Chicago has been at the forefront of urban school reform. Beginning with a dramatic move in 1990 to shift power away from the central office, through CEO Paul Vallas’ use of standardized testing to hold schools and students accountable for teaching and learning, and into CEO Arne Duncan’s bold plan to create 100 new schools in 10 years, Chicago has attempted to boost academic achievement through a succession of innovative policies.
Each wave of reform has brought new practices, programs, and policies that have interacted with the initiatives of the preceding wave. With each successive wave of reform this fundamental question has been raised: Has progress been made at Chicago Public Schools (CPS)? This study addresses the question by analyzing trends in elementary and high school test scores and graduation rates over the past 20 years.

Key findings described briefly in this summary report include: (a) Graduation rates in Chicago have improved dramatically, and high school test scores have risen; more students are graduating without a decline in average academic performance; (b) Math scores have improved incrementally in the elementary/middle grades, while elementary/middle grade reading scores have remained fairly flat for two decades; (c) Racial gaps in achievement have steadily increased, with white and Asian students making more progress than Latino students, and African American students falling behind all other groups; and (d) Despite progress, the vast majority of CPS students have academic achievement levels that are far below where they need to be to graduate ready for college (Luppescu, Allensworth, Moore, De la Torre, & Murphy, 2011).

Honig (2009) stated that recent state and national policy has both reflected and helped to further an image of localities as parochial, reactionary, ineffective, and appropriately marginalized in the enterprise of school reform. Growing state and national roles (on one hand) and growing market and private sector inroads (on another) have the potential to undermine localities as sites for both pragmatic policy making and for political mobilization (exercising power in the other sectors).
Although the present study does not measure student achievement in Chicago public schools reform characteristics linked to school reform are mentioned to present arguments either positive or negative impact supported by research.

**Decentralization versus centralization.** In an attempt at improving student achievement some school districts have decided to decentralize. However, decentralization in school districts can mean so many different things that the term has nearly lost its meaning (Ouchi, 2006).

Not all forms of decentralization are equal, nor does centralization by itself produce meaningful change. Ouchi (2006) conducted three studies of decentralization reform. In each study decentralization was accompanied by enhanced public choice, thus creating a competitive market for education. The districts also undertook other important changes, such as increased emphasis on both student performance and on training of principals. In each of the three cases, change was fostered by widespread public dissatisfaction.

Researchers articulate the complexities of decentralization by noting that the term decentralization has different meaning and is ambiguous depending on location and municipality. Heinz-Dieter (2009) state many education reforms of the past 25 years have involved the administrative decentralization of decision-making authority in education in the United States and worldwide.

Decentralization experiments in New York City and Chicago, widespread adoption of site-based management or shared decision making across many districts and states, and the emergence of relatively independent charter schools are all examples of
efforts to strengthen education by placing greater rights and responsibilities in the hands of lower level participants.

However, many of these experiments were marred because decentralization turned out to mean different things to different people.

In Edmonton, Alberta, Canada the goal was to empower principals. Interviews with current and former school district executives confirm that the Edmonton reform sought to reduce friction between the district central office and individual schools (Tucker & Codding, 1998). Through decentralization, the central office was focused on setting standards and auditing performance, while each school made its own operating decisions (Ouchi, 2006).

In Seattle and Houston the goal was to improve student achievement. In the Houston Independent School District (HISD), public dissatisfaction with low student scores led to the election in 1989 of several reform-oriented candidates to the school board (McAdams, 2000) and the adoption of a Declaration of Beliefs and Visions, which declared that “HISD must decentralize” (McAdams, 2000). In Seattle, public dissatisfaction with the schools had grown to the point that the Washington State House of Representatives (1990) had severely criticized the failures of the public schools (Ouchi, 2006).

The study of decentralization developed in response to the growth of very large business and governmental organizations (Ouchi, 2006). Scholars have established that increasing size yields several organization effects that result in decreased effectiveness (Blau & Schoenherr, 1971; Terrien & Mills 1955). Studies of decentralization in schools cover many approaches that comparing them require caution. For example, school
decentralization from the national to the state level (Fiske & Ladd, 2000; Walberg, Paik, Komukai, & Freeman, 2000) and from the state to local school districts (Corcoran & Christman, 2002; O'Day, 2002) has not yielded consistent effects on student achievement.

Scholars have argued that research has not found consistent results because of unmeasured nuances in relations between district offices and individual schools (Honig, 2004, Stein, Hubbard, & Mehan, 2004). Hannaway (1996) has also noted some of the diverse meanings of decentralization in the study of school systems.

Over the past two decades, a large number of countries have been engaged in the decentralization of decision-making to schools. This inclination towards decentralization is a global phenomenon, affecting developing as well as developed countries. The increased attention to decentralization in education is probably best reflected by the numerous initiatives of central governments or local authorities to stimulate decision-making by schools, through site- or school-based management, local management of schools, or the establishment of relatively autonomous reform schools, like the charter schools in the USA (Maslowski, Schreens, & Luyten 2006).

Researchers state the reasons for educational decentralization are manifold, and often vary across countries. In a number of countries that were engaged in widespread decentralization efforts during the 1980s, the impetus to decentralize decision-making powers was primarily based on financial motives. Decentralization was expected to generate revenues for the education system by taking advantage of local sources of taxation and by reducing operating costs.
Other motives, particularly during the 1990s, originated from the need to restore the legitimacy of politics and governmental institutions by redistributing power and by allowing parents and other local stakeholders to participate in decisions taken in schools. This was believed to increase the commitment of local actors to the school and to stimulate educational innovations tailored to the needs of students and parents and—as far as vocational education is concerned—to the requirements of regional employers (Maslowski et al., 2006).

Apart from these various incentives to engage in decentralization efforts, educational decentralization is also infused, or at least legitimated by the aspiration to enhance the quality of education. Through which school processes decentralization will eventually result in better education and hence in better student outcomes, and whether these ambitions are actually reasonable, often remains unclear (Maslowski et al., 2006). However, Walberg et al. (2000) making a crucial distinction, note that while moving decisions from the national to state or district level is not important, decentralization to the level of the individual school does make a difference:

Decision-making…made at the school level was associated with higher science achievement. These findings remind us of some modern business theories, which hold that central boards and officers set profit or other targets while lower operating units set their own means of organizing their work to attain the targets.

Ravitch (1974) has detailed the history of reform attempt in the New York City schools from 1805 until the 1970s as a process that has alternated centralization and decentralization between chancellor and local area superintendents, but has never delegated control to individual schools. Decentralization, as school reform, has occurred
in major cities throughout the United States. Researchers examined how Chicago turned to radical decentralization as a “last resort” strategy, a similar experiment in New York City moved into its terminal stage (Cardozo, 2003; Traub, 2002; Ouchi, 2000). In New York City, the movement for decentralization was prompted by racial segregation that persisted long after the Supreme Court’s Brown vs. Board decision (Gittell, 1967). In 1969, the Mayor’s Panel on School Decentralization produced a report that called for dividing the city into smaller school districts (45–65 in number), to be governed by boards composed of district residents chosen by parents and the mayor. These community boards would determine their own personnel policies, while New York City’s central agency would have authority over citywide policies and provide specified centralized services.

One of the similarities between the two decentralization efforts was their emphasis on radical decentralization. The expectation was that the local people—liberated from the constraints of urban education bureaucracies—would take matters into their own hands and, unlike their bureaucratically entrenched predecessors, enact policies in the interest of their children.

**Autonomy.** Maslowski et al., (2006) stated measuring the benefits of educational decentralization and school autonomy is a complicated endeavor, for a number of reasons. First, decentralization of decision-making authority to schools and other local actors does not take place in isolation. It may be accompanied by other policies that either hinder or facilitate a thorough implementation of decentralization. Second, even where educational decentralization efforts are not influenced by other policy measures, effects that can be ascribed to decentralization policies are hard to decipher. As
educational policies practically all aim at improving the quality of schooling, it is difficult to assess to what degree observed outcomes are to be attributed to educational decentralization, or whether they should be credited to other policy measures. This is especially true as the path of causation between educational policies and school changes is nearly always uncertain, multiple factors and actors influence any particular change in school practices, and often a lengthy chain of intermediate factors can be thought of, allowing many disturbances (Maslowski et al., 2006).

Michael Fullan (1993) arrived at similar conclusions: “Organizations…must continually manage the constructive tension of “fit” and “split” operations—sometimes integrating, at other times decentralizing, and often doing both at the same time with respect to different functions.” Weick and Sutcliffe (2001) argued that it is the “balance of centralization with decentralization” that matters, not either one alone:

“Excess centralization can weaken local containment and resolution of problems, whereas excess decentralization can weaken the comprehension of wider threats and the capacity to coordinate responses.”

Education researchers and policy makers have not always fully embraced the integrated view of centralization and decentralization and its implications. First, it is neither desirable nor even feasible to create effective decentralization without some kind of counterbalancing (re)centralization. When we decentralize, we create new sub centers of decision-making. Lest this downward shift of decision-making lead to confusion or chaos, it must be balanced by a commensurate recentralization. In other words, centralization and decentralization are not mutually exclusive; they are each other’s prerequisites. Another overlooked implication is that centralization is not synonymous
with “top-down coercion” (Heinz-Dieter, 2009). As noted in this study New York City education reform retooled annually to ultimately create organizations that resembles integrated structures with grass roots decision-making capacity.

School Support Organizations (SSO) designed to operate as grass roots support provide services to schools through network teams that principals select.

Organization theorists suggest that decentralization and centralization are not mutually exclusive, but that centralization of core policies at higher organizational levels can be a prerequisite of effective decentralization and autonomy at lower levels. More generally, the quality of an institution is not determined by centralization or decentralization per se, but by its institutional configuration and relative balance.

This dovetails with findings of education policy researchers that the “usual either/or categories of centralization or decentralization used to describe patterns of curricular governance become less accurate, and even misleading” (Astiz, Baker, & Wiseman, 2002).

Chapter Summary

Schools are organizations where teachers work together in an interactive social system. The social organization of the school structures the relationships of teachers, administrators, and students in ways that affect instructional activities. Social cognitive theory asserts that teacher’ perceptions of both self and organization influence their actions. The environment a person develops for living and working is created individually and collectively. The belief systems of a faculty result in cultures that can be revitalizing or demoralizing to the school’s social system (Good & Brophy, 1986).
Efficacy beliefs impact how people feel, think, act, and motivate themselves. The efficacy beliefs that emerge from the interactive process in schools influence both participants’ well-being and what they can accomplish as a group (Bandura, 1993, 1997). Bandura used the term human agency to describe the ways that people affect some level of control over their own lives as a result of their self-efficacy beliefs and are thus enabled to put in order a path to a particular goal (Rentz, 2007). Bandura’s social cognitive theory expanded the examination of the human agency to the employment of collective agency that operates through the mutual efficacy beliefs of groups. All organizations, even nations, can unravel predicaments and enhance lives by working together when they possess collective efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

The reviews of the literature in relation to the criteria of organizational efficacy (collective and self) and organizational reform and education reform correlate in the quest for improved teacher and student achievement. Bandura’s social cognitive theory highlights processes (social interactions) that are significant to bring about reform. This study investigated the effects of education reform, teacher improvement, and student achievement and perceptions of collective and self-efficacy as means of exploring network (SSO) support to New York City schools.

