THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF
PHILADELPHIA

District-Wide Survey Technical Report

Updated November 2022

"Representativeness of Respondents" section (pp. 14-24) added September 2023; all other information remains unchanged.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The School District of Philadelphia (SDP) District-Wide Survey (DWS) represents a unique opportunity for students, parents/guardians, teachers, principals/assistant principals, and support staff in Philadelphia's District, Charter, and Alternative schools to share their perspectives and provide feedback about how they experience and perceive their schools. Our goal is that the feedback from the surveys be rigorous, actionable data that can be used to improve our city's schools.

This report describes the framework that guided survey development, the administration of the surveys, the processes of survey reliability testing and validation, and the construction of school-level scores for reports. With an eye toward the goal of creating an equitable system of schools, survey feedback provides a more complete picture of Philadelphia schools than relying solely on traditional measures of school success. By considering the perspectives of different groups in a school, the data derived from these surveys can help pinpoint what is working well in a school along with areas that need to be improved.

History of Survey Development

The DWS program began in 2014-15, with surveys for four stakeholder groups: students, parents/guardians, teachers, and principals. The design of the four initial surveys was conducted by researchers in the SDP Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) and the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education (Penn GSE). The design process drew from extensive research on effective schools and comprehensive school reform and the work of Bryk and his colleagues at The University of Chicago Consortium on School Research,[1] who found that five school improvement domains (now called the "5Essentials"[2]) were strongly related to student achievement gains in Chicago Public Schools[3] and schools across Illinois.[4] The survey instruments were designed to capture topics similar to the 5Essentials, with questions drawn and/or adapted from prior SDP surveys as well as the 5Essentials surveys.

---

[1] Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

[2] See https://uchicagoimpact.org/our-offerings/5essentials.

[3] Hart, H., Young, C., Chen, A., Zou, A., & Allensworth, E.M. (2020). Supporting school improvement: Early findings from reexamination of the 5Essentials survey. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Consortium on School Research. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/supporting-school-improvement

[4] Klugman, J.; Gordon, M.F., Sebring, P.B. and Sporte, S.E. (2015). "A First Look at the 5Essentials in Illinois Schools." Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. https://consortium.uchicago.edu/publications/first-look-5essentials-illinois-schools

Over time, the surveys have been reviewed and revised based on feedback from students, teachers, school administrators, principals, parents/guardians, and Central Office staff via focus groups and cognitive interviews.[5] In 2019, the surveys were revisited, and further stakeholder feedback was gathered via focus groups and an online survey. Based on the review of stakeholder feedback and statistical analyses, minor question-level changes were made to each of the four original surveys in 2019-20; however, the overall framework of the five major topics was maintained.[6] Whenever changes are made to the survey, a factor analysis, Cronbach's alpha calculations, and a longitudinal measurement invariance (LMI) analysis are conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the surveys.

The stakeholder groups included in the survey has been expanded in recent years. In 2019-20, ORE developed and piloted a fifth survey, for non-instructional school-based staff, a group which includes counselors, nurses, classroom aides, climate staff, psychologists, and secretaries.[7] Factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha calculations conducted on the support staff pilot data confirmed the validity of the items as categorized under the School Climate, Leadership, and Professional Capacity topics and their respective subtopics.[8] In 2020-21, the principal survey was also expanded to include assistant principals.

In the winter of the 2020-21 school year, ORE worked with members of the newly established Equity Coalition to develop new DWS questions about equity and inclusion that could help us understand the perspectives and experiences of parents/guardians, students, teachers, principals, and school-based staff. Questions on this topic were adopted and adapted items from existing validated staff and student instruments developed by Panorama Education.[9] Statistical analyses (factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha calculations) were used to determine whether these items were valid and reliable measures, and to group them into subtopics within each survey. We also found that Equity and Inclusion scores are moderately correlated with other topics on the surveys and student scores were related to student math achievement.[10] In 2021-22, the Equity and Inclusion topic was adopted as a sixth core DWS topic.

---

[5] See the 2016-17 Technical Report: https://www.philasd.org/research/programsservices/district-wide-surveys/district-wide-survey-technical-reports/

[6] See the 2019-20 Technical Report: https://www.philasd.org/research/programsservices/district-wide-surveys/district-wide-survey-technical-reports/

[7] The survey is currently only conducted with District support staff. A full list of positions included in the survey is available in Appendix B.

[8] See the 2020-21 Technical Report: https://www.philasd.org/research/programsservices/district-wide-surveys/district-wide-survey-technical-reports/

[9] The Panorama Equity and Inclusion Surveys: https://go.panoramaed.com/thanks/measuring-equity-inclusion?submissionGuid=baac0511-51e1-4196-aabd-9c9669cf5dad

[10] https://www.philasd.org/research/2022/09/30/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-dei-scores-on-the-district-wide-survey-and-school-trends-2020-21/

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF
PHILADELPHIA

Survey Framework

Taken together, the five surveys administered in 2021-22 (student, parent/guardian, teacher, support staff, and principal/assistant principal) were designed to measure six core topics:[11]

1. **Climate** – Areas affecting the school environment: school mission and vision, respectful relationships, student safety and support, and challenges to student learning.

2. **Instruction[12]** – Student engagement and how students, parents/guardians, and teachers feel about the quality of teaching and learning at their school.

3. **Leadership** – How school leaders communicate and implement their school vision, how they manage their responsibilities, and how they perceive their level of autonomy.

