

**Kyrene Middle School Evaluation:  
Phase 1 (Implementation)**

**David R. Garcia**  
**Assistant Professor, Arizona State University**

**M. Suzan DePrez**  
**DELTA Graduate Student, Arizona State University**

**October 16, 2006**

# **Kyrene Middle School Evaluation: Phase 1 (Implementation)**

David R. Garcia  
*Assistant Professor, Arizona State University*

M. Suzan DePrez  
*DELTA Graduate Student, Arizona State University*

---

## **Introduction**

The evaluation of the Kyrene Elementary School District (Kyrene) Middle School model (model) is conceptualized as a three-year, three-phase design beginning in spring 2006. The evaluation begins with a process evaluation in year one and transitions to an outcome evaluation in year three.

The evaluation is based on a guiding framework, common in program evaluation, which divides the model into three phases: implementation, maturation and outcome. Phase 1 of the evaluation focuses on the extent to which the model has been implemented as intended. Phase 2 of the evaluation includes targeted follow-up on key implementation issues and a shift toward defining program outcomes. Program maturation is marked by the establishment of routine operational procedures in the course of content delivery. In the third and final year of the evaluation (Phase 3) the evaluation shifts to a focus on assessing program outcomes. Given that the Kyrene middle schools serve grades six through eight, the evaluation will center on the progression of the 2005-2006 cohort of sixth grade students through the end of their eighth grade year.

This report represents the evaluation outcomes for Phase 1 of the evaluation. At this stage, the working assumption of the evaluation is that the model has not been fully implemented.

The purpose of the evaluation in Phase 1 is to provide timely feedback to Kyrene District Officials (district officials) and the members of the Kyrene School District Governing Board (governing board) about program implementation so adjustments can occur in a timely manner.

The evaluation was conducted by David R. Garcia, Ph. D., Assistant Professor, Arizona State University and Suzan DePrez, Graduate Student, DELTA program, Arizona State University. Henceforth, the evaluators will be referred to collectively as the “research team.”

The research team presented the evaluation outcomes to district officials and the governing board in a public meeting on June 13, 2006. The evaluation outcomes were presented in this manner for two reasons. First, the evaluation schedule was ambitious in order to provide results with sufficient time for district officials and the governing board to initiate changes in the program for the 2006-2007 school year. Second, the public meeting allowed an opportunity for district officials, the governing board and the research team to discuss the program implementation. Since the public meeting, district officials have indicated that they have begun program implementation improvements based on the evaluation outcomes.

This report presents the supporting data for the key findings presented to the governing board at the aforementioned public meeting. The organization of the report closely follows the PowerPoint presentation provided by the research team to the

governing board at the public meeting. The report includes background on the model, a description of the research methods, findings and a conclusion.

## **Background**

The governing board adopted the New Middle School model (model) on March 8, 2005. The model consists of a five-period daily schedule that includes four core classes of 68-minutes (Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science); one 68-minute daily period Exploratory courses meeting on an A/B rotation throughout the year; and a 30-minute lunch. The district now refers to all course offerings outside of Core classes as Exploratory. There are two types of Exploratory courses (outside of Core), year long courses in Spanish, Band, Orchestra, Physical Education, and Chorus. While nine week courses (formerly, the “wheel”) include Art, Theater, Multi-media, and Family and Consumer Sciences. The daily schedule includes an Academic Lab-Homeroom period of 34 minutes that meets four days per week allowing for the continuation of one early student release day each week. The early student release day is Wednesday. In addition, teachers have one 68-minute period per day for planning and preparation.

According to district officials, Academic Lab was intended as time that would be planned by the teacher teams for the purpose of benefiting students. The K-8 Committee desired that Academic Lab would not be a “prescribed program.” Purposively, teachers were not provided with instructions for implementing Academic Lab.

The recommendation from district officials stated that the model addresses the following needs:

1. Improve student achievement (effectiveness)
2. Maintain the quality of Kyrene programs
3. Prepare students for High School coursework
4. Maintain or improve teacher/student ratios
5. Allot preparation and development time for teachers
6. Yield cost savings in order for the governing board to balance the budget in the 2005-06 school year ([www.kyrene.org/gb](http://www.kyrene.org/gb)).

Implementation of the model began in fall of the 2005-2006 school year. After the model was implemented, district officials collaborated with the research team to articulate the program outcomes to be evaluated. The research team presented the focus and methodology of the evaluation to the governing board in a public meeting on January 24, 2006.

The evaluation focuses on three overarching aspects of the model implementation:

1. The impact of providing longer periods of uninterrupted instructional time, particularly in Core classes
2. The interpretation and application of Academic Lab
3. The impact of redefining the Exploratory Program.

## **Methods**

Phase 1 of the evaluation is designed to assess the implementation of the model from the point of view of key stakeholders. The evaluation design includes three data collection methods; online surveys, interviews and focus groups. The purpose and logistics of each data collection method are discussed separately.

### ***Online Survey***

The online survey was administered to measure teachers' opinions of the implementation of the model. All certified middle school teachers in the Kyrene Elementary School District were invited to participate in the online survey. The survey was developed by the research team and field tested with a group of Kyrene middle school teachers. The suggestions and input of the Kyrene teachers in the field test were incorporated into the final version of the survey (see Appendix A for the full survey and results). After consulting with district staff, the research team determined that the optimal time to administer the survey was shortly after the district completed the state standardized tests. The online survey was administered between April 25, 2006 and April 30, 2006. In total, 198 teachers completed the full survey. According to district records, there were 355 certified teachers employed in Kyrene middle schools in 2005-2006 that were eligible to take the survey, yielding a response rate of 56 percent.

### ***Principal Interviews***

One-on-one interviews were conducted on March 9, 2006 with three of the six principals from Kyrene middle schools who were selected at random by the research team. The interviews were held at the Kyrene School District office and lasted between 45 minutes to one hour per interview. Each interview was conducted using a prepared script of questions (see Appendix B for the interview protocol). If needed, the interviewer used probing questions to allow principals to further clarify their responses. Each interview was recorded and later transcribed. Transcriptions of the interviews were coded into categories relating to the major components of the model implementation: 1) General perceptions (positive and negative) 2) Core classes 3) Academic Lab and 4) Exploratory

Programs. All three interviews were analyzed to find common themes relating to the overall implementation of the model components.

### ***Focus Groups: Students***

Student focus groups were conducted at each of the six Kyrene middle schools. The research team requested that seven students participate in each focus group: five students from grade six, one student from grade seven, and one student from grade eight. In accordance with the three-year evaluation of the model, sixth grade students were oversampled in the focus groups. The research team required that each student involved in the focus groups have a different Academic Lab teacher in order to learn how a broad spectrum of teachers has implemented the model.

District officials were asked to select students at each school that met the above requirements. Focus groups sessions were held on March 21, 28 and 29, 2006 at the individual schools.

Each focus group session was completed with only the students and the researcher present. All sessions were recorded and transcribed. Students were asked their first name, grade level, what school they attended in the previous year, and if they were in the same Academic Lab class with any other student in the group. The research team accounted for two pairs of students who had the same Academic Lab teacher when coding the session data.

Prior to starting each session, students were read a standardized, prepared introduction and given the opportunity to ask any questions. Each interview was conducted using a prepared script of questions (see Appendix C for the interview

protocol). If needed, the interviewer used probing questions to allow students to further clarify their responses. Each session lasted 30-40 minutes.

Each student focus group session was transcribed and coded into categories associated with the model: 1) General perceptions (positive and negative) 2) Core Classes 3) Academic Lab and 4) Exploratory Programs. Each transcription was then further coded into sub themes across all schools.

In total, 30 sixth grade students, 6 seventh grade students, and 6 eighth grade students participated in the focus sessions. Fourteen student participants were male and twenty-eight were female.

### ***Focus Groups: Exploratory Teachers***

Four Exploratory teachers from each Kyrene middle school were selected to participate in focus group sessions using a stratified random sampling method. To begin, a sampling frame was developed to identify the number of teachers per school and Exploratory Areas to be included in the focus group session (Table 1).

The sampling frame includes two dimensions. The first dimension is Exploratory Areas, which are listed in alphabetical order along the left side of the sampling frame. The second dimension is schools. The sampling frame includes six columns to match the number of Kyrene middle schools. Next, the Exploratory Areas in the dark shading were allocated using a 2-3 pattern (2-art; 3-band; 2-chorus; 3-drama and 2-FACS). The Exploratory Areas in the light shading were allocated three spaces until each column (school) had four interview allocations. Lastly, actual Kyrene middle schools were selected at random and inserted into the columns to replace the generic numbers. The

specific schools designated to each column are not provided in the following tables in order to protect the anonymity of the participating teachers.

