□ 41.7% Dissemination of test scores to shape instruction □ 0.5% No opportunities for follow-up were offered □ 1.6% Other (specify): ■ Online PD courses (1) ■ New teacher conference (1) ■ Observations and feedback from Reading Coaches (1)
If the professional development model at your school included regular follow-up, in your opinion, is the follow-up professional development that was provided to teachers after the PD sufficient? N=220 □ 60.5% Yes □ 5.9% No □ 33.6% Don't know/Not sure
CTION IV — REDUCED CLASS SIZE
How many students do you currently have in your class? N=208 Mean: 18 students [Range: 3 students – 57 students] Classroom Teachers, Pre-K: Mean=17 students [Range: 11-19 students] Classroom Teachers, K-3 rd grade: Mean=18 students [Range: 12-26 students] Classroom Teachers, 4 th -5 th grade: Mean=20 students [Range: 12-26 students] Specialty Teachers (Art, Music, PE): Mean=21 students [Range: 16-25 students] Resource Teachers (ESL, Special Ed): Mean=18 students [Range: 3-45 students] Other Teachers: Mean=20 students [Range: 4-57 students]
Has the number of students in <i>your class</i> decreased during the 2004-2005 school year? N=210 ☐ 61.4% No ☐ 38.6% Yes
a. What led to the reduction of class sizes in your school? N=109 40.4% State initiative (please explain): DSSF (16) Students transferred (12) Mandates of legislature (5) Reduced class size with additional positions (4) More at Four initiative (2) NCLB (2) Title 1 funding (1) Leandro monies (1)
 Other State initiative (not specified) (1) 35.8% District initiative (please explain): DSSF monies from the District (17) Other District initiative (not specified) (15) Reduced class size with additional positions (3) Research-based decision (2) Students transferred (2)
0.9% Curriculum plan (please explain): Small group reading instruction (1)
 7.3% School Improvement Plan (please explain): Other School Improvement Plan activity (not specified) (7) School chose to reduce class sizes (1)
 45.0% Other (please explain):

- More at Four program (1)
- Tutorials in third and fourth grades (1)
- Additional EC staff hired (1)
- DPI suggestion (1)

Ha ^r	ve any changes been made to your physical classroom sp 89.2% No 10.8% Yes	ace to	allow fo	or class siz	e reductio	n? N=204
a.	If yes, what effect (if any) has the change in physical class only one response) N=37 32.4% Neutral – The change in classroom space has no 64.9% Positive – The change in classroom space has factorial and the change in classroom space has no classroom	t had a	any effe	ct on instruc	uction. tion.	,
	nat types of scheduling or other programmatic change plementation of reduced class sizes? (Check all that app	oly)	N=190			
D	14.2% Parallel or block scheduling	7.4%	Multiage	e grouping	of students	3
	28.4% Hired additional teachers/teaching assistants	13.2%	Team te	eaching		
			_	roup instru		
			_	g or remed	iation	
	22.6% Used school-wide curriculum plan (e.g., SFA) ☐ 1 3.2% Other, specify:	18.9%	None			
	 More at Four program requirements (1) Hired Pre-K Coordinator (1) Other changes not specified (1) om what you have observed as a result of reduced classanges occurred in the K-3 classrooms with respect to tea 	ching		rning? (C		hat apply)
• 1	ncreased standardized test scores N=172		4.1%	□ 25.0%	•	□ 44.2%
•	ncreased use of project-based instruction N=160			□ 18.1%		□ 43.1%
	ncreased time spent on instruction N=168		4.8%	□ 23.2%	□ 44.0%	□ 28.0%
• F	Reduced time spent on classroom management N=169		13.0%	□ 22.5%	□ 36.7%	□ 27.8%
۰F	ewer discipline-related problems N=168		11.3%	□ 27.4%	□ 33.3%	□ 28.0%
• Ir	ncreased use of small group instruction N=172		5.8%	□ 14.0%	□ 54.1%	□ 26.2%
• 0	Greater incidence of individualized student instruction N=171		5.8%	□ 22.2%	44.4%	□ 27.5%
• Ir	ncreased parental involvement in the classroom N=165		28.5%	□ 23.6%	□ 13.9%	□ 33.9%
• Ir	ncreased use of alternative student assessment methods N=1	61 🗆	11.8%	□ 22.4%	□ 32.3%	□ 33.5%
• P	Positive changes in level of student effort and initiative N=168		6.5%	□ 27.4%	□ 36.3%	□ 29.8%
• ir	ncreased use of testing results to inform instruction N=166		6.0%	□ 16.3%	□ 44.6%	□ 33.1%
• 0	Other:N=44		2.3%	□ 9.1%	□ 15.9%	□ 72.7%
	 Other changes not specified (41) No changes in class size (2) No teaching assistant (1) 			>		

What do you believe is the added value (if any) of the presence of the teaching assistants in a reduced class size setting?

