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Ensuring optimal learning environments so every student can succeed in a global society!
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In North Carolina, the use of the NC TWC Survey results are integral components of:

- District and School Improvement Plans
- Educator Evaluations and School Administrator Evaluations
- The state compliance plan for ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) funding (Titles I, IIA, IV). ESSA strongly emphasizes the use of research-based strategies for school improvement and the use of the NCTWC survey data is mentioned numerous times in the state plan.

It is supported by the North Carolina Budget and administered through NCDPI.
WHAT IS THE NCTWC SURVEY?

The NC TWC survey is an anonymous, online survey of teachers and all school-based licensed educators in the state of North Carolina every two years.

- Measures teaching conditions based on the standards adopted by the NC State Board of Education in 1999
- Questions have been shown to be connected to student achievement and teacher retention; externally validated
- The school is the unit of measurement
- NC was the first to administer this statewide survey starting in 2002; more than 16 other states followed
- More than 100,000 educators have completed the biennial survey in NC since 2008, representing 86-91% of the educators in the state
INGERSOLL ADDRESSED FOUR RESEARCH QUESTIONS

**PART A**

1.) To What Extent Do Schools Focus on Instructional Leadership?

2.) Is Instructional Leadership Related to Student Achievement?

**PART B**

3.) What Role Do Teachers Have in School Decision-Making?

4.) Is Teacher Decision-Making Related to Student Achievement?
Dr. Ingersoll’s recent research on teaching conditions used the teacher working conditions survey which “is one of the largest and best sources of information on school conditions and student achievement.”

* Public Schools (Includes Charter Schools); All schools met the 50% minimum threshold for response rates. (in NC it is 40%)
KEY FINDING: CONNECTIONS TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Students in schools with higher levels of instructional leadership and teacher decision-making perform at least 10 percentage points* higher in both mathematics and English language arts proficiency on their state assessments.

High poverty schools often lack the instructional and teacher decision-making elements that strongly relate to increased student achievement, limiting students’ potential.
RESEARCH PART A:
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP (IL)
LEVELS OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

- Overall Average Instructional Leadership: 61%
- Teachers Can Raise Concerns: 43%
- Atmosphere of Trust in School: 49%
- Leaders Support Teachers: 57%
- Faculty and Leaders Share Vision: 57%
- School Improvement Team is Effective: 58%
- Faculty Recognized for Accomplishments: 60%
- Teachers Get Effective Feedback: 65%
- Teacher Evaluation is Consistent: 67%
- Teacher Evaluation is Objective: 73%
- Leaders Facilitate Data Use: 91%
- Teachers Held to High Standards: 94%

Percent Schools where Teachers Agree/Strongly Agree
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP & STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Percentile Ranking of School’s Student Proficiency, by the Overall Level of Instructional Leadership, after Controlling for School Characteristics

Levels of Instructional Leadership

- Lowest IL: 44
- Low: 47
- Average: 50
- High: 53
- Highest IL: 55

Percentile Ranking of Schools’ Student Proficiency
IL ELEMENTS MOST TIED TO ACHIEVEMENT

1. Holding teachers to high standards
2. Providing an effective school improvement team
3. Fostering a shared vision for the school

But, Schools Sometimes Lag in These....
• In 42% of schools’ faculty report there is NOT an effective School Improvement Team
• In 43% of schools’ faculty report there is NOT a Shared Vision among Faculty and Leaders
RESEARCH PART B:
THE ROLE OF TEACHERS IN
SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING (T DM)
THE ROLE OF TEACHERS IN SCHOOL DECISION-MAKING

OVERALL AVERAGE TEACHER ROLE

- PROVIDING INPUT ON SCH BUDGET: 6%
- SELECTING NEW TEACHERS FOR SCHOOL: 12%
- DETERMINING CONTENT OF PROF. DEV.: 13%
- ESTABLISHING STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROCEDURES: 36%
- SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANNING: 45%
- SELECTING STUDENT GRADING AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES: 63%
- SELECTING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS: 64%
- DEVISING TEACHING TECHNIQUES: 88%

Percent Schools where Teachers have Moderate/Large Roles
CONNECTION OF TEACHERS’ ROLES IN D-M TO ACHIEVEMENT

(Percentile Ranking of School’s Student Proficiency, by the Overall Level of Teacher Decision-making, after Controlling for School Characteristics)

Levels of Teacher Decision-making

- Lowest T DM: 45
- Low: 47
- Average: 50
- High: 53
- Highest T DM: 56

Percentile Ranking of Schools’ Student Proficiency
1. Teachers’ role in establishing student discipline procedures

2. Teachers’ role in school improvement planning

But, Schools Sometimes Lag in These....