Overall, twenty four Exploratory teachers were invited to attend the focus group sessions and fifteen teachers attended (Table 2). All Exploratory areas were represented except for Physical Education. The Physical Education teachers invited to participate in the session did not attend. Of the fifteen participants, ten were female and five were male.

**Table 1: Sampling Frame for Exploratory Teacher Focus Group**

Each "X" represents one teacher allocation

Exploratory Area	School					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Art	X	X				
Band		X	X	X		
Chorus					X	X
Drama	X		X		X	
FACs		X		X		
Multi-media	X		X			X
Orchestra			X	X		X
P.E.		X			X	X
Spanish	X			X	X	
<b>Total 24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

Each "X" represents one teacher allocation

**Table 2: Number of Exploratory Teachers Participating in the Focus Groups, by Program Area and School**

Exploratory Area	School					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Art	1	1				
Band		0	0	1		
Chorus					1	1
Drama	1		1		1	
FACs		1		1		
Multi-media	1		1			0
Orchestra			0	1		0
P.E.		0			0	0
Spanish	1			0	1	
<b>Total 15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

The research team conducted three Exploratory teacher focus groups. Exploratory teachers from two different schools participated in each session. The focus group sessions were conducted on March 21, 28 and 29, 2006 at the Kyrene District office after the school day; teachers were not removed from class to participate in the focus groups. Each session was conducted with only a researcher and the session participants present. Each interview was conducted using a prepared script of questions (see Appendix D for the interview protocol). If needed, the interviewer used probing questions to allow participants to further clarify their responses.

Each session lasted 40-50 minutes and was recorded. The focus group sessions were transcribed and the contents coded into specific categories associated with the implementation of the model. Sub themes were then identified across all focus groups.

## Findings

The findings section closely follows the PowerPoint presentation given to the governing board on June 13, 2006. The major areas addressed in the findings section are Core Subjects (excludes Language Arts), Language Arts, Exploratory Program, Professional Development, Academic Lab, Discipline, Professional Satisfaction and Next Steps.

In the following tables, the survey results are presented for four different teacher groupings according to the following definitions:

All – includes all certified middle school teachers in the district

Core – includes *only* Math, Science and Social Studies teachers

Exploratory – includes only Exploratory teachers

Language Arts – includes only Language Arts teachers

Teachers self-identified into one of the previous groupings.

In addition, several questions asked teachers to compare the teaching and learning environment under the model to the same conditions last year. In these tables, the results are presented for only teachers who self-indicated that they taught in a Kyrene middle school last year.

The survey results are presented in a series of tables. The tables include the results for individual survey questions. In the tables, respondents (persons taking the survey) are distinguished from responses (answers to individual survey questions). In some cases, the respondent may not have answered a specific question. These cases are labeled as “No Response.” The tables include four different columns that provide information about the

number and percentage of respondents and responses. The column headings and definitions are as follows:

1. Frequency – the number of responses or respondents
2. Percent – percent of responses, including those respondents that did not provide an answer to the question (referred to as No Response in the table).
3. Valid Percent – percent of responses, excluding those respondents who did not provide an answer to the question (No Response)
4. Cumulative Percent – running total of the percent of responses, excluding those respondents who did not provide an answer to the question (No Response)

## ***Core Subjects***

***Core teachers are spending more time on task.***

***Core teachers report students are spending more time on task.***

Longer class periods for Core classes are central features of the model. The purpose of the longer class periods is to provide additional instructional time to promote classroom practices that improve academic achievement. It should be noted that the survey results in this section exclude Language Arts teachers. According to almost 70 percent of Core teachers, the 68-minute class period provides more academic time for their students (Table 3). Teachers also were asked to assess the extent to which students were spending more time on task within the 68-minute class period compared to last year. Fifty-six percent of Core teachers indicated that students are spending more academic time on task (Table 4).

**Table 3: The sixty-eight minute class period provides more academic time for my students.  
(Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	33	36.7	44	44
<b>Agree</b>	19	21.1	25.3	69.3
<b>Disagree</b>	13	14.4	17.3	86.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10	11.1	13.3	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	75	83.3	100	
<b>No Response</b>	15	16.7		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 4: With the longer class period, my students spend more academic time on task.  
(Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	25	27.8	33.3	33.3
<b>Agree</b>	17	18.9	22.7	56
<b>Disagree</b>	15	16.7	20	76
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	18	20	24	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	75	83.3	100	
<b>No Response</b>	15	16.7		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

Teachers also were asked about their impressions of the impact the model has had on key aspects of teaching and learning, in this case the amount of time available for instruction. The response categories ranged from Very Positive to Very Negative. With regard to the impact of the model on the amount of time available for instruction, 53 percent of all teachers indicated that the model has had a positive impact (Table 5).

**Table 5: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the amount of time available for instruction? (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Very positive</b>	36	18.2	18.4	18.4
<b>Positive</b>	67	33.8	34.2	52.6
<b>No Difference</b>	22	11.1	11.2	63.8
<b>Negative</b>	30	15.2	15.3	79.1
<b>Very Negative</b>	37	18.7	18.9	98.0
<b>No Opinion</b>	4	2.0	20.	100.0
<b>Total Responses</b>	196	66.9	100.0	
<b>No Response</b>	2	1.0		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100.0		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

In general, Principals’ comments concurred with the teacher survey results; more time in the core classes is a benefit of the model. Typical Principal comments include:

“I think that teachers are embracing the Core very much. They love their 68-minute periods. Science and Social Studies teachers are thrilled. Math teachers seem to be happy about it. All of my teachers are very much appreciative of (having) less students on their team. I think it’s going very well.”

“Increased time in math, science and social studies is definitely a plus!”

“Science really found it a real plus to be able to do their experiments... (and) kids have more time for math, and my math scores are higher than ever!”

“Science, Social Studies and Math teachers in general are having a pretty good time with it.”

### ***Core Teachers Covering Material in More Depth***

According to the model objectives, one major purpose of longer class periods is to increase and improve the academic focus in Core classes. To that end, the online survey included a series of questions on the relationship between the longer class periods and the depth in which material is both presented by teachers and learned by students. Sixty-five percent of Core teachers either Strongly Agree or Agree that with the longer class period,

and they are able to present class material in greater depth (Table 6). Students learning class material is a higher standard for agreement because teachers have less control over student behaviors than their own. Half of Core teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that, compared to last year; students are learning the class material in greater depth (Table 7). The preponderance of Core teachers also believe that the model had a positive impact on the depth of material covered in class (Table 8).

**Table 6: With the longer class period, I am able to present the class material in greater depth. (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	22	24.4	29.3	29.3
<b>Agree</b>	27	30	36	65.3
<b>Disagree</b>	19	21.1	25.3	90.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6	6.7	8	98.7
<b>No Opinion</b>	1	1.1	1.3	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	75	83.3	100	
<b>No Response</b>	15	16.7		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 7: Compared to last year, my students are learning the class material in greater depth. (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	13	14.4	17.6	17.6
<b>Agree</b>	24	26.7	32.4	50
<b>Disagree</b>	23	25.6	31.1	81.1
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10	11.1	13.5	94.6
<b>No Opinion</b>	4	4.4	5.4	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	74	82.2	100	
<b>No Response</b>	16	17.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 8: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the depth of material covered in class? (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Very positive</b>	15	16.7	16.7	16.7
<b>Positive</b>	42	46.7	46.7	63.3
<b>No Difference</b>	25	27.8	27.8	91.1
<b>Negative</b>	6	6.7	6.7	97.8
<b>Very Negative</b>	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
<b>No Opinion</b>	1	1.1	1.1	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	90	100	100	

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

***Core Teachers Providing More Differentiated, Individualized Instruction***

If the model is implemented as intended, longer class periods would provide time for teachers to tailor their instructional practices to specific students. Approximately half of Core teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they are able to provide more differentiated instruction with the longer class periods (Table 9), while 60 percent of teachers indicated that the longer class period allows them to interact more with students on a personal level (Table 10).