[N=180 – multiple responses provided by respondents]

Individualized instruction (N=123; 68.3%)

 Small group instruction (N=59; 32.8%) General help with instruction, preparation, and attending to students' needs (N=46; 25.6%) Improved classroom management (N=40; 22.2%) Clerical assistance (N=12; 6.7%) Allows teachers more time for planning, PD, or breaks (N=11; 6.1%) Increased student achievement (N=4; 2.2%) Improved parent contact (N=2; 1.1%) No need for teaching assistant in reduced class size setting (N=2; 1.1%)
Did you receive professional development that was <i>specifically geared</i> towards helping you work more effectively in a reduced class size setting? N=208 □ 12.0% Yes □ 88.0% No
a. If yes, please describe the topics or strategies that were covered in the training. [N=22 – multiple responses provided by respondents] • Literacy instruction (N=12; 54.5%) • Cooperative learning; strategies for partner and small group instruction (N=12; 54.5%) • Math and science instruction (N=4; 18.2%) • Program-based training (e.g. SFA, CSR, Smart Discipline) (N=4; 18.2%) • Thinking Maps, Thinking skills, and Inquiry-based instruction (N=3; 13.6%) • Technology instruction (N=1; 4.5%) • Special needs instruction (N=1; 4.5%) • Bullying workshop (N=1; 4.5%) • Data analysis (N=1; 4.5%)
Thinking about the past four school years, has there been an increase in staff turnover at your school? N=231
□ 36.4% Yes □ 24.7% No □ 39.0% Don't Know
 If you checked yes above, please indicate the circumstances that led to the increase in staff tumover at your school.
 [N=61 – multiple responses provided by respondents] Difficulties with school (due to location, low morale, poor funding, or unsupportive staff) (N=27; 44.3%) Difficulties with administration (lack of support or assistance, changes in leadership, etc.) (N=21; 34.4%)
 Difficulties with student body (discipline, poor achievement, etc.) (N=13; 21.3%) Teachers move from area, or retire (N=13; 21.3%) Lack of parent involvement or support (N=6; 9.8%) Qualification or legislative restrictions (N=6; 9.8%) Large student body (N=4; 6.6%) Lack of individual time for or control over planning (N=3; 4.9%)
What changes (positive or negative) have taken place at your school because of the implementation of

reduced class sizes?

[N=127 – multiple responses provided by respondents]

SITIVE

- Increase in individualized and small group instruction (N=58; 45.7%)
- Improved student success and achievement (N=26; 20.5%)
- Improved class management (N=21; 16.5%)
- Better student-teacher relationships (N=17; 13.4%)
- More time, resources, and flexibility (N=13; 10.2%)
- Improved student and teacher morale and motivation (N=6; 4.7%)
- Lower teacher turnover (N=1; 0.8%)

GATIVE

- No reduction in class size (N=23; 18.1%)
- Loss of TA's or teachers (N=9; 7.1%)
- Increased demands on teachers (N=5; 3.9%)
- Space and scheduling difficulties (N=4; 3.1%)
- Difficult transition to higher grades with larger class sizes (N=3; 2.4%)
- Little flexibility for individual teachers due to fixed curriculum, less time, and more work (N=2; 1.6%)

What constraints, challenges, or obstacles (if any) did you or your school encounter in implementing reduced class sizes?

[N=79 – multiple responses provided by respondents]

- Inadequate availability of resources (e.g. space, money, materials) (N=25; 31.6%)
- Shifting old teachers, and recruiting and training new teachers (N=17; 21.5%)
- Loss of TA's; increase teacher turnover (N=17; 21.5%)
- No reduction in class sizes (N=11; 13.9%)
- No challenges or constraints (N=6; 7.6%)
- Higher grade levels not reduced (N=3; 3.8%)
- Changing teaching strategies to accommodate assessments (N=2; 2.5%)
- Scheduling difficulties (N=2; 2.5%)
- Growing enrollment (N=1; 1.3%)
- Conflicts with other programs and initiatives (N=1; 1.3%)

Thank you for completing this survey.