The work of theorist Herbert Simon with means-ends chain theory is emulated in various ways by researchers Orsingher et al. (2011), and Turner et al. (2006), using goal achievement as the basis of levels of satisfaction by customers. However satisfaction research does lead to multidimensional satisfaction constructs that go beyond attitudinal and cognitive factors.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

General Perspective

This chapter presents the methodological context of the case study, including the description of participants, materials, procedure and analysis.

Although SSOs or network services were theoretically designed to help public schools increase student graduation rates and to help principals manage their schools better since 2007, more quantitative and qualitative research is needed to determine if successful outcomes are being achieved for these public schools particularly from the perspective of the principals, who are ultimately being evaluated for the success of their schools. One outcome variable from the perspective of principals is their degree of overall satisfaction with the network services. There continue to be a lack of studies that determine the extent to which principals are really satisfied with these new education reforms and the use of integrated SSOs within their NYC schools. Therefore, the purpose of this case study was to assess the principals’ satisfaction with network support services in the areas of instructional professional development, operations, and student achievement within one NYC network hereafter referred to as the Excel network. This quantitative case study attempted to aggregate and analyze trend data on principal satisfaction with network support across a three-year period within one network in the largest public school system in the world. The present study relied on quantitative satisfaction measures with a population of principals within one network. Creswell (2008) stated that quantitative research is a means for testing objective theories by
examining the relationship among variables. These variables in turn can be measured, typically on instruments, so that numbered data can be analyzed using statistical procedures, therefore building in protections against bias. These areas are significant in the principal satisfaction survey as they are essential in school improvement and success. Willis, Inman, and Valenti (2010) stated that quantitative surveys are better for studies that seek responses to answer specific, pre-specified research questions. This researcher studied the current network model of the New York City (NYC) education system, specifically the level of perceived principal satisfaction. The researcher decided to use a quantitative approach to collect data on this network of schools using existing archival NYC survey data to minimize the potential for bias in the creation of survey items.

**Research Context**

The research context for the present study was the School Support Organizations (SSO) created in the New York City Department of Education for the purpose of improving student achievement and teacher pedagogy. Network school support can be described or measured by type, intensity, and focus of network support provided to schools that addresses student achievement and graduation. Administrative and pedagogical (instructional) needs can be determined and help inform significant analysis for feedback. Trend data of principal satisfaction can inform NYCDOE reform policy in the areas of how network support will look in the future, how principals and school communities will be provided support, and how a modified evaluation tool can be institutionalized to highlight specific areas of school needs. This study evaluated the network structure by conducting an internal analysis of one network the Excel network and several functions performed to support network schools.
The NYCDOE transition to a citywide system of network support was also, designed to create significant cost savings in order to reinvest financial resources directly into school budgets: since 2006, and the cost of school support has decreased 32%. Although the network support structure existed since 2007, organizational changes moved toward creating consistency in school support throughout NYCDOE. In 2009 the NYCDOE required every school within the system to be affiliated with a support network in the Children’s First Network model, making the Excel network one of 60 networks serving NYC public schools.

Excel will be used as a pseudonym throughout this study to identify one school support network. The origins, structure of the team and school cohort, team functions, and data will be authentic to the network otherwise known as Excel.

Excel, a school support organization or network, was borne from the Empowerment education reform in New York City, which made principals accountable for school improvement and student achievement. This paradigm shift from the traditional external bureaucracy brought greater amount of discretion to those in the schools who were actually doing the work of educating children by bringing the service support inside the schools to support teaching.

The Excel network is one of 60 networks in the New York City Department of Education. Every network is evaluated by network principals on an annual basis about services provided to affiliated schools. In the school years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 the Excel network ranked in the bottom third of citywide network rankings based on New York City Department of Education Network rankings. Thus, the present
case study was designed to assess principal satisfaction ratings with the Excel network support provided from 2009-2012.

Schools supported by Excel were located in low socio-economic or poverty areas in New York City throughout four boroughs Manhattan, Bronx, Queens, and Brooklyn. Excel network schools were located across 11 different school districts.

As noted in Table 1.3, the demographic profile of the entire Excel network of schools fell below the poverty level entitling them to free lunches.

Excel was established within the NYCDOE in the beginning of the empowerment movement in 2007. It was one of the original 11 network teams. Excel affiliated schools were identified as disadvantaged and underperforming.

In 2008, the NYCDOE expanded its network model citywide making Excel network one of 22 networks. In 2009 the NYCDOE required every school within the system be affiliated with a network in the new CFN model making Excel network one of 60 networks serving New York City public schools (Urban Education Leadership Program, 2011). In 2010 Excel network team supported 21 self-affiliated schools, helped advance their academic, operational, organizational, leadership, and professional growth. Cross-functional team members who are collectively accountable to principals and peer team members facilitated Excel services. The Excel advisory group of school principals called the Principals Think Tank (PTT) has through informal conversations identified three areas that are critical to their success and have provided this information to the researcher. Therefore, the researcher measured and studied the perception of principals’ satisfaction of the Excel network by examining three variables of effectiveness:
operations, student achievement, and instruction/professional development over a three year period.

**Preliminary Analysis**

Prior to analyzing the three research questions, data hygiene and data screening was undertaken to ensure the variables of interest met appropriate statistical assumptions. Thus, the variables were first evaluated for missing data, univariate outliers, and normality. Subsequently, independent-samples t-tests were run to determine if any differences existed between variables. That is, the study assessed if significant differences existed in network principal’s perceptions of satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development, operations, and student achievement over a three year period.

**Research Questions**

1a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of *instructional professional development*?

1b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to *instructional professional development* over a three-year period among network principals?

2a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of *operations*?

2b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to *operations* over a three-year period among network principals?
3a. Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of 

*student achievement.*

3b. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with 
network support specifically related to *student achievement* over a three-year 
period among network principals?

**Research Participants**

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) stated that the study population, which 
represents the entire set of relevant units of analysis or data, is defined in terms of 
(a) content, (b) extent, and (c) time. The population of this study comprised of the entire 
network of principals in the Excel network, which consisted of 17 network principals. 
The Excel network principal demographics are presented in Table 3.1.

The demographic profile of each principal of the Excel network was listed using 
categorical data of race gender, and years of school leadership experience.
Table 3.1

*Demographic Characteristics of the 17 Principals in the Excel Network Schools (N = 17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial/Ethnic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Totals of percentages are not 100% for every characteristic because of rounding.

Career experience presented in Table 3.1 displays that more senior principals are past or near retirement with the bulk of leadership experience around the beginning of the Education reform movement in 2001.

Network school demographics presented in Table 3.2 displays demographics of school population per subgroup.
Table 3.2

*Demographic Characteristics of the Public School Students and locations (N = 10,057) in the 17 Excel Network Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>20.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>16.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 1</td>
<td>10,057</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>55.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>47.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>26.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>6878</td>
<td>68.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages were rounded off to the nearest tenth.

The researcher served as network leader for the Excel network from school years 2007-2012. As an executive member of the network, profiles and identities of all staff team members and principals were available for researcher. For the purpose of this study
aforementioned these files were used as data to review information about principals’ knowledge and experience as a school leader.

To complete description of principal profile it was also necessary to mention that each Excel network school consisted of student populations that were 100% eligible for free and reduced meals, placing every school at or below the poverty level.

The Center for Economic Opportunity (2011) documented the poverty level for a household with two adults and two children was $29,477 (Levitan, D’Onofrio, Krampner, Scheer, & Seidel, 2011). Therefore, all schools in the Excel network are comprised of families at or below the 29,477 threshold. The participants for the study were 17 principals from the Excel network who were the current principal of their school at the time the Principal Satisfaction Survey was administered. In school year 2011-2012 the school network membership decreased from 23 to 17 schools because of school change of affiliations during the 2011-2012 school years.

Six affiliated schools decided to exercise their option to re-affiliate with another SSO for the 2012-2013 school years. Of the 17 Excel affiliated schools 14 voluntarily responded to the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS). Eighty-two percent (14) of the network schools responded to the 2011-2012 school year Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS). Note locations of Excel network schools in Table 3.2.

### Instruments Used in Data Collection

The Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS) (PSS, OA, 2007) is a self-report, online electronic survey that consists of 300 questions designed to measure levels of satisfaction of school support provided by central office and school support networks. The PSS is often used as a performance management tool to hold networks and central offices
accountable for the quality of support they provide schools and inform networks’ and central’s efforts to continuously improve their performance. In addition, the PSS is used as a measure of school leadership of principals. In addition the survey enabled tracking of longitudinal progress, while at the same time allowing for adjustments to the survey to support alignment with new structures and priorities.

For each question principals were asked to rate their level of satisfaction of performance provided by the New York City Department of Education. PSS used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very dissatisfied to 4 = very satisfied). Responses were summed to yield scores indicating overall levels of satisfaction for school support performance. Principal satisfaction with network support mean scores could range from (1) very unsatisfied to (4) very satisfied. The PSS is a 300-question survey composed of four sections measuring levels of satisfaction of public school principals for school support provided by self-affiliated networks. Sample items are “How satisfied are you with the overall Quality of support provided by the following members of your core team?” and “How helpful is the support received from each of the following member of your core team in assisting you to improve student outcomes in your school?” The PSS has been used to evaluate network school support performance. However it has been discovered by the researcher that the PSS has not been tested for reliability or validity and may have ambiguity and need for testing. The PSS has been used to measure levels of principals’ satisfaction for overall New York City Department of Education support however the archival data extrapolated will be delimited to network support of schools.

The PSS was administered city wide from 2007-2012 on a voluntary basis to all of the principals in the network (N = 17). Although the network support structure existed
since 2007 organizational changes created consistency in support throughout NYCDOE.
In 2009 the NYCDOE required every school within the system to be affiliated with a support network in the Children’s First Network model, making the Excel network one of 60 networks serving NYC public schools. The researcher of this study served as network leader from year 2007 to 2012 has a list of names of principals and locations of schools and has full access to PSS for the Excel network. In school years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 the PSS was administered twice per school year. In the school year 2011-2012 the PSS was administered once this change occurred because the chancellor of the City of New York Department of Education sought to reduce administrative workload for principals by eliminating one third of the questions because the responses reached a plateau, questions were no longer relevant, questions did not provide actionable feedback, and questions were redundant between offices or asked in other surveys. The survey was distributed electronically taking about one hour to complete.