**Table 9: With the longer class period, I am able to provide more differentiated instruction for students. (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15	16.7	20	20
<b>Agree</b>	24	26.7	32	52
<b>Disagree</b>	28	31.1	37.3	89.3
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	8	8.9	10.7	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	75	83.3	100	
<b>No Response</b>	15	16.7		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 10: During the longer class period, I am able to interact more with each of my students on a personal level. (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15	16.7	20	20
<b>Agree</b>	30	33.3	40	60
<b>Disagree</b>	22	24.4	29.3	89.3
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	7	7.8	9.3	98.7
<b>No Opinion</b>	1	1.1	1.3	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	75	83.3	100	
<b>No Response</b>	15	16.7		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

***Core Teachers Report Being at About the Same Place in the Curriculum***

The research team hypothesized that teachers may be able to cover more of the curriculum content compared to previous years with longer class periods. After analyzing the survey responses, it became clear that the timing of the class content was the more salient issue. Teachers commented that their primary issue is covering the relevant material when they were supposed to. The research team interpreted these comments as teachers timing the curriculum with key events, such as assessments. Therefore, it is not surprising that results indicated that Core teachers, in general, felt that they were in the same place in the curriculum as last year (Table 11).

**Table 11: Compared to last year, where are you in the curriculum? (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Significantly behind	6	6.7	8.1	8.1
A little behind	14	15.6	18.9	27
At about the same place	30	33.3	40.5	67.6
A little ahead	19	21.1	25.7	93.2
Significantly ahead	5	5.6	6.8	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	74	82.2	100	
<b>No Response</b>	16	17.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	90	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

### *Other Academic Issues*

Another intended outcome of longer class periods is the ability of teachers to incorporate more laboratory and simulation exercises into their instruction. One limitation of this study is the lack of the research team and district officials to determine a sufficient list of specific laboratory and simulation practices that should be included in the survey to indicate exemplary implementation of the model. As a result, the survey questions were general in nature and focused on teachers experimenting with new methods of instruction and changing their teaching methods. Over half of all teachers indicated that longer class periods provided the opportunity to experiment with new instructional methods (Table 12). Nearly 60 percent of all teachers indicated that they have changed the way they teach since the introduction of the longer class periods (Table 13). Overall, the model has had a positive impact on teachers trying new instructional methods, particularly among Core teachers (Table 14).

The inability to identify specific instructional strategies to laboratory or simulation practices, however, inhibits further explanation of any changes in teaching

methods. Thus, the conclusion is limited to an indication that over half of all teachers have changed their teaching methods, but there is no further indication of the specific changes that teachers have undertaken in their teaching practices.

**Table 12: With the longer period, I have the opportunity to experiment with new methods of instruction. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	24	12.1	13.6	13.6
<b>Agree</b>	70	35.4	39.8	53.4
<b>Disagree</b>	42	21.2	23.9	77.3
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	34	17.2	19.3	96.6
<b>No Opinion</b>	6	3	3.4	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	176	88.9	100	
<b>No Response</b>	22	11.1		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 13: Since the introduction of the longer period, I have changed the way I teach. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	31	15.7	17.7	17.7
<b>Agree</b>	70	35.4	40	57.7
<b>Disagree</b>	49	24.7	28	85.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	17	8.6	9.7	95.4
<b>No Opinion</b>	8	4	4.6	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	175	88.4	100	
<b>No Response</b>	23	11.6		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 14: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new Middle School model on the opportunity to try new teaching methods? (Core teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Very positive</b>	15	16.7	16.7	16.7
<b>Positive</b>	42	46.7	46.7	63.3
<b>No Difference</b>	25	27.8	27.8	91.1
<b>Negative</b>	6	6.7	6.7	97.8
<b>Very Negative</b>	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
<b>No Opinion</b>	1	1.1	1.1	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	90	100	100	

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

Language Arts teachers, however, held contrary views on this subject. It should be noted that the model in fact provides *less* time for Language Arts rather than more time. Language Arts class periods were shortened from 90 to 68 minutes. Almost 60 percent of Language Arts teachers either disagreed or strongly disagreed that they had the opportunity to experiment with new methods of instruction under the model (Table 15). In addition, only 24 percent of Language Arts teachers indicated that the model has had any kind of positive impact on the opportunity to try new teaching methods (Table 16). The distinct concerns of Language Arts teachers are addressed in further detail in the following section.

**Table 15: With the longer period, I have the opportunity to experiment with new methods of instruction. (Language Arts teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	3	4.8	5.1	5.1
<b>Agree</b>	20	32.3	33.9	39
<b>Disagree</b>	13	21	22	61
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	21	33.9	35.6	96.6
<b>No Opinion</b>	2	3.2	3.4	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	59	95.2	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	4.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	62	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 16: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the opportunity to try new teaching methods? (Language Arts teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Very positive</b>	3	4.8	4.8	4.8
<b>Positive</b>	12	19.4	19.4	24.2
<b>No Difference</b>	18	29	29	53.2
<b>Negative</b>	9	14.5	14.5	67.7
<b>Very Negative</b>	18	29	29	96.8
<b>No Opinion</b>	2	3.2	3.2	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	62	100	100	

## Student Perceptions of Core Classes

### *Student opinions differ by subject area and level of teacher engagement*

Students were questioned directly about their opinion of Core classes. The purpose of this line of questioning was to determine if students uniformly had difficulty with the longer class periods. Their responses, whether negative or positive, however, are associated with how “engaging” they feel the teacher is and the activities included in the class regardless of the subject area. In every student focus group students stated that

classes can seem long, short or just about right depending on the teacher and the activities. One student's comment captures student opinions well,

“I really think it's totally on the approach of the teacher, the way they do it. Some people need to hear it, some need to see it, and some people actually need to do it. It depends on the kid.”

### ***Negative Student Perceptions of Science Classes Related to Passive Class Activities***

In discussing the length of Core classes, students most often commented on their science classes. Students' descriptions of the length of their science classes varied depending on the activities they were engaged in during the class. Some students stated that all they did in science class was, “take notes 24/7.” Students repeatedly referred to the process of taking notes as laborious and boring. For example, “I think science is way too long because all we ever do is read out of the book and take notes.” “We do very few labs; we do a lot of studying in packets, and I don't learn that way. It's hard for me to pay attention.”

### ***Positive Perceptions of Science Class Relate to Student Activity***

Some students could not wait for science class each day. These students describe teachers who had the class engage in experiments more frequently. “(Some teachers) don't do enough hands-on or interactive (activities). Some teachers prefer hands-on activities because our science teacher knows we like hands-on activities. S/he does hands-on activities more often. More often than any other teacher.” Other students commented on science being “fun” or “interesting.” For instance, according to one student, “Sometimes in science class I have the most fun because we do experiments.”

### ***Students Hold Neutral Opinions of Math Classes***

Students most often stated neutral opinions of the length of math classes. Students referred to having time in class to “get homework done,” which seemed to be a positive for them. “I think they’re (math classes) are just right...we leave there feeling that was a good amount of time.” Students had negative perceptions about the length of math classes only when they didn’t have enough work to do during the class period, or when the teacher did not give them time to start their homework. “Some people are bored because they didn’t have any questions and they did the homework, so they’re falling asleep and not paying attention.”

### ***Student Perceptions of Social Studies Classes Slightly Negative***

Student perceptions about the length of social studies classes seemed to depend again on the teacher’s approach to the subject and the type of class activity. Slightly more students expressed negative opinions about the length of their social studies class than those expressing positive attitudes. The following quotes are typical of student responses:

- ❖ “I think social studies is too long because we usually just read.”
- ❖ “I guess it really depends on the teacher so some can say this is boring, others can say this is fun.”
- ❖ “Sometimes we do activities and it makes it (social studies) so fun!”

## **Special Considerations of Language Arts Teachers**

A high percentage of Language Arts teachers took the opportunity on the online survey to express their frustration and concern about how the model has affected their teaching practices. Overwhelmingly, Language Arts teachers expressed that under the

model, they have to cover the same number of required objectives with less time. The following excerpts represent an example of the typical responses:

“Since the new model was implemented, I have less time to teach the same amount of the required standards in a class period, which has put me behind in my instruction. I do not have the 90 minutes to devote to in depth instruction to assure that my students are grasping the concepts presented. Also, LA now has 4 classes which is a tremendous burden on the teacher with the added grading especially of writing assignments, which can take away from instruction preparation”.

“Language arts has suffered, but the other content area classes have benefited”.

“Language arts teachers have been abused. We have the same number of objectives, less time to teach them, and 30 more students. I already spend hours and hours more time grading because of writing than any other discipline in the school. Everyone else's workload was lightened. Mine has increased by 1/3. How do you expect me to have any feeling of accomplishment when you do this”?

“Since I teach Language Arts, I am not given enough time to teach all of my performance objectives because my time with students has been decreased from last year”.

“Language arts has many more objectives to hit than other core areas and now has almost a third less time than last year. 30 more kids. Very difficult”.

Principals echoed the sentiments of the Language Arts teachers.

Principals discussed how some language arts teachers feel a “burden” to teach everything. Also, one principal indicated the need for Language Arts teachers to come together to “prioritize their objectives” across the district.