- Only 45% of schools’ faculties report teachers have a moderate to large role in school improvement planning

- Only 36% of schools’ faculties report teachers have a moderate to large role in establishing student discipline procedures
More Teacher Involvement in School Improvement Planning

Having a More Effective School Improvement Team

Higher Student Achievement

But, Schools Often Lag in These...

- In 55% of schools report teachers have a SMALL or NO role in School Improvement Planning
- In 42% of schools report there is NOT an effective School Improvement Team
Data showed there is an imbalance in Instructional Leadership and Teacher Roles in Decision-Making.

Yet these are among the areas most associated with improved student achievement.

- High Standards
- Teacher Accountability
- Teacher “Voice”
- Shared Vision
In High Poverty Schools The Imbalance Of School And Teacher Leadership Elements Are Exacerbated

Therefore, students in these schools are often at an even greater disadvantage!
In 42% of schools the faculty report there is **NOT an Effective School Improvement Team**

In 43% of schools the faculty report there is **NOT a Shared Vision among Faculty and Leaders**

In 55% of schools the faculty report teachers have only a **SMALL or NO role in School Improvement Planning**

In 64% of schools the faculty report teachers have only a **SMALL or NO role in Establishing Student Discipline Procedures**

Let’s look at the findings as related to real numbers in the study.....
SUMMARY OF INGERSOLL RESEARCH FINDINGS

1. Schools vary in IL and T DM

2. Higher Poverty Schools usually less IL and T DM

3. Both IL and T DM related to student achievement

4. Some areas of IL and T DM more strongly related to student achievement

5. Schools often lag in those elements of IL and areas of T DM that are most strongly related to student achievement
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NOTE: The rates of agreement are the percentage of teachers and administrators in agreement to the each of the five questions. (This is slightly different from the way the information is displayed in Dr. Ingersoll’s full report as he used the percentage of schools where teachers agreed.)
### COLE: INGERSOLL FINDINGS & DATA ACROSS NC DISTRICTS

#### COLE’s Analyses of 2018 NC Data
Spring 2019
All Districts Comparison
Examples below are randomly selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Leadership Items</th>
<th>Teacher Decision-Making Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty and leadership have a shared vision</td>
<td>The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th># Total Educators</th>
<th>COLE %</th>
<th>INGERSOLL %</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Roles of teachers in establishing student discipline procedures</th>
<th>Roles of teachers in planning school improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>120880</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT A</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT B</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT C</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT D</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT E</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT F</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT G</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT H</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT I</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT J</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Heatmap Key
- % Agreement less than 30
- % Agreement between 30-50
- % Agreement between 50-70
- % Agreement between 70-80
- % Agreement between 80-90
- % Agreement more than 90

#### School Leadership
- 84.3% for The faculty and leadership have a shared vision
- 93.1% for Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction
- 84.1% for The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school

#### Teacher Decision-Making
- 61.5% for Roles of teachers in establishing student discipline procedures
- 77.7% for Roles of teachers in planning school improvement
## COLE: SELECT SCHOOLS IN A LOW PERFORMING NC DISTRICT

### School Leadership Items

| Center for Optimal Learning Environments Analyses | School Leadership Items |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| 2018 NC Data Spring 2019 School Comparisons in District | The faculty and leadership have a shared vision | Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction | The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school | Roles of teachers in establishing student discipline procedures | Roles of teachers in planning school improvement |