This network case study was delimited to archival data extrapolated from the PSS from years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 to align with last citywide organizational changes in the NYCDOE. Although the PSS was comprised of multiple sections the specific areas of focus on the PSS will be professional development/instruction, student achievement, and operations. Ex-post facto data was extrapolated from the principal satisfaction survey for each school year from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The yearly response rates for completed PSS submitted by the principals citywide and for the Excel network are presented in table 3.4. The response rates ranged from 76% to 89% citywide over the three year period of 2009-2012, but the response rates in the Excel network remained relatively constant – 82-83%.
Table 3.3

*Principals’ Response Rate for Completion of PSS Over a Three-Year Period in the Excel Network (N = 17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>City-Wide Response Rate</th>
<th>Excel Network Response Rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Percentages were rounded off to nearest tenth. NYC Public Schools N = 1750.

**Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis**

The researcher collected archival Excel network data from annual surveys distributed citywide to all NYCDoe public schools from 2009-2012 school years. The researcher extrapolated survey data germane to Excel network to analyze principals’ perception of satisfaction. The Principal Satisfaction Survey was distributed by Department of Education twice annually in the fall and spring from 2007-2011 to all school principals to provide feedback regarding services provided by network and NYCDoe staff for the academic year. As a result to principal recommendation the PSS was distributed in 2011-2012 in the spring of 2012.

The Principal Satisfaction Survey is an anonymous survey, which is electronically distributed to all public school principals to determine levels of satisfaction in instructional and operational areas. Neither network principals nor school information is revealed, however results were culled by network to determine network effectiveness in
critical areas. The NYCDOE used the information as criteria for improving service
support to schools. The advisory team PTT discussed in an informal conversation what
sections were priorities to them in leading their school. They cited the sections pertaining
to operations, student achievement, and professional development/instruction. The New
York City Department of Education Office of Accountability designed and administered
the PSS since 2007. Although the PSS has been used, the researcher NYCDOE staff
stated that the PSS was not tested for reliability.

Reliability analyses were run to determine if the dependent variables (principal
satisfaction with instructional development, operations, and student achievement) as
measured by the PSS were sufficiently reliable. Reliability analysis allows one to study
the properties of measurement scales and the items that compose the scales (Tabachnick
& Fidell, 2007). That is “reliability estimates indicate the stability, internal consistency,
and equivalence of the items or parts composing the measurement device” (Keppel &
Zedeck, 1989, p. 449). Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis procedure calculates a
reliability coefficient that ranges between 0 and 1. The reliability coefficient is based on
the average inter-item correlation.

Preliminary analyses (data hygiene and data screening) was undertaken to ensure
the variables of interest met appropriate statistical assumptions. Thus, the analyses
followed a similar analytic strategy in that the variables were first evaluated for missing
data, univariate outliers, and normality. Subsequently, independent-samples t-tests were
run to determine if any differences existed between variables. This study was limited to
archival data extrapolated from the PSS from years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-
2012 to align with last citywide organizational changes in the NYCDOE. Although the
PSS is comprised of multiple sections the specific areas of focus on the PSS were professional development/instruction, student achievement, and operations. Ex-post facto data was extrapolated from the principal satisfaction survey for each school year from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The researcher used independent-samples t-tests were run to determine if any differences existed between variables over a three-year period. Principal satisfaction of instructional professional development was measured by 6-items on the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS), principal satisfaction operations was measured by 35 items, and principal satisfaction of student achievement was measured by 27-items. Response parameters for the dependent variables were measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree. If PSS network satisfaction ratings among the 17 principals were found to be poor or below average, the network would be disbanded, merged with another network, or schools would have an opportunity to re-affiliate to a new network. Thus, the implications of understanding principal satisfaction ratings of networks are very important to the principals, the public schools and support networks.

Inferential statistics were used to draw conclusions from the sample tested. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to code and tabulate scores collected from the surveys and provide summarized values where applicable including the mean, standard deviation, and central tendency. Independent-samples t-tests were used to assess three research questions.
Chapter 4: Results

Research Questions

Trend data of principal satisfaction with network support can inform NYCDOE reform policy in the areas of how network support will look in the future, how principals and school communities will be provided support, and how a modified evaluation tool can be institutionalized to highlight specific areas of school needs. This study evaluated the network structure by conducting an internal archival analysis of principal satisfaction of school support from school support organizations within the Excel network over a three-year period 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012.

The research questions were:

**Research Question 1a (RQ1a):** Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of instructional professional development?

**Research Question 1b (RQ1b):** Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support ratings specifically related to instructional professional development over a three-year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 among network principals?

**Research Question 2a (RQ2a):** Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of operations?

**Research Question 2b (RQ2b):** Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support ratings specifically related to operations over
a three year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 among network principals?

**Research Question 3a (RQ3a):** Were principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of student achievement?

**Research Question 3b (RQ3b):** Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support ratings specifically related to student achievement over a three year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 among network principals?

**Data Analysis and Findings**

**PSS reliability analyses.** First, prior to analyzing the three research questions, reliability analyses of the PSS was undertaken to ensure the variables of interest met appropriate statistical assumptions. Reliability analyses were run to determine if the dependent variables (principal satisfaction with instructional development, operations, and student achievement) as measured by the PSS were sufficiently reliable. Reliability analysis allows one to study the properties of measurement scales and the items that compose the scales (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). That is “reliability estimates indicate the stability, internal consistency, and equivalence of the items or parts composing the measurement device” (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989, p. 449). Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis procedure calculates a reliability coefficient that ranges between 0 and 1. The reliability coefficient is based on the average inter-item correlation. Scale reliability is assumed if the coefficient is ≥.70. Results from the test found that the variable constructs were sufficiently reliable. Cronbach’s Alpha ranged from .85 to .93 for the 79 items. See Table 4.1 for details of the results.
Table 4.1

*Summary of Reliability Analysis of the PSS measures of Satisfaction with Network Support*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSS Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Instructional Development</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Operations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Student Achievement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Acceptable reliability scores are ≥ .70 – .80

**Analysis of research questions.** Inferential statistics were used to draw conclusions from the sample tested. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to code and tabulate scores collected from the surveys and provide summarized values where applicable including the mean, standard deviation, and central tendency. As shown in Table 4.2, Hypotheses 1-3 used independent-samples t-tests to test whether or not significant differences existed in network principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development, operations and student achievement over a three year period. The dependent variables were network principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with network support specifically related to principal satisfaction with instructional professional development (Hypothesis 1), operations (Hypothesis 2) and student achievement (Hypothesis 3).
Principal satisfaction of instructional professional development was measured by 6-items on the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS), principal satisfaction operations was measured by 35 items, and principal satisfaction of student achievement was measured by 27-items. Response parameters for the dependent variables were measured on a 4-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Agree*, 4 = *Strongly Agree*. Additionally, some survey items provided a fifth response option that allowed participants to state that the item’s content did not pertain to them or their school; these responses were treated as missing data. Composite, averaged, scores were calculated for the dependent variables by summing scores across the constructs and then dividing by the number of construct items. That is, on the 1 to 4 point scale, scores that are greater than or equal to 1 and less than 2.5 would indicate dissatisfaction; whereas scores greater
than 2.5 and less than or equal to 4 would indicate satisfaction. Composite scores were used as the dependent variables for Hypotheses 1-3.

The independent variable was the school year data collected including: 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. Data for the 2009-2010 school years was collected once during the fall of 2009 and once during the spring of 2010. Furthermore, the archival data for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were compiled/aggregated in a manner that was unusable in an independent-samples t-test model; that is, the archival data were presented as series means for all items, rather than participants’ individual scores for each item. Therefore, the independent-samples t-test models for Hypotheses 1-3 will examine differences in principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with network support between fall 2009 and spring 2010 only. However, data from the 2011-2012 school year was aggregated in a manner that a single, overall averaged score could be calculated for two of the dependent variables (instructional professional development and operations). Thus, the overall average scores for 2011-2012 were used simply as a comparison for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years.

**Preliminary data screening.** Before the hypotheses were assessed, the data were screened for missing data and univariate outliers. The data were screened for univariate outliers by transforming raw scores to z-scores and comparing z-scores to a critical value of ±3.29, \( p < .001 \) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Z-scores that exceed this critical value were more than three standard deviations away from the mean and thus represented outliers. The distributions were evaluated and no cases with univariate outliers were found. Missing data were investigated using frequency counts and several cases existed within the distributions. Due to the low sample size, missing data were replaced by the
series mean for that particular survey item unless the participant did not respond to 80% or more of the constructs’ items which resulted in the participant being removed from the analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell state that mean substitution has been a popular technique to estimate missing values since it is a conservative procedure that does not change the overall mean distribution (2007). Therefore, 11 cases did not respond to 80% or more of the survey items for instructional professional development; two cases did not respond to 80% or more of the survey items for operations; and two cases had a response rate less than 80% for student achievement. Thus, for Hypotheses 1-3, 34 responses from participants were received and 23 were evaluated by the independent-samples t-test for Hypothesis 1 \((n = 23)\); 32 were evaluated by Hypothesis 2 \((n = 32)\), and 32 were evaluated by Hypothesis 3 \((n = 32)\). Descriptive statistics for the independent variables by year are displayed in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

**Descriptive Statistics of the Principal Satisfaction Ratings with Network Support Across Three Major Areas by School Year (2009-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Instructional Professional Development</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>−0.019</td>
<td>−0.651</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>−0.171</td>
<td>−2.787</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Operations</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>−1.711</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>−0.793</td>
<td>−0.030</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Network Support in Student Achievement</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PSS Scale: (4) Very Satisfied with Network Support, (3) Satisfied, (2) Dissatisfied, (1) Very Dissatisfied, or (5) I did not request this service.

**Test of normality.** Before the hypotheses were analyzed, basic parametric assumption were assessed. That is for the dependent variables (instructional professional development, operations, and student achievement) the assumption of normality was evaluated. To statistically test the assumption of normality the skew coefficients were divided by the skew standard error resulting in a z-skew coefficient for the variables by year. Specifically, z-skew coefficients exceeding the critical value of ±3.29 ($p < .001$) may indicate non-normality. Thus, based on the evaluation of the z-skew coefficients, no
variables exceeded the critical value. Kurtosis was also evaluated using the same method and no distributions were found to be significantly kurtotic. Therefore, the variables were assumed to be normally distributed. Skewness and kurtosis statistics are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

*Skewness and Kurtosis Analyses of the Principal Satisfaction Ratings with Network Support Across Three Major Areas by School Year*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Skew Std. Error</th>
<th>Z-skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Kurtosis Std. Error</th>
<th>Z-kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Professional Development</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>−0.019</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>−0.035</td>
<td>−0.651</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>−0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>−0.171</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>−0.202</td>
<td>−2.787</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>−1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>−1.711</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>−1.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>−0.793</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>−1.406</td>
<td>−0.030</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>−0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>−0.779</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>−1.381</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Homogeneity of variance.** Homogeneity of variance was evaluated using Levene’s Test of Equality of Error Variance to determine if the error variance of the dependent variables were equal across school years (fall 2009 and spring 2010). Results from the test indicated that all the distributions did meet the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Thus, the distribution of variances across the school years was assumed to be equally distributed. See Table 4.5 for details.
Table 4.5

Summary of Levene’s Test for Hypothesis 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Principal Satisfaction with Network</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Professional Development</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of Hypothesis 1a and 1b

Research Question 1a (RQ1a) Analyses. Were network principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of instructional professional development?