Furthermore, the online survey results reveal that Language Arts teachers generally hold a more negative opinion of the model than other Core teachers. Language Arts teachers were more likely than the other teacher groups to disagree or strongly disagree that the model provides opportunities to experiment with new methods of instruction (Table 17). Language arts teachers, along with exploratory teachers, are more

likely than Core Teachers to disagree or strongly disagree that they are able to present class material in greater depth (Table 18).

**Table 17: With the longer period, I have the opportunity to experiment with new methods of instruction. (Language Arts Teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	3	4.8	5.1	5.1
<b>Agree</b>	20	32.3	33.9	39
<b>Disagree</b>	13	21	22	61
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	21	33.9	35.6	96.6
<b>No Opinion</b>	2	3.2	3.4	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	59	95.2	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	4.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	62	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

**Table 18: With the longer class period, I am able to present the class material in greater depth. (Language Arts teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	1	1.6	1.7	1.7
<b>Agree</b>	18	29	30.5	32.2
<b>Disagree</b>	15	24.2	25.4	57.6
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	22	35.5	37.3	94.9
<b>No Opinion</b>	3	4.8	5.1	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	59	95.2	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	4.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	62	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

### ***Students Perceive Language Arts Teachers' Dissatisfaction with the Model***

The dissatisfaction of Language Arts teachers with the model also was perceived by students. It is important to note that students were not asked directly to comment on their Language Arts teachers' perceptions about the model. Students commented about Language Arts teachers and classes in the course of answering other unrelated questions.

Students mentioned that their Language Arts teachers “did not like the model” because the teachers told them that they used to have more time (to teach).” Also, a student mentioned, “My teacher says she used to have 45 minutes for reading and 45 minutes for Language Arts...Language Arts are just about right (now) leaning towards too long.”

***Designating Language Arts Objectives Will Impact the Perceptions of Language Arts Teachers about the model***

According to minutes from the K-8 Programming Meeting held on March 29, 2005 a goal of the Curriculum and Instruction Department was to “communicate a rationale” for integrating reading and writing strategies into the Core classes. Training was to be scheduled to aid social studies, science and math teachers in implementing this aspect of the model.

Principals stated that the District was providing professional development for Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum (WRAC). The WRAC Committee is made of representatives from each campus who attend district meetings to discuss and share ideas and develop prepared lessons for implementation at the schools. According to Principals, this model had some drawbacks. One Principal said this process was no different than what had always been happening on the campus, “There was a group that developed (lessons) ...but we still need to do more.” Another principal described the WRAC training as “successful training, (but) from a systems perspective it was a desire to go a little faster than people were ready for.”

At the June 13, 2006 governing board meeting, district officials noted that specific Language Arts objectives would be designated and assigned to Science and Social Studies classes for the 2006-07 school year. This modification to the WRAC program

along with continued professional development in WRAC appear to address some of the issues identified by Language Arts teachers and once implemented, these activities should improve the perceptions that Language Arts teachers hold about the model.

## **Special Considerations of Exploratory Teachers**

The model has had a dramatic impact on the schedule and frequency of Exploratory classes. Several stakeholders indicated their concern about the unintended consequences of the model on Exploratory teachers and classes. Therefore, the evaluation design included two methods to document the opinions of Exploratory teachers. First, three focus groups were conducted exclusively with Exploratory teachers. Second, the online survey results were disaggregated to isolate the opinions of Exploratory teachers. This section details the opinions of Exploratory teachers,

In the focus groups, Exploratory teachers commented on how the model's A/B rotation schedule has affected the structure of individual classes and curriculum delivery over the course of the year. Their comments can be categorized into perceptions of the depth of lessons versus the breadth of the overall curriculum. Exploratory teachers report that the quality of individual lessons (depth) has improved under the model. Most Exploratory teachers, however, stated that they have not been able to cover as much of the curriculum compared to the previous year (breadth).

In individual class periods, many Exploratory teachers stated positive attitudes about the 68-minute period because the longer period allows them to complete a lesson in the same day. The longer class period also provides for extended student work time on projects and labs. For example, Exploratory teachers commented:

- ❖ “As a drama teacher, I do the instruction, we do a plan and everyone gets to perform that day. It’s not carried over (like last year); ...I really found it very successful this year!”
- ❖ “I just feel that we can finish it (lesson) and really talk about and deprogram and what happened and what did you see today, instead of boom, boom, boom. I just love the 68-minutes.”
- ❖ “I don’t think the structure of what I’m doing is that different, but the pacing, the depth, the ability of the kids being able to really get into what they’re working on is much improved.”

According to Exploratory teachers, the A/B schedule does result in less breadth in the curriculum. For example, 66.7 percent of Exploratory teachers report being behind or significantly behind in the curriculum compared to last year and no Exploratory teachers reported being significantly ahead in the curriculum (Table 19).

**Table 19: Compared to last year, where are you in the curriculum?  
(Exploratory Teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Significantly behind</b>	17	44.7	47.2	47.2
<b>A little behind</b>	7	18.4	19.4	66.7
<b>At about the same place</b>	8	21.1	22.2	88.9
<b>A little ahead</b>	4	10.5	11.1	100.0
<b>Total Responses</b>	36	5.3	100.0	
<b>No Response</b>	2	4.8		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	38	100.0		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

In addition, over 70 percent of Exploratory teachers indicated that students need more frequent class periods to learn their best (Table 20).

**Table 20: My students need more frequent class periods to learn their best.  
(Exploratory teachers only)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	18	47.4	48.6	48.6
<b>Agree</b>	9	23.7	24.3	73
<b>Disagree</b>	3	7.9	8.1	81.1

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	3	7.9	8.1	89.2
<b>No Opinion</b>	4	10.5	10.8	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	37	97.4	100	
<b>No Response</b>	1	2.6		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	38	100		

\* Results include only teachers who taught at a Kyrene Middle School during the previous school year

Spanish and Music teachers were most likely to indicate that the schedule changes associated with the model have had a negative impact on instruction. The following quotes are from Spanish and Music teachers:

- ❖ “We have not even completed our methods books; we’re about ¾ of a way through our method books at this point.”
- ❖ “I still say the majority of the time kids spend on the risers and what I’m finding really is I’m spending more time on fewer pieces of music comparatively than I’ve done before.”
- ❖ “We had to cut out a lot of the things that made Spanish fun because we have to cover so much grammar and so much vocabulary that we’re just constantly pushing them (students).”

### ***Inconsistency in Class Size and Scheduling for Exploratory/Elective Courses***

The scheduling of Exploratory classes was mentioned by Exploratory teachers in every teacher focus group. Exploratory teachers indicated that at many campuses exploratory classes vary in size from extremely low (6-7) to extremely high (33-47). Exploratory teachers expressed great frustration with this inconsistency and in some cases resentment of teachers with stable class sizes. For example, one teacher commented, “Exploratory is really struggling for a number of reasons because of the different choices the students are being forced to make. They have small, small classes. They had a lot fewer classes than they are used to. Scheduling seems to be a real problem.” It should be noted that the intent was to provide students with their first and

second choices for Exploratory classes and efforts to accommodate student choices created challenges for maintaining consistent class sizes.

## **Professional Development**

The research team also hypothesized that few Kyrene middle school teachers have experience teaching with 68-minute class periods. As a result, teachers may desire additional professional development to teach with the longer class period. The results indicate that this hypothesis does not hold for two reasons. First, a limited number of teachers (27 percent) participated in professional development on how to teach with the longer class periods (Table 21). Second, nearly 80 percent of Kyrene teachers believe they are already adequately prepared to provide quality instruction with the longer class periods (Table 22).

**Table 21: This year, did you participate in professional development on how to teach with the longer class periods? (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>No</b>	145	73.2	73.2	73.2
<b>Yes</b>	53	26.8	26.8	100
<b>Total</b>	198	100	100	

**Table 22: I am adequately prepared to provide quality instruction with the longer class periods. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	54	27.3	27.8	27.8
<b>Agree</b>	100	50.5	51.5	79.4
<b>Disagree</b>	21	10.6	10.8	90.2
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	10	5.1	5.2	95.4
<b>No Opinion</b>	9	4.5	4.6	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	194	98	100	
<b>No Response</b>	4	2		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

## Academic Lab

Academic Lab (AL) is a prominent feature of the model. All stakeholders, either before or during the evaluation, mentioned the importance of AL to the model's implementation. The opinions of teachers, students and principals all provide indications that AL is not being implemented as intended.

A substantial percentage of teachers have not received guidance on the expectations for AL (Table 23). In addition, 57 percent of teachers report that they are unprepared to use AL productively (Table 24).