Third Annual Evaluation of the High-Priority (HP) Schools Initiative

Teaching Assistant Survey --- Comparison Schools ---Total Received (N=112)

s you may know, the State Legislature prescribed four initiatives for the High-Priority (HP) schools: duced class size (K-3), extended teacher contracts for professional development, extended school year r students, and an added instructional support position. The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) has sked Metis Associates, a private research firm, to conduct a third annual evaluation of the HP Schools itiative. Teaching assistants in each of the HP schools are being asked to complete this survey.

e appreciate your cooperation, and encourage you to answer the questions honestly and as completely s possible. Please know that the survey is anonymous, and that all of your answers will remain strictly onfidential. Please return your completed survey to Metis Associates in the attached envelope by turning the sealed envelope to the specially marked box located in your school's main office. If you have

tion I – Background	in 1100 phono na	11001, 1 077 000	1000.
TION I - BACKGROUND			
What is your position at the school?			
	Full-time	Part-time	
 Teaching Assistant in Grades K-3 N=72 	□ 98.6%	□ 1.4%	
• Teaching Assistant in Grades 4-5 N=8	□ 50.0%	□ 50.0%	
• Resource Teaching Assistant (ESL, special education) N=15	□ 100.0%		
 Specialty Subjects Teaching Assistant (music, art, physical education, media) N=4 	□ 100.0%		
Other (specify): N=21 Pre-K Teaching Assistant (12)	□ 100.0%		
 Computer lab TA (4) Literacy tutor (3) Title 1 TA (1) ISS TA (1) 			
Please indicate the number of years of teaching assistant expear as one year: N=11012.33Years	xperience you ha	ve (include the c	urrent
What is your highest education achievement? N=106			
	Other (specify):		
□ 1.9% GED or High School Equivalency Diploma • Some co	•	• •	
□ 16.0% Bachelor's (4-year) degree • Teachin Element • Early Cl • Work Ke • Journey • Masters	g towards Associng certification (E tary Education, L hildhood classes eys test and PD (i man's certification in Education (1) d Left Behind cer	arly Childhood Te ibrary Tech) (7) completed (3) 2) on (2)	aching
Did (or will) you receive certification as a teaching assistant ☐ 58.3% Yes ☐ 41.7% No	? N=103		

	 a. If yes, which of the following certifications have you received? (Check all that apply) N=52 25.0% North Carolina Association of Teacher Assistants' (NCATA) Professional Development Plan 46.2% North Carolina Department of Labor Teacher Assistant Apprenticeship Certification Program 38.5% Other (specify): Associate's Degree (6) No Child Left Behind certification (5) Work Keys assessment requirements (3) Teaching Assistant certification/diploma (3) Early Childhood certification (2) Library Technology (1) Paraprofessional (1) NC Teaching certificate "A" (1)
	inking about <i>the classroom in which you work for most of the day</i> , has the number of students the class decreased during the 2004-2005 school year? N=109
	69.7% No ☐ 23.9% Yes ☐ 6.4% Not sure — this is my first year as a teaching assistant in this school
wo □ a.	ave your roles and responsibilities as a teaching assistant changed at all since you have been orking in a reduced class setting? N=53 34.0% Yes
ECTIO	ON II — TEACHING ASSISTANT ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES
1.	How often do you provide the following types of assistance to the classroom teacher(s)? (Please provide your answer for each type of assistance by circling the appropriate response)
	Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently (1-2 times (3-4 times a (5 or more a week) week) times a week
cade	emic:

	Never	Rarely (1-2 times a week)	(3-4 times a week)	(5 or more times a week)
cademic:				
Tutor/assist children in learning class material using the teacher's lesson plans N=110	□ 3.6%	□ 7.3%	□ 27.3%	□ 61.8%
Serve as a substitute teacher N≃105	□ 35.2%	37.1%	□ 15.2%	□ 12.4%
Grade tests and assignments as instructed by the teacher N=108	□ 25.9%	□ 8.3%	□ 24.1%	□ 41.7%
Observe and record student performance N=110	□ 9.1%	□ 11.8%	□ 39.1%	□ 40.0%
Demonstrate various instructional activities N=109	□ 2.8%	□ 8.3%	□ 42.2%	□ 46.8%
Listen to students reading in small groups N=107	□ 4.7%	□ 10.3%	□ 23.4%	□ 61.7%
Help students find information for reports N=105	□ 41.0%	□ 21.0%	□ 21.0%	□ 17.1%