| North Carolina | 84.3 | 93.1 | 84.1 | 61.5 | 77.7 |
| DISTRICT       | 76.3 | 86.7 | 77.5 | 56.6 | 71.4 |
| ELEMENTARY A   | 90.7 | 97.7 | 95.2 | 75.6 | 92.7 |
| ELEMENTARY B   | 92.9 | 95.3 | 86.0 | 79.5 | 97.0 |
| ELEMENTARY C   | 79.6 | 92.2 | 87.8 | 47.8 | 66.0 |
| ELEMENTARY D   | 84.4 | 91.1 | 91.1 | 54.8 | 88.6 |
| ELEMENTARY E   | 27.3 | 33.3 | 35.7 | 35.6 | 44.2 |
| ELEMENTARY F   | 84.4 | 91.1 | 91.1 | 54.8 | 88.6 |
| ELEMENTARY G   | 68.8 | 81.6 | 69.4 | 53.1 | 71.7 |
| MIDDLE A       | 38.3 | 73.4 | 46.4 | 32.8 | 35.6 |
| MIDDLE B       | 68.0 | 81.6 | 79.6 | 58.0 | 77.6 |
| MIDDLE C       | 89.4 | 100.0 | 81.4 | 63.0 | 64.4 |
| MIDDLE D       | 61.2 | 80.8 | 53.3 | 22.9 | 40.0 |
| HIGH A         | 91.7 | 93.4 | 94.2 | 71.2 | 76.3 |
| HIGH B         | 42.7 | 80.0 | 57.5 | 21.6 | 61.6 |
| HIGH C         | 74.7 | 88.0 | 66.2 | 56.2 | 54.2 |

**HEATMAP KEY**

- % Agreement less than 30
- % Agreement between 30-50
- % Agreement between 50-70
- % Agreement between 70-80
- % Agreement between 80-90
- % Agreement more than 90
2018 NCTWC Survey: Connections to Student Achievement and Teacher Retention

ANALYSES OF KEY FINDINGS FOR POLICY MAKERS

CONNECTING INGERSOLL ELEMENTS AND TEACHER RETENTION

Constructs and Teacher Retention

School Leadership continues to be the primary influence educators cite as their willingness to remain teaching in their current school. Thirty percent of the respondents in 2018 (approximately 20,000 teachers) listed this as their answer.

The percentage of answers indicating the construct of School Leadership as the reason teachers wish to remain in their school may be of importance to policy makers because of the connection Dr. Ingersoll made to student achievement and School Leadership. Of note should also be the percentages of survey respondents that list Teacher Leadership (16%) and Managing Student Conduct (11%) in this bigger picture, since both aspects are also discussed in Dr. Ingersoll’s research. Note the small role Professional Development (2%) plays in why teachers say they wish to remain in their school.

Understanding the potential implications of these data is important to all policy makers in North Carolina because of the connection to student achievement and teacher retention. As Dr. Ingersoll states in his research report, this data can provide a roadmap for policymakers on strategies for improving schools. It also helps policy makers better utilize their often limited federal and state resources for school improvement.

INGERSOLL ELEMENTS: LOW AND HIGH PERFORMING SCHOOLS

The five Ingersoll elements were analyzed as related to the 2017-18 North Carolina list of low-performing schools. In North Carolina, schools that receive a Student Performance Grade of ‘F’ or ‘P’ and a School Growth Status of “Not Met” or “Not Met” are classified as low-performing. Student Performance Grades are calculated as part of North Carolina’s ESSA plan. The plan’s weighted model of 8% achievement and 10% growth was indicators relevant for Elementary/Middle and High Schools. The School Growth Status is based on the school’s EVAAS scores and the status is determined according to an index set by the state. For the purpose of this analysis, schools on the low-performing list were categorized as “low” and all other schools were categorized as “high”.

In each of the five elements of leadership identified by Dr. Ingersoll to have the strongest connection to student achievement, the low-performing schools had lower rates of agreement. Three elements each showed a drop of at least seven percentage points when comparing high-performing schools to low-performing schools. The elements were:

- The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.
- The roles of teachers in planning school improvement.
- The roles of teachers in establishing school discipline procedures.

Figure 5: Ingersoll Elements and School Performance Grades
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New, Quantifiable Data showing the connection to student achievement of five specific school leadership elements.

Not only for all schools, the data is especially compelling for high poverty schools, where billions of dollars are spent each year on school improvement.

The ‘fixes’ to improve schools using this research as the basis are NOT resource-heavy.