**Table 23: I have received guidance on the expectations for Academic Lab.  
(All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	9	4.5	4.7	4.7
<b>Agree</b>	73	36.9	37.8	42.5
<b>Disagree</b>	42	21.2	21.8	64.2
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	39	19.7	20.2	84.5
<b>No Opinion</b>	30	15.2	15.5	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	193	97.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	5	2.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

**Table 24: I am prepared to use the Academic Lab productively. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	16	8.1	8.3	8.3
<b>Agree</b>	36	18.2	18.7	26.9
<b>Disagree</b>	44	22.2	22.8	49.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	66	33.3	34.2	83.9
<b>No Opinion</b>	31	15.7	16.1	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	193	97.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	5	2.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

Principals were positive about the professional development activities provided by the Academic Lab Advisory Committee. For example, comments included:

- ❖ “We’ve had the Academic Lab committee meeting and really getting a lot of ideas out; classes being offered on preparing Academic Lab. ...It’s been well received!”
- ❖ “It’s now being offered to all teachers. It was offered to new teachers initially; was so well received, it’s now being offered to all teachers on a first-come, first-served basis.”

***Student Perceptions of Academic Lab***

The lack of consistent guidance coupled with teacher uncertainty regarding the productive use of AL, are likely explanations for the extreme variability across classrooms in the implementation of AL. The working objectives of AL included

providing increased student support and providing time for specialized programs.

Overall, AL is not being implemented to meet these objectives.

The research team learned about the implementation of AL using students as the primary information source. Students were chosen as the optimal information source because they have relevant experiences with AL activities in the classroom. Student opinion was gathered through focus groups with students representing all middle schools and grade levels (see Methods section for more information on the student focus groups). In the focus groups, students were asked, “At school you have a class called Academic Lab. What do you think of Academic Lab?” This question was followed by, “Think back to last week. What did you do in Academic Lab?” The researcher used probing questions to encourage students to provide descriptive details about these activities. Researchers coded and analyzed these activities. To assess the implementation of AL, the researchers compared the activities to the district objectives for AL.

### ***Students Hold Largely Negative Perceptions of Academic Lab***

In general, students voiced negative opinions of AL. Most commonly, students felt that Academic Lab was a “waste of time” or that Academic Lab “doesn’t matter,” “doesn’t help,” or “isn’t necessary.”

For example, one student remarked, “It’s not like (just) a waste of time, (it’s) like a waste of your brain, like- it’s supposed to help you?” Another student added, “I just don’t think it’s necessary.”

Furthermore, several students questioned the purpose of Academic Lab. For example, most students did not see “the point of it (Academic Lab).” Other students remarked, “In AL (Academic Lab) you get random stuff...sometimes we do stuff and

sometimes there's nothing to do." "We used to have a schedule, now we don't; I don't know what happened."

### ***Students Consider Academic Lab as Detached From the Rest of the Curriculum***

When students mentioned AL activities with an academic-orientation, they described these activities overwhelmingly as "study hall." In some instances these "study hall" or "homework" days were specifically designated by the teacher and limited to these certain days. In other instances these study hall days and/or sustained silent reading were a default. In other words, if no other activity was scheduled students could "do their homework" or "read" if they chose to. Students most often felt this was a "loose" time with little accountability. One student said, "It's not like a real class; the teachers don't teach you anything and there's no grades."

### ***Few Students Refer To "Innovative" or "Enrichment" Activities as Part of Academic Lab***

Few students mentioned activities that could be classified as "enrichment." Students' impressions of the few "enrichment" activities they mentioned, however, were positive. For example, club types activities focused on student interests or project-based activities such as publishing a newspaper, or putting on a play were mentioned in a positive light. One student said, "It isn't all bad. Lots of stuff we do is so, so fun!" Another added, "I like what we do in Academic Lab. We have a lot of planned activities."

Some students described activities related to incentive programs and management of student stores within teams. These programs reward students for good behavior and/or academic work. For example, "We get bonus points that the teacher gives you...basically

play money and at the end of every quarter we have (a day) and you have an auction where you buy stuff in a store.”

Other innovative activities mentioned by students focused on community service. For example, “We’ll be outside cleaning up the track.” “Our AL is trying to get more fun stuff like community service for the hospital, like baking cookies or something.” These types of activities were not mentioned by all students; indicating that students across the entire district are not participating in these activities.

### ***Student Perceptions Reflect the Degree of Teacher Buy-In of Academic Lab***

Students most often expressed neutral opinions or were dissatisfied with how their teachers interacted with them individually during Academic Lab. Students described teachers who were “busy” during AL time and could not provide assistance them:

- ❖ “The teacher doesn’t exactly teach you during Academic Lab.”
- ❖ “The other classes the teacher actually helps you if you need help.”
- ❖ “Most teachers don’t spend their Academic Lab time doing things that are productive and help people...everyone else is complaining about them.”

Students from every focus group commented on how their Academic Lab teachers used at least some of Academic Lab time to “check their e-mail or grade papers.” For example, “A lot of teachers don’t really care. My teacher says to silent read or do your homework. S/he has stuff to do, s/he has to grade papers.”

### ***Principals Describe Academic Lab as Exclusively “Academic”***

For implementation purposes, it is important to note that principals consider AL as “teacher or team driven” and did not articulate a clear role for themselves in the implementation of AL. Principals acknowledged that AL is flexible and that this

flexibility is difficult for teachers to grasp. One administrator specifically pointed out the discrepancy in expectations of teachers as it relates to standards and curriculum for other classes by saying, “It’s a very uncertain thing for teachers in a time when curriculum is so systematically driven.” This administrator went on to say, “We’re all working around what it really is for, what it’s about, how it’s going to work and how it’s going to work for that specific school, grade and team.”

Principals also described AL as being focused on academics, a perception that is consistent with student perceptions’ of AL as “study hall.” Each Principal described a different model for tutoring type activities at their schools. “Some teams specialize and kids rotate through math, sustained silent reading, study hall ...” One Principal expressed concern over the ability to effectively tutor individuals through Academic Lab. “The numbers are high, so if I (teacher) am supposed to be helping kids with tutoring, you know you’ve got thirty kids in a class.”

Principals did not make any mention of the Academic Lab teacher serving as a student advocate in a manner articulated in the program objectives. In fact, one principal felt strongly that Academic Lab time should not be used as an Advisory Period. “Some people thought if you do middle school you need to do an advisory program...that was what middle school was all about. They (district) tried that years ago and it didn’t work. This is more directed at academics.”

### ***District Action and Further Research***

The practical impact of the extreme variability in implementation of Academic Lab is that this important aspect of the model has not been implemented as intended. District officials are recommended to create consistent expectations for AL and to

communicate those expectations effectively. Once the District has taken action to improve the implementation of AL, further research is necessary to assess if Academic Lab is being implemented as intended.

## Discipline

A reduction in student discipline referrals is an expressed outcome of the model. At the implementation stage, there is no clear perception that the model has had an impact on student discipline. In addition, future evaluation of the impact of the model on discipline must take into consideration that two different perceptions, in-class versus out-of-class, exist regarding the impact of the model on student discipline.

### *There is No Clear Perception Among Teachers that the Model has Reduced Discipline Referrals.*

The in-class perception of student discipline is based on teacher opinion. Over half of all teachers surveyed indicated that they have not noticed any change in the number of student discipline referrals since the introduction of the model (Table 25). Among the teachers who have perceived a change in discipline referrals, 77 percent believe that the number of discipline referrals has increased (Table 26).

**Table 25: Since the introduction of the new middle school model, have you noticed a change in the number of student discipline referrals? (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>No</b>	105	53	53	53
<b>Yes</b>	93	47	47	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	198	100	100	

**Table 26: The number of discipline referrals has...\* (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------------	--------------------

Increased a lot	31	33.3	33.3
Increased some	41	44.1	77.4
Stayed the same	1	1.1	78.5
Decreased some	18	19.4	97.8
Decreased a lot	2	2.2	100
Total Responses	93	100	

\* Includes only teachers who perceived a change in the number of student discipline referrals.

On the other hand, Principals perceive campuses to be “calmer.” Principal perceptions of student discipline reflect out-of-class perceptions. Principal opinions of “calmer” campuses may be due to less transition times between classes in the model. One Principal said, “There are fewer transition times, so discipline is down and the campus feels calmer as far as you’re just not always every 45 minutes up and moving. You’re only moving a shorter period (of the day) and groups of kids are not moving that much” Another added, “We’re seeing a decrease in the discipline; that I suspect is resulting in the fact that there is less transition time for kids.”