Null hypothesis 1a (H01a). Network principals were not satisfied with network support in the area of instructional professional development.

Alternative hypothesis 1a (H11a). Network principals were satisfied with network support in the area of instructional professional development.

Research question 1b (RQ1b) analyses. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development over a three year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012) among network principals? The following are the null and alternative hypotheses based on research question 1b:
Null hypothesis 1b ($H_01b$). There is no significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development over a three year period.

Alternative hypothesis 1 ($H_A1b$). There is a significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development over the three year period.

Using SPSS 21, an independent-samples t-test was performed to assess differences in the principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development over a three year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. Since the data for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were unusable, the independent-samples t-test was used to test differences between fall 2009 and spring 2010. Results indicated there was no statistically significant difference in principal satisfaction related to instructional professional development between fall 2009 and spring 2010, $t (21) = -0.617, p = .544$. 
Figure 4.1. Means plot of principal satisfaction with network support within the major functional area of instructional professional development in fall 2009 and fall 2010.

According to Figure 4.1 and Table 4.3, the Excel principals reported that they were satisfied with the network support with regard to the functional area of instructional professional development in fall 2009 (M = 3.05, SD = 0.655) and in fall 2010 (M = 3.22, SD = 0.311).

Results of Hypothesis 2a and 2b

Research question 2a (RQ2a) analyses. Were network principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of operations?

Null hypothesis 2a (H₀2a). Network principals were not satisfied with network support in the area of operations.
Alternative hypothesis 2a (Hₐ2a). Network principals were satisfied with network support in the area of operations.

Research question 2b (RQ2b) analyses. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to the functional area of operations over a three year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 among network principals? The following are the null and alternative hypotheses based on research question 1:

Null hypothesis 2b (H₀2b). There is no significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to operations over a three year period among network principals.

Alternative hypothesis 2b (Hₐ2b). There is a significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to operations over a three year period among network principals.

An independent-samples t-test was performed to assess differences in the principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to operations over a three year period. Since the data for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were unusable, the independent-samples t-test was used to test differences between fall 2009 and spring 2010. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in principal satisfaction with network supported related to the functional area of operations between 2009 and 2010, t (30) = −0.082, p = .936. Thus, the null hypothesis for Research Question 2 was retained. As indicated in Figure 4.2, there was no significant difference in principal satisfaction of with network support in regard to the functional area of operations between school years. That is, Excel principal satisfaction ratings scores from
spring 2010 ($M = 3.36, SD = 0.341$) were not significantly higher than scores from fall 2009 ($M = 3.35, SD = 0.394$). According to Figure 4.2 and Table 4.3, the Excel principals reported that they were generally satisfied with the network support with regard to the functional area of operations in fall 2009 ($M = 0.335, SD = 0.394$) and in spring 2010 ($M = 3.36, SD = 0.341$).

Figure 4.2. Means plot of principal satisfaction with network support in regard to the functional area of operations in fall 2009 and spring 2010.
Results of Hypothesis 3a and 3b

Research question 3a (RQ3a) analyses. Were network principals satisfied with network support specifically in the area of student achievement?

Null hypothesis 3a (H03a). Network principals were not satisfied with network support in the area of student achievement.

Alternative hypothesis 3a (H1a). Network principals were satisfied with network support in the area of student achievement.

Research question 3b (RQ3b) analyses. Are there significant differences in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to the functional area of student achievement over a three year period among network principals from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012? The following are the null and alternative hypotheses based on research question 1:

Null hypothesis 3b (H03b). There is no significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to student achievement over a three year period among network principals.

Alternative hypothesis 3b (H1b). There is a significant difference in the network principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to student achievement over a three year period among network principals.

An independent-samples t-test was performed to assess differences in the principal satisfaction with network support specifically related to student achievement over a three-year period. Since the data for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years were unusable, the independent-samples t-test was used to test differences between fall 2009 and spring 2010. Results indicated there was no statistically significant differences in
principal satisfaction with network support in the area of student achievement between fall 2009 and spring 2010, \( t(30) = 0.596, p = .435 \). Thus, the null hypothesis for Research Question 3 was retained. As indicated in Figure 4.3, there were no significant differences in principal satisfaction with network support with regard to the functional areas of student achievement between fall 2009 and spring 2010. That is, scores from spring 2010 \( (M = 3.07, SD = 0.582) \) were not significantly higher than scores from fall 2009 \( (M = 3.13, SD = 1.489) \). However, according to Figure 4.3 and Table 4.3, the Excel principals reported that they were very satisfied with the network support with regard to the functional area of operations in fall 2009 \( (M = 3.35, SD = 0.341) \) and in spring 2010 \( (M = 3.36, SD = 0.341) \).
Summary of Results

The selection of inferential test (independent-samples t-test) was chosen due to the characteristics of the variables and research questions. The researcher used independent-samples t-test since there was no way to identify individual principal responses in the PSS to match or compare across the school years 2009-2012. Independent-samples t-tests do not require matched data and solely look at an overall mean difference and they are robust enough to use with low sample size.

Reliability analyses were run to determine if the dependent variables (principal satisfaction with instructional development, operations, and student achievement) as
measured by the PSS were sufficiently reliable. The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha reliability analysis to test the variable constructs. Results from the test found the variable constructs sufficiently reliable.

Using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to code and tabulate scores collected from the surveys and provide summarized values for Excel network principal responses where applicable including the mean, standard deviation, and central tendency added valuable insight. The researcher used Descriptive Statistics to examine anomalies in principal satisfaction ratings with network support across three major areas by School Year (2009-2011). Data cleansing was conducted by to determine the presence of univariate outliers. None were found.

As a result, the researcher discovered that Excel principals reported that they were satisfied with the network support with regard instructional professional development, very satisfied with operations, and satisfied with student achievement over a three-year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012.

Although several inconsistencies in the characteristics of PSS were discovered, as noted in the data cleansing and descriptive analysis tables and figures on the three dependent variables, there were no statistical significant differences. In fact all outcomes were normal concluding during the school years 2009-2012 principals were satisfied with Excel network support.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the results of the study of principal satisfaction of network school support over a three-year period by exploring the Excel network, one network of 17 schools within the New York City Department of Education. The principal response data from the Principal Satisfaction Survey, which is electronically distributed by New York City Department of Education to all New York City public school principals for the school years 2009-2012, was extrapolated and analyzed in the areas of instructional professional development, operations, and student achievement. This chapter will explore the implications of the study findings in terms of professional practice, discuss the study’s limitations, and offer recommendations for professional practice and future research. The chapter will conclude with remarks that summarize the dissertation.

The purpose of the present study was to assess whether there were significant changes to principals’ satisfaction with network support over a three-year period from 2009-2012. Assessing the differences in principals’ satisfaction define what type of school support best assists schools for improved performance, and what type of school support is most needed for school improvement. This study also investigated what is needed to improve graduation rates and identify what principals need for their leadership development. This research may be beneficial to professionals and families, as it
provided data that can be assessed from various vantage points, which can ultimately be used to improve student outcomes.

The research questions were answered through quantitative analysis of data collected through the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS) of the Excel network. The PSS measured network principal satisfaction with network support related to instruction development, operations, and student achievement. The sample studied was one network, which included 17 principals. The PSS was distributed electronically citywide. Data were taken from archival PSS over a three-year period from 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012.

Extrapolated survey data was used germane to Excel network to analyze principals’ perception of satisfaction. The Principal Satisfaction Survey is distributed to all public school principals by NYCDOE to provide feedback regarding services provided by network and NYCDOE staff for the academic year.

Prior to analyzing the three research questions, data hygiene and data screening was undertaken to ensure the variables of interest met appropriate statistical assumptions. Thus, this study followed a similar analytic strategy in that the variables were first evaluated for missing data, univariate outliers, and normality. Subsequently, independent-samples t-tests were run to determine if any differences existed between variables. The study assessed if significant differences existed in network principal’s perceptions of satisfaction with network support specifically related to instructional professional development, operations, and student achievement over a three-year period.

The inferential test (independent-samples t-test) was chosen due to the characteristics of the variables and research questions. Independent-samples t-test, the
most appropriate test for this study would be either an ANOVA or paired-sample t-test, since there is no way to identify individual principals in the data (to match/compare their scores across school years. Independent-samples t-tests do not require matched data and solely look at overall mean differences across the school years; also, they are robust enough to deal with low sample sizes.

**Implications of Findings**

The study found that principals were in fact satisfied with network school support services provided by the Excel network in the areas of instructional professional development, and student achievement for the school years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. The study also found that Principals in the Excel network was very satisfied with support in operations for the school years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012. Although principal satisfaction of network support in the studied areas was important other implications were germane to the study.

New York City Department of Education is the largest school system in the United States. Since there is limited research on principal satisfaction of network support in the New York City Department of Education this study can serve as a guide for changes in other school systems and other networks. Principal satisfaction is significant in determining what is needed to address improvement of graduation rate of students who attend public schools. Results of this study can serve as data for analyzing how various groups of students such as at risk, racial and gender specific populations achieve with specific network supports provided to schools. Also, principals could identify what is needed for schools success and improved administrative leadership of their schools. As a feedback tool the PSS data can inform central office administrators what elements are
necessary to create a more improved feedback tool to assist principals in reaching their goals for success. Finally, policy makers can improve the service structure to ensure that equal access to resources are available to maximize every child’s educational potential.

Turner and Krizek (2006) state the assessment and monitoring of customer satisfaction provides organizational members with valuable feedback about their company’s performance. This feedback, in turn, provides managers and other organizational stakeholders with information that has the potential for helping them retain current customers as well as develop new customers. Contemporary business practices such as initial contact point surveys, time lag surveys, feedback cards, and frequent-shopper monitoring programs are a few of the ways that organizations collect this feedback.