Final, 10/14/2005

	Nevel	(1-2 times a week)	(3-4 times a week)	(5 or more times a week)
Check and correct students' work while in progress N=109	□ 9.2%	□ 8.3%	□ 24.8%	□ 57.8%
Check homework assignments N=106	□ 17.9%	□ 8.5%	□ 19.8%	□ 53.8%
Assist students with disabilities with their class work N=108	□ 13.9%	□ 12.0%	□ 19.4%	□ 54.6%
Assist English language learners with their class work N=107	□ 33.6%	□ 13.1%	□ 26.2%	□ 27.1%
Help prepare materials for instruction N=109	□ 6.4%	□ 8.3%	□ 22.9%	□ 62.4%
Other (specify):N=6		□ 12.5%		□ 87.5%
 Guide center playtime (2) Assist students in any of their needs (2) Teach a reading class (1) Teach students to use computer software (1) 				
dministrative:				
Supervise students outside of the classroom (e.g., cafeteria, schoolyard, school discipline center, field trips) N=111	□ 2.7%	□ 3.6%	□ 10.8%	□ 82.9%
Attend professional development workshops N=105	□ 13.3%	□ 44.8%	□ 22.9%	□ 19.0%
Hand out materials for lessons N=109	□ 3.7%	□ 11.9%	□ 20.2%	□ 64.2%
Maintain student health records N=106	□ 32.1%	□ 29.2%	□ 13.2%	□ 25.5%
Maintain student attendance records N=108	□ 18.5%	□ 21.3%	□ 10.2%	□ 50.0%
Arrange classroom furnishings and equipment N=106	□ 17.0%	□ 29.2%	□ 22.6%	□ 31.1%
Prepare visual aids N=107	□ 22.4%	□ 16.8%	□ 31.8%	□ 29.0%
Other (specify):N=4		□ 22.2%	□ 11.1%	□ 66.7%
 Maintain classroom sanitation (1) Manage classroom art (1) Assist with money collection (1) Assist with any administrative needs (1) 				
lassroom Management:				
Praise/support achievement of students N=104		□ 0.9%	□ 6.3%	□ 92.9%
Keep students on task N=110		□ 0.9%	□ 4.5%	□ 94.5%
Create awards for positive behavior N=110	□ 2.7%	□ 7.3%	□ 19.1%	□ 70.9%
Encourage student self esteem N=104		□ 1.8%	□ 5.4%	□ 92.9%
Teach citizenship, social skills, and respect for others N=93	□ 2.7%	□ 1.8%	□ 12.5%	□ 83.0%
Settle minor student conflicts N=111	□ 1.8%	□ 9.9%	□ 17.1%	□ 71.2%
Participate in the development of discipline policy N=109	□ 9.2%	□ 16.5%	□ 16.5%	□ 57.8%
Discipline misbehavior through approved methods N=109	□ 2.8%	□ 11.0%	□ 18.3%	□ 67.9%
Monitor and record student behavior N=108	□ 9.3%	□ 9.3%	□ 13.0%	□ 68.5%
Report discipline problems to teacher or principal N=107	□ 2.8%	□ 12.1%	□ 24.3%	□ 60.7%
Other (specify):N=2		□ 16.7%	□ 16.7%	□ 66.7%
 Ensure student hygiene (2) 				

Please rate yourself on the following:

	Not Applicable	Slightly Skilled	Moderately Skilled	Highly Skilled
have successful methods of dealing with children. N=85	□ 0.9%		□ 23.2%	□ 75.9%
have working knowledge of the core subjects at the grade evel with which I work. N=87	□ 1.8%		□ 20.5%	□ 77.7%
l am familiar with the school organization and its community. N=111			□ 21.6%	□ 78.4%
I have a good understanding of what is expected behavior for children (e.g., basic characteristics of ages and stages). N=94		□ 0.9%	□ 15.2%	□ 83.9%
l can create learning aids that strengthen lesson plans. N=111	□ 5.4%	□ 2.7%	28.8%	□ 63.1%
can teach to the children's different levels of knowledge or abilities. N=111	□ 1.8%	□ 0.9%	□ 26.1%	□ 71.2%
know how to use good methods of recognition, reward, and punishment. N=95	□ 1.8%	□ 1.8%	□ 11.6%	□ 84.8%
can solve most minor problems independently. N=99	□ 0.9%	□ 0.9%	□ 9.8%	□ 88.4%
keep student information confidential. N=111	□ 1.8%		□ 4.5%	□ 93.7%
Thank you for completing	this survey	/.		