## Professional Satisfaction

Many stakeholders expressed that the implementation of the model could have a negative impact on the professional satisfaction of Kyrene middle school teachers. Therefore, the online survey included a series of questions designed to assess the professional satisfaction of Kyrene middle school teachers. The series of questions can be used as a baseline measure in future inquiries about the impact of the model on professional satisfaction.

***Kyrene Teachers Report a High Degree of Professional Satisfaction.***

Kyrene teachers reported a high degree of professional satisfaction during the first year of the model implementation. Over 80 percent of teachers either agreed or strongly agreed with three of the four professional satisfaction questions. The exception is that 64 percent of teachers believed that they are treated like a professional in the district (Tables 27-30).

**Table 27: Kyrene schools are a good place to teach. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	28	14.1	14.5	14.5
<b>Agree</b>	128	64.6	66.3	80.8
<b>Disagree</b>	32	16.2	16.6	97.4
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5	2.5	2.6	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	193	97.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	5	2.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

**Table 28: In Kyrene, I feel like I can make a difference with students. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	35	17.7	17.9	17.9
<b>Agree</b>	139	70.2	71.3	89.2
<b>Disagree</b>	16	8.1	8.2	97.4
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5	2.5	2.6	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	195	98.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	1.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

**Table 29: In Kyrene, I am treated like a professional. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	24	12.1	12.3	12.3
<b>Agree</b>	100	50.5	51.3	63.6
<b>Disagree</b>	49	24.7	25.1	88.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	22	11.1	11.3	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	195	98.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	1.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

**Table 30: I enjoy teaching at a Kyrene school. (All teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	36	18.2	18.5	18.5
<b>Agree</b>	128	64.6	65.6	84.1
<b>Disagree</b>	26	13.1	13.3	97.4
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5	2.5	2.6	100
<b>Total Responses</b>	195	98.5	100	
<b>No Response</b>	3	1.5		
<b>Total Respondents</b>	198	100		

The research team created a composite index of the professional satisfaction questions. The professional satisfaction index ranges from a value of 4 to a value of 16 with higher values indicating higher levels of professional satisfaction.

The mean scores for each teacher grouping (Core, Exploratory and Language Arts) were compared to assess differences between these teacher groups in the degree of

professional satisfaction. Core teachers were the least satisfied of the teacher groups (Table 31) and the difference in professional satisfaction between Core teachers and the other groups is statistically significant at the .05 level ( $F = 3.74, p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 31: Professional Satisfaction Index, Mean Scores by Teacher Position**

	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation
<b>Exploratory Program</b>	36	8.86	2.24
<b>Language Arts</b>	62	8.77	2.56
<b>Core</b>	89	7.91	2.23
<b>Total</b>	187	8.38	2.38

## Next Steps

The following steps pertain to the evaluation of the model in Phase 2 (program maturation). Year 2 of the evaluation includes 1) a follow-up investigation of the major implementation issues identified in Year 1, and 2) defining outcome indicators and developing the baseline data.

### *Step 1: Continue Investigating the Implementation of Academic Lab*

Academic Lab was the only major area of the model not implemented as intended. At the June 13, 2006 session before the governing board, the research team recommended that district officials take action to develop explicit expectations for AL and to communicate those expectations to schools to promote consistency in the implementation of AL. District officials accepted the recommendations and are taking steps to improve the implementation of AL. Follow-up focus groups should be conducted in fall 2006 to assess the impact of district efforts and to re-assess the implementation of AL.

### ***Step 2: Define Model Outcome Indicators***

According to district documents, the model outcomes include:

1. Increase the number of proficient students and reduce the number of novice students in reading, writing and mathematics
2. Reduce variability in academic achievement between schools
3. Improvement on another academic indicator (such as AIMS excelling, high school readiness)
4. Maintain or reduce number of disciplinary referrals
5. Provide cost savings
6. Maintain high level of teacher professional satisfaction

The preceding outcomes are a solid foundation for a future evaluation of program outcomes. In Phase 2, the preceding outcomes must be defined with greater detail and articulated into measurable terms. For example, what assessment(s) (state, district, etc.) should be used to assess academic outcomes? What additional academic indicator will be used to evaluate the program?

### ***Step 3: Establish Baseline Outcome Data***

Once the outcome indicators are articulated into measurable terms, the baseline outcome data for the model outcomes can be collected and baseline values for each outcome indicator calculated. The baseline values are used to assess change over time related to the model.

# Appendix A

## Kyrene Teacher Survey Responses

### All Teachers

**Q1a: I am currently under contract as a certified teacher for the Kyrene School District?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	198	100	100	100

**Q2a: Did you teach in a middle school in the Kyrene school district last year?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	22	11.1	11.1	11.1
Yes	176	88.9	88.9	100
Total Respondents	198	100	100	

**Q3a: The sixty-eight minute class period provides more academic time for my students.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	49	24.7	28	28
Agree	50	25.3	28.6	56.6
Disagree	21	10.6	12	68.6
Strongly Disagree	50	25.3	28.6	97.1
No Opinion	5	2.5	2.9	100
Total Responses	175	88.4	100	
No Response	23	11.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3b: With the longer class period, my students spend more academic time on task.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	37	18.7	21.1	21.1
Agree	41	20.7	23.4	44.6
Disagree	34	17.2	19.4	64
Strongly Disagree	55	27.8	31.4	95.4
No Opinion	8	4	4.6	100
Total Responses	175	88.4	100	
No Response	23	11.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3c: With the longer class period, I am able to teach with fewer class interruptions as a result of less transitions.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	41	20.7	23.3	23.3
Agree	36	18.2	20.5	43.8
Disagree	44	22.2	25	68.8
Strongly Disagree	50	25.3	28.4	97.2
No Opinion	5	2.5	2.8	100
Total Responses	176	88.9	100	
No Response	22	11.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3d: Fewer out of class interruptions have helped me to increase the amount of academic time on task for my students.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	34	17.2	44.2	44.2
Agree	32	16.2	41.6	85.7
Disagree	4	2	5.2	90.9
Strongly Disagree	3	1.5	3.9	94.8
No Opinion	4	2	5.2	100
Total Responses	77	38.9	100	
No Response	121	61.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3e: With the longer class period, I am able to provide more differentiated instruction for students.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	19	9.6	10.9	10.9
Agree	58	29.3	33.1	44
Disagree	58	29.3	33.1	77.1
Strongly Disagree	39	19.7	22.3	99.4
No Opinion	1	0.5	0.6	100
Total Responses	175	88.4	100	
No Response	23	11.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3f: During the longer class period, I am able to interact more with each of my students on a personal level.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	20	10.1	11.4	11.4
Agree	71	35.9	40.3	51.7
Disagree	46	23.2	26.1	77.8
Strongly Disagree	36	18.2	20.5	98.3
No Opinion	3	1.5	1.7	100
Total Responses	176	88.9	100	
No Response	22	11.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3g: With the longer period, I have the opportunity to experiment with new methods of instruction.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	24	12.1	13.6	13.6
Agree	70	35.4	39.8	53.4
Disagree	42	21.2	23.9	77.3
Strongly Disagree	34	17.2	19.3	96.6
No Opinion	6	3	3.4	100
Total Responses	176	88.9	100	
No Response	22	11.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3h: Since the introduction of the longer period, I have changed the way I teach.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	31	15.7	17.7	17.7
Agree	70	35.4	40	57.7
Disagree	49	24.7	28	85.7
Strongly Disagree	17	8.6	9.7	95.4
No Opinion	8	4	4.6	100
Total Responses	175	88.4	100	
No Response	23	11.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3i: With the longer class period, I am able to present the class material in greater depth.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	28	14.1	15.9	15.9
Agree	54	27.3	30.7	46.6
Disagree	46	23.2	26.1	72.7
Strongly Disagree	42	21.2	23.9	96.6
No Opinion	6	3	3.4	100
Total Responses	176	88.9	100	
No Response	22	11.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3j: Compared to last year, my students are learning the class material in greater depth.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	16	8.1	9.2	9.2
Agree	42	21.2	24.1	33.3
Disagree	52	26.3	29.9	63.2
Strongly Disagree	54	27.3	31	94.3
No Opinion	10	5.1	5.7	100
Total Responses	174	87.9	100	
No Response	24	12.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3k: Compared to last year, where are you in the curriculum?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Significantly behind	40	20.2	23	23
A little behind	40	20.2	23	46
At about the same place	62	31.3	35.6	81.6
A little ahead	26	13.1	14.9	96.6
Significantly ahead	6	3	3.4	100
Total Responses	174	87.9	100	
No Response	24	12.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3l: The resources and materials adopted by the district are conducive to teaching with a longer class period.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	7	3.5	4	4
Agree	56	28.3	32	36
Disagree	41	20.7	23.4	59.4
Strongly Disagree	40	20.2	22.9	82.3
No Opinion	31	15.7	17.7	100
Total Responses	175	88.4	100	
No Response	23	11.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q3m: Since the introduction of the new middle school model my students are completing homework assignments on time.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
More often	10	5.1	5.9	5.9
At the same rate as last year	110	55.6	64.7	70.6
Less often	50	25.3	29.4	100
Total Responses	170	85.9	100	
No Response	28	14.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q4a: Are you an Exploratory Program Teacher?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	139	70.2	79	79
Yes	37	18.7	21	100
Total Responses	176	88.9	100	
No Response	22	11.1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q5a: Are you part of a teacher team?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	15	7.6	10.8	10.8
Yes	124	62.6	89.2	100
Total Responses	139	70.2	100	
No Response	59	29.8		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q5c: Compared to last year, are there**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
More teachers in your teacher team	8	4	6.5	6.5
The same number of teachers	41	20.7	33.1	39.5
Fewer teachers	75	37.9	60.5	100
Total Responses	124	62.6	100	
No Response	74	37.4		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q5d: Compared to last year, the teacher team meetings are more productive.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	9	4.5	7.3	7.3
Agree	26	13.1	21	28.2
Disagree	44	22.2	35.5	63.7
Strongly Disagree	33	16.7	26.6	90.3
No Opinion	12	6.1	9.7	100
Total Responses	124	62.6	100	
No Response	74	37.4		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q5e: Compared to last year, the teacher teams provide more opportunities to communicate with students on a personal level.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	10	5.1	8.1	8.1
Agree	26	13.1	21	29
Disagree	42	21.2	33.9	62.9
Strongly Disagree	35	17.7	28.2	91.1
No Opinion	11	5.6	8.9	100
Total Responses	124	62.6	100	
No Response	74	37.4		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6a: This year, did you participate in professional development on how to teach with the longer class periods?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	145	73.2	73.2	73.2
Yes	53	26.8	26.8	100
Total Responses	198	100	100	