The infrastructures to utilize federal and local resources towards these fixes... Are already in place via state and local ESSA Plans.
INTEGRATING THIS RESEARCH INTO STATE PRIORITIES

STATE PRIORITIES under ESSA

NCTWC SURVEY

TITLE I FUNDING

LEANDRO

TITLE IIA FUNDING

EQUITY
The NC Regional Support Structure is crucial to support and work with schools and districts to use the NC TWC data for school improvement.
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2020 NCTWC SURVEY

www.ASQNC.com

Save the Date

What: NCTWC Survey
When: March 2-31, 2020
Who: The NCTWC Survey is for all licensed school-based educators.
Where: WWW.ASQNC.COM
Why: Teaching conditions in schools are important for many reasons. Whether it’s their relationship to student learning or strong influence on teacher retention, research continues to confirm these data matter.

The biennial NCTWC Survey documents the collective voices of licensed school-based educators. The data from the anonymous survey are one component of the on-going process for collaborative school and district improvement plans across the state. With nine iterations of the NCTWC Survey and over 100,000 respondents in 2018 (91 percent) to critical questions about their workplace, analyses have been consistent and clear: the conditions teachers face in schools and classrooms are essential elements to improving student achievement and teacher retention.
Real-time response rates are shown beside each school and district.

Access to help is via electronic form on the website and is used for items such as replacement codes, headcount adjustments, general questions, etc.

Weekly incentives (private monies) for schools reaching 100% response rate.

Web results approximately 6 weeks after the close of survey - item analysis and comparison to 2018.

Policy consultation and training.
WHAT’S NEW?
Addition of new sections for questions which are reflective of today’s school and classroom environments:

1. Equity
2. School Safety and Bullying

2020 will also see:

1. A Comprehensive Communications Plan*
2. A new Toolkit* for district and school leaders, focusing on the use of the Ingersoll findings in their School Improvement Plans

*See the next two slides for details.
2020 COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

✓ Target dates for all communications so you can plan ahead

✓ Shared common talking points specifically for the events leading up to, during, and after the survey

✓ You can customize these common talking points for your stakeholder audience

✓ Share what you are communicating (Twitter, Facebook, newsletter, etc.) so it can be placed in the News section of the website
NCDPI has scheduled training for leaders in November.

*The new NCTWC 2020 toolkit will focus on using the Ingersoll research in school and district improvement plans so schools can use their own NCTWC data in a research-based, comprehensive plan for improvement.*

- Focus on the latest research-based strategies for school improvement (Including Ingersoll’s Key Findings)
- Develop specific goals for the next year based on school/district data
- Will be downloadable and ready to use by facilitators and session participants
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THANK YOU!

For more information contact:

Cynthia M. Martin, Ed.D.
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
Director of District & Regional Support (DRS)
Email: Cynthia.martin@dpi.nc.gov
Office: 919-807-4007
Fax: 919-807-3362
Cell: 919-727-4584

Ann Maddock, CEO
Center for Optimal learning Environments
Email: amaddock@optimallearningenvironments.com
Cell: 919-600-4945
Ingersoll found students in schools with higher levels of school leadership and teacher leadership (as in the NCTWC Survey sections) perform at least 10 percentage points higher in both mathematics and English language arts proficiency on their state assessments (*After allowing for poverty and other demographic factors.)

The elements (aka: specific questions in the NCTWC Survey) of school leadership with the greatest connection to student achievement are school leaders who: 1. Hold teachers to high standards; 2. Provide an effective school improvement team; 3. Foster a shared vision for the school.

The elements of teacher leadership with the greatest connection to student achievement are schools which involve teachers in: 1. Establishing student discipline procedures; 2. School improvement planning.

Just as importantly, Ingersoll found that school leaders implement the five elements differently in schools, with a strong preference of holding teachers to high standards, yet all five elements are strongly connected to student success.

In high poverty schools, this imbalance is exacerbated, often placing students in these schools at an even greater disadvantage.
Complete Copies of Related Articles and Reports
www.gse.upenn.edu/faculty/ingersoll

For further information and guidance on using Dr. Ingersoll’s research in education policy towards school improvement, please contact his liaison for this work,
Ann Maddock 919.600.4945
amaddock@optimallearningenvironments.com