Access to quality education throughout the nation must be provided to every child as a foundation to promising careers. The education reform of 2002 in New York City was designed to address this social anomaly. The Bloomberg administration of 2002 in New York City ushered in mayoral control over education in order to eliminate *de facto* dropout factories. That is, never in the history of New York City politics did the mayor control the enormous public school system. As mentioned in Chapter 1 the Board of Education, a separate entity became another department under the mayor. The auspices of this new department in part included addressing low graduation and high dropout rates throughout New York City especially in high-impoverished communities. Chancellor Joel Klein dismantled a system that failed to evidence success in meeting the challenges of graduating children. The shift from the complicated bureaucratic structure that employed thousands of administrators with divergent agendas to one that handed
decision-making power and autonomy to school leaders was historic, non-traditional, and unprecedented.

Chancellor Joel Klein appointed Eric Nadelstern, a career educator, as Chief of Schools in the Department of Education to steward the new reform and ultimately change the previous supervisory ineffective structure to a new effective service delivery structure. This new structure that empowered principals to make decisions for their schools, also, held principals accountable for their schools success. Networks or SSOs were created by this new service structure to provide support to every public school in New York City. Under the Bloomberg administration the concept of networks or SSOs was new and non-traditional with expectations to pioneer ways that essential services, which include the areas studied in this research, be provided to schools.

This study documented the impact and approval of one network on principal satisfaction to network schools during a three-year period of 2009-2012 as one aspect of network effectiveness to schools. Both Klein and Nadelstern have since left the New York City Department of Education with the mayor soon to follow as his term expires. In 2013 with the election of a new mayor the question remains if the new administration will allow the network structure to continue to exist. Eric Nadelstern (2012) expressed that his ideas of network development had not been totally realized and expressed his concerns that the New York City public schools will revert back to the old ineffective structure,

“Another regret I continue to harbor is that networks were not given more autonomy on my watch. I had hoped that, after a period of scale-up and capacity building, we could devise a way for networks, at least the most successful one, to
spin off from the Department of Education and function as independent educational management organizations. In 2013, New York City will elect a new mayor. . . . it’s not hard to envision how easily the city’s schools can be returned to a geographically organized system” (Nadelstern, 2012, p. 18).

We must hold our leaders in education accountable by monitoring outcomes of schools and how decisions are being made. Future studies should attempt to evaluate the impact of the new reform in education to enhance aspects that work. For example, future studies can assess whether satisfaction of services lead to improved school goals.

Questions can be asked whether network service delivery enhances leadership goals. Future studies can assess how leaders are being held accountable for school success. Future studies can assess how effective networks are in improving school leadership. Lastly, future studies should explore where educational resources should be focused for comprehensive school improvement.

**Limitations**

First, this is a study of three school years of archival data extrapolated from the Principal Satisfaction Survey from years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 to align with last citywide reform in the NYCDOE. The method of the study relied on inferential test (independent-samples t-test) discussed in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4 it was discussed that the variables and research questions are looking to determine if differences exist on continuously scaled variables (i.e., Likert-type scaled). However in some categories there was a 1-5 scale with 5 meaning, “I did not request service,” which added inconsistencies to the PSS.
Second, there is no way to identify individual principals in the data (to match/compare their scores across school years). Independent-samples t-tests do not require matched data and solely look at overall mean differences across the school years; also, they are robust enough to deal with low sample sizes.

Third, one network was studied out of more than 60 that currently exist in the New York City Department of Education as a direct result of the confidentiality and anonymity of the PSS protocol other network data is not available to anyone not directly connected to network. The researcher served as network leader of network, which has been identified as Excel a pseudonym for a functional network in the New York City Department of Education during the 2009-2012 school years.

Fourth, regarding the PSS, there is no way to determine whether or not the PSS is a valid indicator of satisfaction since the survey questions were not consistent across each of the school years. The lack of redundancy causes the surveys (and their constructs) to measure slightly different things (than originally developed) and/or measures the appropriate construct(s) to a lesser degree than originally developed. Further, the survey needs to be validated by a team of content experts (preferably, the author[s] of the survey and several other professionals in the field) whom have given their approval (statistically evaluated) that the constructs actually measure the targeted models/constructs.

Fifth, the major drawback to the study was that the participants were given different surveys each year. This results in a situation that makes inferential statistics nearly implausible to run. That is, the vast majority of the data collected by each survey was basically useless as comparison data since most of the questions did not match (the only useful data that could be used to compare across school years were data that
stemmed from the same survey questions). Since not all survey items were used, the overall representation of each construct does not match that which was originally defined by the author(s) of the survey.

Finally, responses from Excel network’s 17 principals were studied. A larger sample size (at least 100+) would provide much more dependable results; that is, the likelihood that a duplicate study would find similar results increases as the sample size increases. Additionally, a larger sample size makes it easier to determine that differences observed in the dependent variable (principal satisfaction) are actually due to the independent variable (school year), rather than some other factor (e.g., gender, age, etc.). Thus, a larger sample size would provide a sounder, and more accurate, representation of the population in general.

Recommendations

The most important recommendation can also be considered a limitation. Make the PSS a valid tool to assess principal satisfaction. To date although the PSS is used to evaluate levels of principal satisfaction for network support there is no evidence that the PSS consistently measures satisfaction. Also the PSS changed format and survey questions in the areas studied as well as other significant categories the overall representation of each construct does not match that which was originally defined by the author(s) of the survey. Whenever the questions change different things are measured creating a lack of redundancy, which is needed for reliability and validity. Also, consistency over time can be useful factors for future studies.

Future studies should attempt to examine how principal satisfaction leads to innovative changes that support school improvement, greater administrative support,
teacher or pedagogical enhancement, and improved student outcomes. Researchers should explore if principal satisfaction and principal goal attainment, to determine if there are any correlations to principal satisfaction and school success. Finally researchers should explore how the network support teams evaluate the schools that comprise the networks to evaluate school leadership and determine how to best support schools in all significant areas.

Summation

The study’s independent variables were the school year 2009-2012. The dependent variable was satisfaction as measured by the PSS in the areas of instructional professional development, operations and student achievement. The research questions were answered through quantitative analysis of data collected through the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS) of the Excel network. The PSS measured network principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with network support related to instruction development, operations, and student achievement. The sample studied was one network, which included 17 principals. The PSS was distributed electronically citywide. Data were taken from archival PSS over a three-year period.

This study used the theoretical model of Herbert Simon’s Means-ends chain theory that principals (makers) act in order to achieve desired outcomes or end states (Gutman, 1982; Reynolds & Gutman, 1988). Assessing the differences in principal satisfaction defines what type of school support best assists schools for improved performance, and what type of school support is most needed for school improvement. This study also investigated what is needed to improve graduation rates and identify tools principals need for their leadership development.
The research questions were answered through quantitative analysis of data collected through the Principal Satisfaction Survey (PSS) of the Excel network. The PSS measured network principals’ perceptions of satisfaction with network support related to instruction development, operations, and student achievement. The sample studied was one network, which included 17 principals. The PSS was distributed electronically citywide. Data were taken from archival PSS over a three-year period.

Using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to code and tabulate scores collected from the surveys and provide summarized values for Excel network principal responses where applicable including the mean, standard deviation, and central tendency added valuable insight. Descriptive Statistics were used to examine anomalies in principal satisfaction ratings with network support across three major areas by School Year (2009-2011). Data cleansing was conducted by to determine the presence of univariate outliers. None were found.

As a result the researcher discovered that Excel principals reported that they were satisfied with the network support with regard instructional professional development, and operations over a three-year period from 2009-2012. Also, this study documented that Excel principals were very satisfied with student achievement over a three-year period from 2009-2012.

**Conclusion**

Mayor Rudy Guilliani spent a major portion of his administration trying to decentralize the then Board of Education with no success. However, Mayor Michael Bloomberg was successful at the beginning of his tenure in converting a massive bureaucratic system into an innovative service structure that demonstrated potential in
addressing failure in the public schools. Although mayoral control may be passed on to
the next mayor in a new administration, the question still remains if the network or SSO
structure will remain as a part of the new mayor’s plans to support schools, communities,
students, and their families.
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SECTION 1. GENERAL QUESTIONS

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the DOE?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. I feel supported by the Department in attaining my overall goals for my school
b. The Department has helped me to set clear measures of progress for student achievement
c. The Principals’ Calendar is a useful planning tool to help me organize my work
d. The Principals’ Portal helps me to easily find the information, resources, and systems I need

Please approximate the percentage of time you generally spend on the following, based on the scale range below:

Scale – a 0% to 20% – 21% to 40% – 41% to 60% – 61% to 80% – 81% to 100% (1, 2, 3, 4, 5)

a. Core work as school leader to run my school (observing/developing teachers, instructional planning, meeting with students and parents, using accountability tools to accelerate student learning, managing financial and physical resources, and developing systems and structures)
b. Work that comes from outside my school (from DOE central offices or otherwise -- including reports, compliance efforts, surveys, data requests, etc.)

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION:

What suggestions do you have to improve the Principals’ Planning Calendar or streamline the work that comes from outside of your school? [Please skip this question if you have no comments].

How satisfied are you with the overall QUALITY of support provided by the following members of your core team? (Note: you will be asked more detailed questions about this support later in the survey)

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Network Team
b. Integrated Service Center (ISC)
How helpful is the support received from each of the following members of your core team in assisting you to improve student outcomes in your school?

Scale – Very Helpful – Helpful – Somewhat Helpful – Not at all Helpful (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Network Team
b. Integrated Service Center (ISC)

---

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY

How satisfied are you with the overall QUALITY of support provided by the following members of your core team? (Note: you will be asked more detailed questions about this support later in the survey)

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Network instructional supports
b. Network operational supports

---

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY

How helpful is the support received from each of the following members of your core team in assisting you to improve student outcomes in your school?

Scale – Very Helpful – Helpful – Somewhat Helpful – Not at all Helpful (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Network instructional supports
b. Network operational supports

---

FOR D75 SCHOOLS ONLY

How satisfied are you with the overall QUALITY of support provided by the following resources? (Note: you will be asked more detailed questions about this support later in the survey)

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. District 75
b. Integrated Service Center (ISC)

---

FOR D75 SCHOOLS ONLY

How helpful is the support received from each of the following resources in assisting you to improve student outcomes in your school?