**Q6b: The professional development I participated in was sufficient to prepare me to teach with the longer class periods.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	2	1	3.8	3.8
Agree	13	6.6	25	28.8
Disagree	20	10.1	38.5	67.3
Strongly Disagree	10	5.1	19.2	86.5
No Opinion	7	3.5	13.5	100
Total Responses	52	26.3	100	
No Response	146	73.7		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6c: I am adequately prepared to provide quality instruction with the longer class periods.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	54	27.3	27.8	27.8
Agree	100	50.5	51.5	79.4
Disagree	21	10.6	10.8	90.2
Strongly Disagree	10	5.1	5.2	95.4
No Opinion	9	4.5	4.6	100
Total Responses	194	98	100	
No Response	4	2		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6d: There is still more for me to learn about how to teach effectively with the longer class periods.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	17	8.6	8.8	8.8
Agree	87	43.9	45.1	53.9
Disagree	41	20.7	21.2	75.1
Strongly Disagree	24	12.1	12.4	87.6
No Opinion	24	12.1	12.4	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6e: At times, I run out of activities or materials by the end of class periods.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	9	4.5	4.6	4.6
Agree	42	21.2	21.5	26.2
Disagree	68	34.3	34.9	61
Strongly Disagree	74	37.4	37.9	99
No Opinion	2	1	1	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6f: I am prepared to use the Academic Lab productively.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	16	8.1	8.3	8.3
Agree	36	18.2	18.7	26.9
Disagree	44	22.2	22.8	49.7
Strongly Disagree	66	33.3	34.2	83.9
No Opinion	31	15.7	16.1	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q6g: I have received guidance on the expectations for Academic Lab.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	9	4.5	4.7	4.7
Agree	73	36.9	37.8	42.5
Disagree	42	21.2	21.8	64.2
Strongly Disagree	39	19.7	20.2	84.5
No Opinion	30	15.2	15.5	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q7a: Since the introduction of the new middle school model, have you noticed a change in the number of student discipline referrals?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	105	53	53	53
Yes	93	47	47	100
Total Responses	198	100	100	

**Q7b: The number of discipline referrals has...**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Increased a lot	31	15.7	33.3	33.3
Increased some	41	20.7	44.1	77.4
Stayed the same	1	0.5	1.1	78.5
Decreased some	18	9.1	19.4	97.8
Decreased a lot	2	1	2.2	100
Total Responses	93	47	100	
No Response	105	53		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q7c: My students have difficulty paying attention for the full class period.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	66	33.3	33.8	33.8
Agree	72	36.4	36.9	70.8
Disagree	41	20.7	21	91.8
Strongly Disagree	13	6.6	6.7	98.5
No Opinion	3	1.5	1.5	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q7d: My students have difficulty staying engaged for the full class period.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	62	31.3	31.8	31.8
Agree	73	36.9	37.4	69.2
Disagree	43	21.7	22.1	91.3
Strongly Disagree	14	7.1	7.2	98.5
No Opinion	3	1.5	1.5	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q7e: My students need more frequent class periods to learn their best.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	58	29.3	29.6	29.6
Agree	41	20.7	20.9	50.5
Disagree	52	26.3	26.5	77
Strongly Disagree	18	9.1	9.2	86.2
No Opinion	27	13.6	13.8	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q7f: How often do students use class time to work on homework assignments?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Daily	24	12.1	12.5	12.5
A few times a week	58	29.3	30.2	42.7
Once a week	26	13.1	13.5	56.3
Once every two weeks	14	7.1	7.3	63.5
Rarely or never	70	35.4	36.5	100
Total Responses	192	97	100	
No Response	6	3		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q8a: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the amount of time available for instruction.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very positive	36	18.2	18.4	18.4
Positive	67	33.8	34.2	52.6
No Difference	22	11.1	11.2	63.8
Negative	30	15.2	15.3	79.1
Very Negative	37	18.7	18.9	98
No Opinion	4	2	2	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q8b: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the depth of material covered in class.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very positive	32	16.2	16.3	16.3
Positive	56	28.3	28.6	44.9
No Difference	48	24.2	24.5	69.4
Negative	28	14.1	14.3	83.7
Very Negative	29	14.6	14.8	98.5
No Opinion	3	1.5	1.5	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q8c: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on the opportunity to try new teaching methods?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very positive	19	9.6	9.7	9.7
Positive	71	35.9	36.2	45.9
No Difference	64	32.3	32.7	78.6
Negative	14	7.1	7.1	85.7
Very Negative	17	8.6	8.7	94.4
No Opinion	11	5.6	5.6	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q8d: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on reducing class interruptions?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very positive	17	8.6	8.7	8.7
Positive	41	20.7	20.9	29.6
No Difference	77	38.9	39.3	68.9
Negative	33	16.7	16.8	85.7
Very Negative	21	10.6	10.7	96.4
No Opinion	7	3.5	3.6	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q8e: In your opinion, what has been the impact of the new middle school model on student achievement.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very positive	11	5.6	5.6	5.6
Positive	36	18.2	18.5	24.1
No Difference	81	40.9	41.5	65.6
Negative	35	17.7	17.9	83.6
Very Negative	24	12.1	12.3	95.9
No Opinion	8	4	4.1	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q9a: This year, I have participated in professional development on how to develop interdisciplinary/integrated curricula or teach interdisciplinary/integrated material.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	104	52.5	52.5	52.5
Yes	94	47.5	47.5	100
Total Responses	198	100	100	