Appendix 2

Results of Teacher Assistant ANOVA Analyses

Appendix 2

Table A-1 – HP Implementation by Teaching Assistant Retention Cross Sectional ANOVA Analysis

Fall/Spring 2004 to Spring 2005 EOG Reading Gains, Grade 3

Group (I)	Group Mean Z-Score	Omnibus F- Value	Group (J)	Mean Difference (I- J)	Post Hoc Significance
Four Year Implementation	on Level (2002 –	8.035*			
2005)		(p < 0.001)			
Low (N=153)	-0.0086		Medium	0.0121	1.000
			High	0.1271	0.118
Medium (N=2320)	-0.0207		High	0.1150*	0.001
High (N=526)	-0.1357				
Teaching Assistant Reten	tion	0.317 (p=0.728)			
None (N=391)	0.0001				
Some (N=1513)	-0.0798				
Most (N=1095)	0.0000				
Implementation Level * 7 Assistant Retention	Teaching .	1.980 (p=0.115)			
Low None (N=0)	3 44 3				
Low Some (N=50)	-0.0180				
Low Most (N=103)	-0.0041				
Medium None (N=320)	-0.0755				
Medium Some (N=1234)	0.0420				
Medium Most (N=766)	-0.0207				
High None (N=71)	-0.1824				
High Some (N=229)	-0.1167				
High Most (N=226)	-0.1404				

Table A-2 – HP Implementation by Teaching Assistant Retention Cross Sectional ANOVA Analysis

Fall/Spring 2004 to Spring 2005 EOG Mathematics Gains, Grade 3

Group (I)	Group Mean Scale Score	Omnibus F- Value	Group (J)	Mean Difference (I- J)	Post Hoc Significance
Four Year Implementa	tion Level (02 –	4.274*			
05)	·	(p=0.014)			
Low (N=153)	-0.0626		Medium	-0.0123	1.000
			High	0.0961	0.536
Medium (N=2320)	-0.0503		High	0.1084*	0.012
High (N=526)	-0.1587				
Teaching Assistant Ret	tention	24.485*			
		(p < 0.001)			
None (N=391)	-0.0160		Some	0.0930	0.106
			Most	0.0193	1.000
Some (N=1513)	-0.1090		Most	-0.0736	0.051
Most (N=1095)	-0.0353	*			

Group (I)	Group Mean Scale Score	Omnibus F- Value	Group (J)	Mean Difference (I- J)	Post Hoc Significance
Implementation Level * 7	Teaching	14.886*		***	
Assistant Retention		(p < 0.001)			
Low None (N=0)	**				
Low Some (N=50)	-0.6855		Low Most	-0.9253	a
,			Medium None	-0.6821	
			Medium Some	-0.6245	
			Medium Most	-0.6328	
			High None	-0.6128	
			High Some	-0.4440	
			High Most	-0.5835	
Low Most (N=103)	0.2398		Medium None	0,2432	
· · ·			Medium Some	0.3008	
			Medium Most	0.2925	
			High None	0.1671	
			High Some	0.4813	
			High Most	0.3418	
Medium None (N=320)	-0.0034		Medium Some	0.0576	
, ,			Medium Most	0.0493	
			High None	0.0693	
			High Some	0.2381	
			High Most	0.0986	
Medium Some (N=1234)	-0.0610		Medium Most	-0.0083	
` ,			High None	0.0117	
			High Some	0.1805	
			High Most	0.0410	
Medium Most (N=766)	-0.0527		High None	0.0200	
` /			High Some	0.1888	
			High Most	0.0493	
High None (N=71)	-0.0727		High Some	0.1688	
Q , (2) (2) (2)			High Most	0.0293	
High Some (N=229)	-0.2415		High Most	-0.1395	
High Most (N=226)	-0.1020			and Falls	

a post hoc test are not traditionally performed for interactions in n-way ANOVAs.

Appendix 3 List of High Priority (HP) Schools

2003-2004 High Priority Schools, Organized by District

Anson County Schools

Wadesboro Primary

Bertie County Schools

Aulander Elementary Windsor Elementary

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools

Shamrock Gardens Elementary Thomasboro Elementary Westerly Hills Elementary

Cumberland County Schools

Lillian Black Elementary Pauline Jones Elementary Teresa C. Berrien Elementary

Durham Public Schools

George Watts Elementary Lakewood Elementary W.G. Pearson Elementary Eastway Elementary

Edgecombe County Schools

Roberson Elementary

Forsyth County Schools

Ashley Elementary
Cook Elementary
Forest Park Elementary
Kimberley Park Elementary
North Hills Elementary
Petree Elementary

Gaston County Schools

Rhyne Elementary Woodhill Elementary

Guilford County Schools

W.M. Hampton Elementary Fairview Elementary Clara J. Peck Elementary

Hertford County Schools

Riverview Elementary

Nash-Rocky Mount Schools

James C. Braswell Elementary
O.R. Pope Elementary

Northampton County Schools Rich Square Creecy Elementary

Robeson County Public Schools West Lumberton Elementary

Union County Public Schools East Elementary Walter Bickett Elementary

Vance County Schools
Clark Street Elementary
New Hope Elementary
Pinkston Street Elementary

Wayne County Public Schools
Carver Heights Elementary