Scale – Very Helpful – Helpful – Somewhat Helpful – Not at all Helpful (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. District 75
b. Integrated Service Center (ISC)

---

SECTION 2. ACADEMIC SERVICES

This section contains questions about academic services provided to schools by your network, and the central offices of teaching and learning, talent, labor relations, student enrollment, and students with disabilities and English language learners.
FOR SCHOOLS IN NETWORKS ES01, ES03, ES05, ES06, ES11, ES16, ES19, ES20, ES21, AND ES22 ONLY:

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

Taking into account the expectations set in your service level agreements and the services you have requested, how satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your ESO Network Team members (or if your team is not organized by function evaluate the services listed in parentheses)?

a. **Achievement Coach** (data analysis, inquiry team support, youth development, professional development and coaching)

b. **Business Services Manager** (coaching, professional development, and assistance with ISC relations)

c. **Special Services Manager** (assistance in designing programs and operational support to improve the achievement of special needs students and ELLs)

d. **Network Leader** (leadership of the network team, community building within the network of schools, and other services, overall coaching and support to help schools reach their achievement goals)

FOR SCHOOLS IN NETWORKS L301, L303, L304, L305, AND L306 ONLY:

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people/teams on your network team?

a. Cohort Leaders

b. Content Area Specialists

FOR SCHOOLS IN NETWORKS L101, L103, L104, L105, L106, L108, and L108 ONLY:

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

*Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses*

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people in your network? For a more detailed description of these roles, please click here.

a. **Network Team Leader** (leadership of the network team; responsiveness to your needs; community building within your network of schools; coaching and support to improve your work as principal; coaching and support to help your school reach its achievement goals)

b. **Network Instructional Support – ELA** (leadership with your school’s ELA teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of ELA instruction; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)

c. **Network Instructional Support – Math** (leadership with your school’s math teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of math instruction; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)
d. **Network Instructional Support – Social Studies** (leadership with your school’s social studies teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of social studies instruction; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)

e. **Network Instructional Support – Science** (leadership with your school’s science teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of science instruction; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)

f. **Network Instructional Support – ELL** (leadership with your school’s teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of instruction for ELL students; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)

g. **Network Instructional Support – Special Education** (leadership with your school’s special education teachers; coaching and support to improve the quality of instruction for students with disabilities; responsiveness to you and your school’s needs)

h. **Community Facilitators** – (development of school-community partnerships; grant writing; youth leadership development)

---

FOR SCHOOLS IN NETWORKS L401, L403, L404, AND L406 ONLY:
Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

*Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses*

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people/teams in your network? For a more detailed description of these roles, please click here.

a. **Network Team Leader** (leads network and provides direct support and coaching to principals and school teams around instruction, leadership, operations, and accountability tools, including Progress Report, Quality Review, and PPR)

b. **Network Achievement Specialist** (supports network schools with analyzing and utilizing data to inform instruction, provides coaching and professional development to principals and school staff around accountability tools)

c. **Network Special Services Specialist** (supports the network’s schools in the development and implementation of instruction and programs for English language learners and students with disabilities)

d. **Knowledge Management Team** (instructional specialists providing professional development and on-site content support in the areas of English language arts, social studies, English language learners, arts, math, science, technology, special education, intervention, enrichment, differentiated instruction and youth development)

---

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

*Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses*

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people/teams in your network? For a more detailed description of these roles, please click here.

a. **Executive Officers for Instruction (Network Leaders)** – [Data analysis, inquiry team support, coordination of services with other DOE offices, i.e. ISC, Legal; Quality Review, Progress Reports, PPR Review and Preparation Support]

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request these services (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people/teams? For a more detailed description of these roles, please click here.

a. Network Support Specialist (NSS) [Content specialists, coaching, professional learning]
b. Research & Development Team (Professional Learning Opportunities) [Professional learning by calendar by content; differentiation; curriculum integration; intervention support; data analysis; NSS support, coaching]

FOR PSO SCHOOLS ONLY: How satisfied are you with the services provided to you by your PSO in the following areas:

Scale – Very Satisfied - Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied - I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Overall instructional, operational, and/or school environment support services
b. The quality of the PSO educational experts/coaches/consultants who work in my school
c. The development of school plans to improve student achievement
d. The design of programs and services to improve the achievement of ELLs and Special Education students
e. Assistance in the development and delivery of youth development services
f. The professional development of staff
g. Faculty and staff recruitment and retention support services

FOR D75 SCHOOLS ONLY: How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the following people/teams?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Team Leader (leads network team and provides direct support and coaching to principals and school teams around instruction, leadership, operations, and accountability tools)
b. Instructional Support Specialist – ELA
c. Instructional Support Specialist – Math
d. Instructional Support Specialist – ELL
e. Assessment Facilitators (supports schools with analyzing and utilizing data to inform instruction, provides coaching and professional development to principals and school staff around accountability tools)

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN1 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?
Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement Manager/Mentoring Coordinator
c. Achievement Manager/Assessment Director/ELL Liaison
d. Achievement Manager
e. Business Services Manager
f. Business Services Liaison
g. Director of Facilities/Space Planning/Safety & Food Services
h. Director of Technology & Data
i. Special Education/Business Services Liaison
j. Human Resources Director
k. Social Worker
l. Administrator of Special Education/Health
m. Administrator of Special Education/Suspensions
n. Attendance Teachers

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN2 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Deputy Network Leader/Achievement
c. Achievement Coach, Assessment & Professional Development Director 1
d. Attendance, ELL, Special Education
e. Budget, Grants
f. Youth Development, Data-IT, Food Transportation
g. Director of Operations, Facilities, Procurement
h. Human Resources
i. Payroll, Programming
j. Data Analyst
k. Achievement Coach 2
l. Safety, Suspensions, Health
m. Attendance Teachers

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN3 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Deputy Network Leader 1
c. Deputy Network Leader 2
d. Director of Achievement / Assessment
e. Operations Associate / Chief of Staff
f. Director of Operations 1
g. Director of Operations 2
h. Director of Youth Development, ELL, Health
i. Facilities, Food
j. Director of Human Resources, Payroll
k. Instructional Specialist
l. Director of Safety, Suspensions, & Transportation
m. Director of Special Education
n. Attendance Teachers

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN4 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Director of Achievement
c. Business Support Manager
d. Human Resources Director
e. Instructional Content Specialist
f. IT Coordinator
g. Budget Support
h. Food / Transportation Specialist
i. Operations Associate
j. Special Services Manager
k. Health / Safety / Suspension Specialist
l. Youth Development Director
m. Administrator of Special Education
n. Attendance Teachers

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN5 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement Coach
c. Operations Manager
d. Director of Strategic Operations
e. Community Associate
f. Data / IT
g. Human Resources Director
h. Payroll Support
i. Budget Support
j. Student Services Manager
k. Administrator of Special Education
l. Director of Student Services
m. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN6 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement Coach
c. Operations Manager 1
d. Operations Manager 2
e. Business Support Manager
f. Special Education Clerical
g. Human Resources Director
h. Operations Assistant
i. Special Services Manager – ELL
j. Special Services Manager – Special Needs 1
k. Special Services Manager – Special Needs 2
l. Youth Development
m. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN7 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Co-Network Leader – Operations Support
b. Co-Network Leader – Instructional Support
c. Achievement Coach 1
d. Achievement Coach 2
e. Lead Special Education Administrator
f. Special Services Manager
g. Application Support Specialist
h. Attendance / Food / Health Manager
i. Operations Manager
j. Human Resources Manager
k. Director of Safety and Suspensions
l. Operations Analyst
m. Youth Development Manager
n. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN8 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Operations Manager
c. Achievement Manager
d. Teacher Assigned
e. Human Resources Director
f. Student Services Specialist
g. Deputy Network Leader – Operations
h. Payroll / Transportation Specialists
i. Procurement Specialist
j. Director of Safety and Suspensions
k. Data / IT
l. Administrator of Special Education
m. Special Education Specialist
n. Instructional Content Specialist
o. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN9 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement, Attendance, Health, Safety, Suspensions, Youth Development
c. Assessment
d. Budget, Grants
e. Data-IT
f. ELL
g. Facilities
h. Food, Procurement, Transportation
i. Human Resources
j. Payroll, Procurement
k. Special Education, Data
l. Special Education, Achievement
m. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN10 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?
Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Leadership and Achievement Manager
c. Operations Manager 1
d. Operations Manager 2
e. Student Services
f. Human Resources Director
g. Coordinator
h. Special Services Manager
i. Deputy Network Leader
j. Instructional Specialist
k. Student Services Manager
l. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN11 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement, Assessment, Instruction 1
c. Achievement, Assessment, Instruction 2
d. Director of Operations, Budget, Facilities 1
e. Data – IT
f. ELL, Special Education Instruction
g. Food, Transportation, Special Education Related Services
h. Director of Operations, Budget, Grants, 311 liaison 2
i. Human Resources, Payroll
j. Procurement, Budget
k. Safety, Suspension, Health
l. Special Education, Youth Development, Compliance, Instruction
m. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN12 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Operations Assistant
c. Achievement Coach 1
d. Achievement Coach 2
e. Director of Youth Development / Special Education Compliance
f. Budget Director
g. Data – IT, ELL Director  
h. Deputy Network Leader  
i. Food, Payroll, Systems Access Support  
j. Grants, Procurement, Transportation Support  
k. Human Resources Director  
l. Safety, Suspensions, Health Director  
m. Director of Special Education  
n. Special Education Data Entry  
o. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN13 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader  
b. Director of Operations, Facilities and Procurement  
c. Assessment Specialist (Consultant)  
d. Achievement Specialist (NSS)  
e. Instructional Support (Consultant)  
f. Achievement & Assessment Specialist (NSS)  
g. Attendance, Food Services & Transportation Liaison  
h. Budget & Grants Manager  
i. Data/ IT Liaison  
j. ELL & Youth Development Specialist (NSS)  
k. Human Resources Director & Payroll Liaison  
l. Director of Safety, Suspensions & Health  
m. Administrator of Special Education  
n. Director of Student Services  
o. Attendance Teachers

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN14 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader  
b. Director of Operations & Budget -and- Data/ IT Liaison  
c. Math & Assessment Specialist (NSS)  
d. Achievement Specialist & Administration of Special Education (NSS)  
e. Achievement, Assessment & ELL Specialist (NSS)  
f. Attendance & Facilities Manager  
g. Food Services Liaison  
h. Grants & Health Manager  
i. Human Resources Director  
j. Payroll & Procurement Liaison
k. Director of Safety & Suspensions  
l. Administration of Special Education & Transportation Liaison  
m. Administration of Special Education (NSS)  
n. Attendance Teachers  

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN15 ONLY:  

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?  

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)  

a. Network Leader  
b. Administrator of Special Education & Assessment Specialist  
c. Assessment Specialist (NSS)  
d. Achievement Specialist & Data/ IT Liaison (NSS)  
e. Achievement Specialist (NSS)  
f. Director of Operations, Budgets & Grants -and- Procurement Liaison  
g. Administrator of Special Education, ELL & Health Specialist  
h. Food Services, Payroll & Transportation Liaison  
i. Human Resources Director  
j. Director of Safety, Suspensions & Youth Development -and- Attendance & Facilities Manager  
k. Special Education Data Support (part-time)  
l. Attendance Teachers  

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN16 ONLY:  

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?  