**Q9b: The professional development I participated in related to interdisciplinary/integrated curricula was sufficient to prepare me to teach in this manner.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	5	2.5	5.3	5.3
Agree	50	25.3	53.2	58.5
Disagree	25	12.6	26.6	85.1
Strongly Disagree	7	3.5	7.4	92.6
No Opinion	7	3.5	7.4	100
Total Responses	94	47.5	100	
No Response	104	52.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q9c: I am adequately prepared to provide interdisciplinary/integrated instruction.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	41	20.7	21.2	21.2
Agree	105	53	54.4	75.6
Disagree	28	14.1	14.5	90.2
Strongly Disagree	6	3	3.1	93.3
No Opinion	13	6.6	6.7	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q9d: In general, the teachers at my school are providing interdisciplinary/integrated instruction.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	15	7.6	7.7	7.7
Agree	91	46	46.7	54.4
Disagree	49	24.7	25.1	79.5
Strongly Disagree	13	6.6	6.7	86.2
No Opinion	27	13.6	13.8	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q10a: Kyrene schools are a good place to teach.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	28	14.1	14.5	14.5
Agree	128	64.6	66.3	80.8
Disagree	32	16.2	16.6	97.4
Strongly Disagree	5	2.5	2.6	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q10b: In Kyrene, I feel like I can make a difference with students.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	35	17.7	17.9	17.9
Agree	139	70.2	71.3	89.2
Disagree	16	8.1	8.2	97.4
Strongly Disagree	5	2.5	2.6	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q10c: In Kyrene, I am treated like a professional.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	24	12.1	12.3	12.3
Agree	100	50.5	51.3	63.6
Disagree	49	24.7	25.1	88.7
Strongly Disagree	22	11.1	11.3	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q10d: I enjoy teaching at a Kyrene school.**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Agree	36	18.2	18.5	18.5
Agree	128	64.6	65.6	84.1
Disagree	26	13.1	13.3	97.4
Strongly Disagree	5	2.5	2.6	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q11a: Are you teaching a new content area this year?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	160	80.8	82.1	82.1
Yes	35	17.7	17.9	100
Total Responses	195	98.5	100	
No Response	3	1.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q11b: Are you teaching two subjects (also referred to as “diads” or “D-pods”)?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	173	87.4	88.3	88.3
Yes	23	11.6	11.7	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q11c: Are you teaching in a content area for which you have been trained or have received formal education?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	12	6.1	6.1	6.1
Yes	184	92.9	93.9	100
Total Responses	196	99	100	
No Response	2	1		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q12a: What grade level do you teach primarily?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
6th	55	27.8	29.4	29.4
7th	61	30.8	32.6	62
8th	71	35.9	38	100
Total Responses	187	94.4	100	
No Response	11	5.6		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q13a: Do you teach in one of the exploratory programs?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	153	77.3	78.9	78.9
Yes	41	20.7	21.1	100
Total Responses	194	98	100	
No Response	4	2		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Q14a: Do you teach language arts?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
No	127	64.1	66.1	66.1
Yes	65	32.8	33.9	100
Total Responses	192	97	100	
No Response	6	3		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Composite of Professional Satisfaction**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
4	19	9.6	9.8	9.8
5	6	3	3.1	13
6	7	3.5	3.6	16.6
7	9	4.5	4.7	21.2
8	75	37.9	38.9	60.1
9	31	15.7	16.1	76.2
10	20	10.1	10.4	86.5
11	11	5.6	5.7	92.2
12	5	2.5	2.6	94.8
13	4	2	2.1	96.9
14	3	1.5	1.6	98.4
16	3	1.5	1.6	100
Total Responses	193	97.5	100	
No Response	5	2.5		
Total Respondents	198	100		

**Teacher Position (LA, EP and Core Teachers)**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Exploratory Teachers	38	19.2	20	20
Language Arts Teachers	62	31.3	32.6	52.6
Core Teachers	90	45.5	47.4	100
Total Responses	190	96	100	
No Response	8	4		
Total Respondents	198	100		

## **Appendix B**

### **Principals Interview Protocol**

#### **Introduction:**

Hello. Thank you so much for meeting with me today. I know how busy things are at the building, and how hard it is to get away some times!

I'm Suzie DePrez and I am a graduate student in Ed Leadership and Policy Studies at ASU. As you may know Dr. David Garcia has been contracted to complete an evaluation of the current middle school model here in Kyrene. As part of that evaluation I would like you to talk about how things are going this year in your school as the new schedule is implemented.

Before we get started, let me explain a few things. I am interested in your personal opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. Your comments are confidential and no personal names or schools will be identified in the summary report. I am taping the session because I don't want to miss anything...and I can't write that fast! Only Dr. Garcia and I will have access to the tape recordings.

Let's get started...tell me a little about yourself...how long have you been a principal and a little about your professional background?

**Topic 1: General Opinions:**

- What is your opinion of the new schedule?
  - Going into this year what were the major concerns principals had about the new schedule?
  - In your opinion, have those concerns been realized?
  - What are the major issues that you have had to deal with related to the new schedule?

**Topic 2: Preparedness/Resources:**

- As you implemented the new schedule at your school what resources/instructional professional development assistance etc. was made available to your staff?

**Topic 3: Student and Staff Adaptation:**

- In your opinion, how are the students doing with the new schedule?
- How about your teachers?

**Topic 4: Teacher Teams:**

- Tell me about the process used by your school to create the teacher teams?
  - How does this process differ from last year?

**Concluding Questions:**

- Overall, how has this year gone with the new schedule?
  - Anything we didn't talk about that you want to add?

## Appendix C

### Student Focus Group Protocol

**Introduction (Upon entering ask each student their name, grade and where they went to school last year):**

Hello! Before we get started I want to thank you for participating in our discussion today. My name is Mrs. DePrez, I am an administrator in the Mesa School District, and I used to be a sixth grade teacher and a junior high school assistant principal too. I am going to school at ASU to get a doctorate degree. Do you know what that is? Any of you think you might want to go to ASU? To get my doctorate degree I have to do some research and I am going to ask you some questions about what you do in school as part of my research...O.K.? Then, what I have to do is write a report and turn it into my teacher at ASU. My teacher's name is Dr. Garcia.

Before we get started, let me explain a few things. There are no right or wrong answers. I have a recorder here because I don't want to miss anything...and I can't write that fast! Please make sure you speak up and try not to speak when someone else is talking so the recorder gets what you say...O.K.? Now, when I write my report it won't have any of your names in it because your names are confidential. What does confidential mean? I will write about what you talked about, but my teacher or anyone who reads my report won't know who said what. Does that make sense?

We should be finished in about 30 minutes. Let's get started by going around the table and introducing yourself... Please tell us your first name.

### **Topic 1: Academic Lab:**

- At school you have a class called Academic Lab. What do you think of Academic Lab?
- Think back to last week. What did you do in Academic Lab?
- How are the activities you do in Academic Lab different or the same as what you do in other classes like reading and math?
  - Homework?
  - Health?
- Anything you want to add about Academic Lab that we didn't talk about?

### **Topic 2: New Class Schedule:**

- Now, I want to talk about your other classes like reading, mathematics, social studies and science. Do you ever find it difficult to pay attention for a whole class period? How often?
- Do you think classes are too long, too short or about right? (probe)
  - All classes? Some classes? Which ones?
- Do you ever do your homework in these classes?
  - If so, how often?
  - How about Academic Lab? Do you ever do your homework in AL?

Thanks so much for your help! You guys were great!

## **Appendix D**

### **Exploratory Teachers Focus Group Protocol**

#### **Introduction:**

Good afternoon! Before we get started I want to thank you for participating in our discussion today. My name is Suzie DePrez, I am a graduate student at ASU and I'll be the facilitator of today's discussion.

As you may know Dr. David Garcia has been contracted to complete an evaluation of the middle school model here in Kyrene. As part of that evaluation I would like you to talk about how you think things are going this year in your classes as the new schedule is implemented.

Before we get started, let me explain a few things. I am interested in your personal opinions. There are no right or wrong answers. You all do not have to agree, come to consensus, or defend your points. That's not what this is about. So, please feel free to share your opinion even if it is different from others in the group.

Our discussion will be on a first name basis. Your comments are confidential and no names will be attached to any report. I will tape the session because I don't want to miss anything...and I can't write that fast! Please make sure you speak up and take turns talking.

We should be finished in about 30-45 minutes. We won't take a formal break, but of course feel free to leave the room if you need to.

Let's get started by going around the table and introducing yourself... first names please.

**Topic 1: General Opinions:**

- What is your opinion of the new middle school model?
- What did you feel the purpose of changing the new model was?
- Going into this year what was the biggest concern that the exploratory teachers had about the new model?
- In your opinion, have these concerns been realized?

**Topic 2: Preparedness:**

- How well prepared were you to teach in the new model?
- What instructional assistance has been available to you from the district? At the school level?
  - How helpful is the instructional assistance?
  - Did any instructional assistance include classroom strategies for extended class periods?

**Topic 3: Instruction**

- Describe your typical class period structure...first, next, then...
  - How does this compare to your class structure last year?
  - Compared to last school year where are your students at in the curriculum?
  - Have you made any changes in your use of materials or activities this year?
- What impact has the new model had on the exploratory program in your school?

**Topic 4: Student Experiences:**

- Tell me about how students are doing in the new model?

**Concluding Questions:**

- In your opinion what is the biggest drawback of the new model?
- In your opinion what is the biggest opportunity associated with the new model?
- Anything we didn't talk about that you would like to add?

That concludes our discussion. Thank you so much for your input!