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)  

a. Co-Network Leader -and- Attendance Manager  
b. Co-Network Leader  
c. Assessment Specialist (NSS)  
d. Achievement Specialist for District 6, District 28, & District 29 Schools (NSS)  
e. Achievement Specialist for District 26 Schools -and- Special Education Administrator (NSS)  
f. Achievement Specialist for District 26 Schools (Consultant)  
g. Budget & Grants Manager  
h. Director of Operations, Data/ IT & Facilities  
i. Administrator for Special Education & ELL Specialist  
j. Food Services & Transportation Liaison  
k. Health/ Attendance Liaison  
l. Human Resources Director  
m. Payroll & Procurement Liaison  
n. Director of Safety, Suspensions & Youth Development  
o. Attendance Teachers  

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN17 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Deputy Director of Operations
c. Deputy Director of Instruction
d. Payroll, Food, & Transportation Liaison
e. Human Resources Director
f. Safety & Suspensions Director
g. Guidance & Health Specialist
h. Achievement Specialist
i. Attendance & Data/ IT Specialist
j. ELL Specialist
k. Administrator of Special Education

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN18 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Achievement Coach
c. Assessment
d. ELL Instructional Support
e. Director of Operations/ Budget/ Grants
f. Human Resources Director
g. Director of Student Services/ Attendance
h. Administrator of Special Education
i. Special Education Clerical Associate
j. Data/ IT – Application Support
k. Procurement/ Payroll/ Transportation/ Food

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------ ---------------

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN20 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Deputy Network Leader (Safety, Suspensions, Youth Development)
c. Human Resources Director (HR, Payroll)
d. Operations Manager (Budget)
e. Student Services Director (Special Education, Instruction, and Compliance)
f. Student Services Analyst (Assessment, Special Education Data)
g. Student Services Specialist (Special Education Instruction)
h. Operations Associate (Procurement, Grants, Health)
i. Operations Manager (Data Systems, IT, Attendance, Facilities)
j. Operations Associate (Food, Transportation, General Administrative)
k. Attendance Teachers

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

FOR CFN SCHOOLS ONLY, FOR CFN19 ONLY:

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your Children First Network Team members?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Network Leader
b. Supervisory Support Specialist
c. Achievement/ Assessment Specialist
d. Human Resources Director, Payroll Support
e. Budget, Procurement
f. Deputy Network Leader (Safety, Suspensions, Youth Development)
g. Special Education
h. ELL, Attendance
i. Facilities, Transportation, Health
j. Clerical Associate, Food
k. Attendance Teachers

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Of the PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND/OR SUPPORTS that you have received in the areas of CURRICULUM and INSTRUCTION below (from the central Division of Teaching and Learning), how satisfied are you with the QUALITY of service provided?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not seek any centrally-offered professional development or support in this area (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Schools Identified for Improvement (SINI or SURR)
b. English Language Arts
c. Math
d. Social Studies
e. Science
f. Library Services
g. Arts
h. Promotion and Credit Policy Support
i. Academic and Postsecondary Guidance
j. Comprehensive Educational Planning support (CEP)
k. Career and Technical Education
l. Shubert Arts Leadership

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

123
Of the PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND/OR SUPPORTS that you have received in the areas of ACADEMIC PROGRAMS and/or GRANTS below (from the central Division of Teaching and Learning), how satisfied are you with the QUALITY of service provided?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not seek any centrally-offered professional development or support in this area (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Early Childhood; Universal Pre-K
b. Gifted and Talented
c. Public School Athletic League (PSAL) programming
d. eLearning Services
e. NCLB/Title I School-wide and Targeted Assistance Programs
f. Campaign for Middle School Success
g. Career & Technical Education (CTE) supports
h. Small Learning Communities (SLC) supports
i. Urban Advantage
j. Teaching American History

How satisfied are you with the OVERALL QUALITY of services provided by the following offices in the central Division of Teaching and Learning? For a more detailed description of these offices, please click here.

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – Not Applicable (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses

a. Curriculum, Standards and Academic Engagement (including)
   (1) Professional Development around core curricula and support materials (e.g. Math, Science, Social Studies, ELA Middle School Libraries and/or units of study),
   (2) Learn at Home Guides (e.g. H1N1 resources),
   (3) Campaign for Middle School Success (e.g. Speaker Series, Blueprint for Middle School Success Publication, Middle School Learning Program),
   (4) Gifted and Talented instructional support and resources (e.g. units of study and professional development)
   (5) Support of grant funded programs (e.g. Teaching American History, Reading First, etc)

b. Arts and Special Projects (including)
   (1) Professional Development in dance, music, theater, visual arts and the moving image,
   (2) Curriculum and support materials (e.g. Blueprint for the Arts),
   (3) Assessment tools including the Arts Education Reflection Tool,
   (4) The individual Arts in Schools Report,
   (5) Special events and programs (e.g. Cultural Pass, Arts and Cultural Education Services Fair, PS Art),
   (6) Website information on the arts,
   (7) School leadership training
   (8) Shubert Arts Leadership

c. Early Childhood Education (including) Portfolio
   (1) Professional Development (e.g., PreK Non Attendance Days, Leadership Series)
   (2) Curriculum materials (e.g. Best Practices for Early Childhood),
   (3) Website information on early childhood,
   (4) Technical Assistance (environment, teacher support),
   (5) PreK Diagnostic Screening (ESI-R) training and support

d. School Improvement (including) Portfolio
(1) Tools, resources, and professional development for Comprehensive Educational Planning (CEP),
(2) Support for implementation of NCLB/Title I programs,
(3) Guidance, resources, and technical assistance for schools identified for improvement (SINU or SURR).

e. Postsecondary Pathways and Planning (including) Cross-functional – Think about this?

(1) Support to strengthen the quality of all secondary pathways and promote rigorous experiences that align to requirements for college and career readiness.
(2) Support, resources (VTEA) and policy guidance to strengthen the quality of CTE pathways through the program approval process, development of robust industry and postsecondary partnerships and work-based learning.
(3) Support for the effective implementation of small learning communities and SLC grants
(4) Coordination of the academic and postsecondary planning functions of guidance, including the Guidance Portal

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of the PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND/OR SUPPORTS that you or your team has received from the central Office of Talent and New Initiatives?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not seek any centrally-offered professional development or support in this area (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

t. Teacher Development
i. Principal Coaching through the NYC Leadership Academy
m. New School Intensive
n. Children First Leadership Workshop Series (provided by the NYC Leadership Academy and the CSA’s Executive Leadership Institute)

To what extent did the following Professional Development opportunities and/or supports influence/change your or your team’s practice?

Scale – Largely Influence – Influence – Slightly Influence – Did Not Influence – I did not seek any centrally-offered professional development or support in this area (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)
o. Teacher Development
p. Principal Coaching through the NYC Leadership Academy
q. New School Intensive
r. Children First Leadership Workshop Series (provided by the NYC Leadership Academy and the CSA’s Executive Leadership Institute)

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding labor relations?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)
a. I am given sufficient support and information to guide teacher tenure decisions
b. I am given sufficient support and information to address low-performing employees
c. My questions involving labor contracts or grievance issues are answered in a timely and satisfactory manner.
d. Overall, I receive sufficient support and information regarding labor issues.

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support surrounding new teacher mentoring provided from:
a. Your network
b. Your SSO Teacher Development Specialist

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied -- I do not have any new teachers (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

The Chief Achievement Office for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners (CAO), established by the Chancellor in July 2009, is focused on accelerating achievement for students with disabilities and English language learners by helping to build system-wide capacity and supporting the work of networks and schools.

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by the Chief Achievement Office for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners in the following areas? For a more detailed description of these areas, please click here.

a. English Language Learners
   (1) Professional Development (e.g., Writing Institute, From Analysis to Achievement, Differentiated Instruction for ELLs in Content Areas, QTEL, Demystifying ELL Data, Dual Language institutes, and ELL-I)
   (2) Grant Support (e.g., Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) and/or Dual Language Implementation, Students with Interrupted Formal Education (SIFE) and Long Term ELLs),
   (3) Intervention Pilots (e.g., Achieve 3000, Imagine Learning, Destination Math),
   (4) Compliance Support (e.g., CR Part 154, Title III Plans, BESIS, Language Allocation Policy (LAP))

b. Special Education
   (1) Professional Development (e.g., CTT Best Practices, Schools Attuned, Wilson Reading Systems, Fundations, SETSS Academy),
   (2) Technical Assistance (e.g., School Improvement Teams, RSE-TAC (formerly SETRC))

c. District 75
   (1) Professional Development offered to all schools (e.g., Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), Therapeutic Crisis Intervention, Differentiated Instruction)

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION:
What are your suggestions for the Chief Achievement Office for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners? What areas should the office focus on to ensure improvement in educational outcomes for both populations? [Please skip this question if you have no comments].
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding student enrollment services?

Strongly Agree - Agree - Disagree - Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. My questions regarding admissions processes are answered in a timely manner
b. My questions regarding individual student placements are addressed in a timely manner
c. My school received sufficient communication about the following:
   i. Admissions Fairs, including Citywide, Borough-wide, High School, Middle School & New Schools
   ii. Admissions calendars
   iii. Enrollment policies
   iv. Parent workshops and presentations
   v. Training and information sessions regarding high school and middle school admissions processes (Middle and High Schools only)

---

FOR TDI SCHOOLS ONLY

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about Teacher Data Reports?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree – I have not yet looked at my reports (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. The Teacher Data Reports have provided me with information that I can use to improve student outcomes in my school
b. Teacher Data Reports have helped me to design professional development opportunities for my teachers
c. Teacher Data Reports have informed my choices of curricula or instructional programs
d. Teacher Data Reports have helped me assess my school’s staffing needs
e. I have discussed the reports with the majority or all of the teachers in my school who had a report

---

FOR TDI SCHOOLS ONLY

How satisfied are you that the support you have received from your Network Leaders and the online Teacher Data Toolkit have enabled you to do the following?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I have not received support from my SAF/Network Leader (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Read and interpret the information in the reports with confidence
b. Understand the concept “value-added”
c. Discuss the reports with teachers
d. Use the reports for instructional improvement

---

Please use the space below to provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding academic services, including suggestions for improvement, streamlining, or supporting your empowerment as a principal. [Please skip this question if you have no comments].

---
PART 3. OPERATIONAL SERVICES

This section contains questions about operational services provided to schools by your Integrated Service Center or Children First Network, and the central offices of facilities, food, pupil transportation, health, safety, finance, technology, family engagement, legal and compliance.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your ISC?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. My ISC understands the unique needs of my school
b. The support I receive from my ISC leads to an increase in time I can spend on instructional issues within my school

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about CFN?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. CFN understands the unique needs of my school
b. The support I receive from CFN leads to an increase in time I can spend on instructional issues within my school

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your ISC or other field-based supports in the following areas? For a more detailed description of these functions, please click here.

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. Attendance (Attendance Content Experts)
b. Budget (ISC Officers)
c. Compliance (Office of Compliance Services)
d. English Language Learners Compliance Specialists (Office of English Language Learners)
e. Extended use (Extended Use Group)
f. Facilities and Space Planning
g. Grants (Senior Grant Officer, Grants Analyst)
h. Health (Health Director)
i. Human resources (HR Deputy Director, HR Partner)
j. Information Technology (Technology Manager, Field Technicians)
k. Application Support (Applications Data Manager, Applications Support Liaisons)
l. Legal (Senior Legal Counsel – Legal Office)
m. Payroll (Payroll Support)
n. Procurement (ISC Representative, ISC Officer)
o. School Food (School Food Service Manager – Office of School Food)
p. School Safety (Safety Administrator)
q. Special education services (Administrator of Special Education, Operations Manager, IEP Manager, IEP specialist)
r. Student suspensions (Suspension Director, Intake Officers)
s. Test administration (Assessment Implementation Director)
How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of support provided by your CFN Team or other field-based supports in the following areas?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1)

- Achievement / Instructional Support
- Assessment (Test Administration)
- Attendance
- Budget
- Compliance (Office of Compliance Services)
- Data / Information Technology
- Extended Use (provided by ISCs)
- Facilities and Space Planning
- Food
- Grants
- Human Resources
- Legal (Senior Legal Counsel – Legal Office)
- Payroll
- Procurement
- Safety
- Special Education Services
- Suspensions
- Transportation
- Youth Development

How would you rate the effectiveness of your HR Partner (in the ISC) and CFN staff in providing the following services?

Scale – Very Effective – Effective – Ineffective – Very Ineffective – I do not receive support in this area (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

- Identifying candidates that I may interview to fill teaching vacancies
- Providing strategies to support retention of high performing staff
- Supporting my efforts to address underperforming school staff (e.g., probationers, tenured teachers, admin employees)
- Helping me to understand the key human capital metrics for my school
- Processing HR-related transactions (e.g. on-boarding, terminations)

How would you rate the effectiveness of the following HR systems?

Scale – Very Effective – Effective – Ineffective – Very Ineffective – I have never used this system (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

- HR Connect [Call center for all DOE employees]
- Open Market Transfer System [System used for reviewing and selecting teachers looking to transfer from other DOE schools]
c. The New Teacher Finder Tool (replaces Fellow Finder and RMS) [System that allows principals to post teacher vacancies, review applications, and search for candidates]
d. Human Capital Profile system (access through the Principals’ Portal) [System used to access certification, probation, and rating information of teachers]
e. Tenure Notification System [System used to track tenure status and to process tenure-related transactions]
f. On-line Rating System [System to process teacher evaluations]
g. OpenHire [System used to review and select applicants in assistant principal C30s]
h. Mentor Tracking System (formerly named NTIMS) [System used to track and report on teacher and school leader mentoring]

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY and RESPONSIVENESS provided by the central Office of School Leadership (Talent Office) in the following areas?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – I did not request this service (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses

a. Assistant principal C30 process [Process for Assistant Principal selection]
b. NYCDOE School Leadership Competencies [tool to assess your strengths and growth areas or to develop your team’s leadership skills]
c. Leadership Development programs, coaching, and/or workshops for principals and aspiring principals [Provided through the Office of School Leadership in partnership with providers including the NYC Leadership Academy, the CSA and others]

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY of the services from central in the following areas related to facilities, food, and transportation in your school?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

Pop ups for answer choices in parentheses

a. Custodial services
b. Repair and maintenance services for my school’s physical structure/facilities
c. School construction team (SCA project manager, construction manager, contractor, community relations manager) [Please skip this question if your school has not undergone a construction project within the last year]
d. Food in the school cafeteria
e. Food staff in the school cafeteria
f. General education busing service
g. Special education busing service

Of the areas related to student transportation listed below, please mark those you feel are most in need of improvement:

Scale – Mark all that apply

a. School bus personnel
b. Bus arrival time/departure time
c. Length of bus trip
d. Communications
e. Other (specify) ____________________
How satisfied are you with the following related to health in your school?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. My school nurse (leave blank if your school does not have a nurse)
b. H1N1 preparedness and support
c. H1N1 in-school vaccination program (elementary schools only)

How satisfied are you with the following related to safety in your school?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Support services provided by the central office when a significant safety issue arises
b. Service provided by my School Safety personnel

test

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the services or potential services provided by DIIT?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. I consult with DIIT and/or the ISC Technology Teams on the technology planning for my school
b. The Help Desk self-help facility (for entering problem tickets; checking on the status of a previously reported problem) is easy to use (leave blank if you have never used)
c. The available menu of technology options supports the instructional vision for my school (e.g. classroom computing devices and productivity software, such as the Microsoft Office Suite)
d. My school's telephone vendor is responsive in requests made for phone moves and repair issues

test

How satisfied are you with the following DIIT and vendor services?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. ASI responsiveness and on-site support [please skip this question if you did not choose ASI as your PCS vendor]
b. Dell responsiveness and on-site support [please skip this question if you did not choose Dell as your PCS vendor]
c. DIIT Help Desk’s responses to questions
d. Availability of the DOE network and response time of the network when accessing the Internet and DOE applications like ATS and Galaxy
e. Proficiency of DOE on-site technicians

If your school has had a new system implemented, how satisfied are you with the support from DIIT and vendors regarding the following areas?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)
a. New wireless access infrastructure
b. New telephone system or telephone system moves and repairs

How satisfied are you with the following applications as they relate to your staff carrying out their day-to-day work?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. The Outlook E-Mail and Calendaring Systems
b. Internet Explorer or Safari Internet Browsers
c. Automate the Schools ( ATS)
d. High School Scheduling and Transcript (HSST/STARS) [please skip if this question does not apply to your school]
e. DOE Internet and Intranet websites (refers to the functionality and features of the websites)
f. Telephone system

Please indicate the name of the telephone vendor for your school.

a. Blackbox (formerly NuVision)
b. Mitel
c. Siemens
d. Teltronics (formerly Harris)
e. Other (please specify) ____________________________

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding family engagement supports?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. The support I receive from my Parent Coordinator significantly helps me to attain my school’s overall goals
b. The Office of Family Engagement & Advocacy is responsive to my family engagement concerns, as well as parent leadership issues in my school community. [Please skip this question if you have had no contact with OFEA].
c. The District Family Advocate is responsive to my concerns as well as parent support issues in my school community. [Please skip if you have had no contact with the District Family Advocate].

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding translations and interpretation services?

Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. I know what translations services are available for my school and how to access them
b. The Office of Translations and Interpretations is able to translate everything I need (all languages)
c. Family involvement in my school is improved as a result of the services offered by the Translation Unit.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding legal, compliance, and audit?
Scale – Strongly Agree – Agree – Disagree – Strongly Disagree (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Legal staff responds to questions and/or requests in a timely manner
b. Legal support is of high quality
c. Compliance support is of high quality
d. Audit support and internal controls training is of high quality

Please use the space below to provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding operational services, including suggestions for improvement, streamlining, or supporting your empowerment as a principal. [Please skip this question if you have no comments].

SECTION 4. ACCOUNTABILITY

This section contains questions about the DOE’s accountability tools and achievement resources.

How satisfied are you with the following services offered surrounding:

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied – Did not provide such guidance (4, 3, 2, 1, 5)

a. The training you received in the use of accountability tools and achievement resources
b. The guidance and support received in engaging teams of teachers in inquiry

c. How helpful is each of the following accountability and achievement tools in improving student outcomes in your school?

Scale – Very Helpful – Helpful – Somewhat Helpful – Not at all Helpful (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Quality Review
b. Progress Report
c. Periodic Assessments (including DYO assessments) [please skip this question if it does not apply to your school]
d. School Survey [formerly the Learning Environment Survey]
e. Engaging teams of teachers in inquiry
f. ARIS
g. Instructional technology [only for schools participating in Title IID competitive grants]

How satisfied are you with the QUALITY and RESPONSIVENESS of support provided by the Division of Accountability and Achievement Resources in the following areas?

Scale – Very Satisfied – Satisfied – Dissatisfied – Very Dissatisfied (4, 3, 2, 1)

e. ARIS
f. ARIS Parent Link
How helpful is each of the following accountability and achievement tools in improving teacher practice in your school?

Scale – Very Helpful – Helpful – Somewhat Helpful – Not at all Helpful (4, 3, 2, 1)

a. Quality Review  
b. Progress Report  
c. Periodic Assessments (including DYO assessments) [please skip this question if it does not apply to your school]  
d. Engaging teams of teachers in inquiry  
e. ARIS  
   i. Instructional technology [only for schools participating in Title IID competitive grants]

During the last six months, how often have you logged into ARIS?
☐ I have not logged into ARIS.  
☐ The only time I logged into ARIS was during a training session.  
☐ I have logged into ARIS one to three times outside of training sessions  
☐ On average, I log into ARIS once or twice a month.  
☐ On average, I log into ARIS once a week.  
☐ On average, I log into ARIS more than once a week.

During the last six months, how many times have you used ARIS for each of the following purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>More than Once a Week</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Once or Twice a Month</th>
<th>Less than Once a Month</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Review student information in ARIS (e.g., assessment test results, attendance data and other information).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Create reports in ARIS to assess the needs of specific sub-groups of students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Create reports in ARIS to monitor the effects of a program / practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Look up information in ARIS about effective practices (e.g., practices found effective by researchers or recommended by teachers, specialists, or experts).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Communicate with families about student performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (please specify)__________________</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The student data in ARIS is timely and up to date.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The student data in ARIS reflects the assessments my school uses to measure student achievement/progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The format of the student data display in ARIS is easy to read.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I have used a resource from the Promising Practices Library in ARIS Connect to support my implementation of a practice described in the Quality Review rubric.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I find ARIS Connect communities easy to use.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The Inquiry Spaces feature in ARIS Connect is a useful way to document strategies implemented by teacher teams.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Most of the instructional resources in ARIS Connect are high quality (e.g., accurate, complete and innovative).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I need additional training or support to learn how to use ARIS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I have access to resources outside of ARIS that have more comprehensive or detailed reports on student information.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I don't have enough time to use ARIS to support my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Concerns about privacy, copyright, or other legal issues prevent me from uploading resources to ARIS Connect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there anything you would like to add about the way in which you are using data, technology, research or collaborative practices?

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

Please use the space below to provide any additional comments or suggestions regarding accountability tools, including suggestions for improvement, streamlining, or supporting your empowerment as a principal. [Please skip this question if you have no comments].

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

CERTAIN SCHOOLS WILL SEE THE MCKINSEY QUESTIONS HERE
Need to make sure they are able to skip if they do not wish to take; need to message carefully the situation.

This is the last question on the survey. Please click the “submit” button below if your responses are final. If you would like to go back to prior pages in the survey, please click the “back” button. You can also leave and resume the survey at a later time; your answers will be saved. Thank you for your cooperation.