4. **Professional Capacity** – How school staff work together, what types of professional development teachers receive, and if teachers feel supported in growing and innovating in their classrooms.

5. **Parent/Guardian-Community Ties** – How schools reach out to and communicate with parents/guardians, what parents/guardians think about these efforts, and how parents/guardians are getting involved with their child's education.

6. **Equity and Inclusion** – How often issues of race, ethnicity and culture are addressed in schools, the extent to which all students and staff feel they are valued members of the school community, how integrated and fair school is for students from different backgrounds, and the extent to which schools promote an anti-racist professional culture.

Additionally, each of the six main topics is composed of subtopics that provide information in specific areas where leaders and stakeholders might target their attention (see Appendix A for a list of all topics and subtopics). For many (but not all) topics, the surveys ask similar questions of multiple respondent groups (e.g., teachers and students) to allow comparison of different views (Table 1).

---

[11] The first five topics draw on Bryk and colleagues' (2010) work in Chicago, which identified five essential supports for school improvement. We altered the language of the essential supports to make the terms more publicly accessible and reflect the broader set of questions covered by the surveys. The original names of the five essential supports identified by Bryk and his colleagues are School Leadership, Parent-Community Ties, Professional Capacity, Student-Centered Learning Climate, and Instructional Guidance.

[12] In some contexts, this topic is also referred to as "Instructional Environment."

Table 1. Topics and Survey Instrument Alignment

Survey	Topic					
	Climate	Instruction	Leadership	Professional Capacity	Parent/ Guardian-Community Ties	Equity and Inclusion
Parent/Guardian	X	X	X*		X	X
Student	X	X				X
Teacher	X	X	X	X	X	X
Principal/Assistant Principal#	X	X	X	X	X	X
Support Staff	X		X	X		X

*Added in 2018-19.
#Assistant principals were included as a respondent group for the first time in 2020-21. They complete the same survey as principals.

Analyzing the responses from different groups in a school can help identify what is working well along with areas that need to be improved. For example, survey results may show that a school is successful in the area of Instruction, but is experiencing challenges in Parent/Guardian-Community Ties. The surveys also include questions that are not aligned to one of the six research-based topics but are of interest to stakeholders across our schools and city. These include questions about school lunches, transportation, and District programs.

Changes to the 2021-22 District Wide Survey Instruments

There were three main categories of changes to the surveys in 2021-22: the reinstatement of questions which had been removed in 2020-21 because students primarily attended school virtually in 2020-21 and in-person questions did not apply, the removal of questions which were no longer needed, and the addition of new questions to meet needs specific to 2021-22.

Reinstating questions removed in 2020-21: Because most of the 2020-21 school year was conducted online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, survey questions were removed that asked specifically about aspects of schooling which were not present in virtual learning, such as physical classrooms and school buildings and transportation. With students and staff back to primarily in-person teaching and learning in 2021-22, these questions were reinstated.[13]

New questions in 2021-22: There were two new categories of questions added in 2021-22. First, questions about students' experiences traveling to and from school were added to the student and

---

[13] A summary of these questions by survey and subtopic is available in Appendix C.

parent/guardian surveys, at the request of the Safe Routes Philly initiative. Second, one question was added to the teacher, principal/assistant principal, and support staff surveys to assess staff familiarity with the Board Goals & Guardrails. Five questions about strategies related to Goals & Guardrails—implementation of new curricula and common planning time—were also added to the teacher survey.

Removal of non-essential questions: A few Equity and Inclusion items were removed from the principal/assistant principal and support staff surveys after factor analysis determined that their removal would enhance the validity of the construct and relevant sub-constructs. Eight items under the Bullying subtopic were removed from the student survey—these were follow-up questions about students' individual experiences with bullying (e.g. "I have been treated badly based on my religion"). Ten questions about students' perceptions of bullying as experienced by all students in the school were retained (e.g. "Students are treated badly (bullied or harassed) based on their religion"). A number of questions about how school leaders use data systems were also removed from the principal/assistant principal survey.

A summary of the number of questions added/reinstated to and removed from the District-Wide Surveys in 2021-22 appears in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of Changes to the 2021-22 District-Wide Surveys

Survey	Total Number of Questions in 2020-21	Number of Questions Reinstated	Number of Questions Added	Number of Questions Removed	Number of Questions Altered	Final Number of Questions in 2021-22
Student	128	22	11	8	7	153
Teacher	158	12	6	1	12	175
Parent/ Guardian	68	10	9	0	4	87
Principal/ AP	131	14	1	25	6	121
Support Staff	54	2	1	2	2	55

Survey Administration

Administration Timeline and Process

Each year, ORE carefully plans the timing and duration of the administration windows for each of the surveys to optimize participant access and response rates. The administration windows for each survey are outlined in Table 3. In response to feedback from stakeholders, we extended the window beginning in the 2015-16 school year.

Table 3. Survey Administration Windows, 2014-15 through 2021-22

Year	Student	Parent/ Guardian	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal^	Support Staff#
2014-15	May 4 – June 19, 2015	April 20 – June 19, 2015	May 18 – June 19, 2015		N/A
2015-16	March 31 – June 27, 2016		May 3 – May 27, 2016		N/A
2016-17	April 3 – June 23, 2017		April 3 – June 5, 2017		N/A
2017-18	February 12 – June 8, 2018		March 1 – June 1, 2018		N/A
2018-19	January 28 – June 7, 2019		February 25 – June 7, 2019		N/A
2019-20*	February 3 – June 15, 2020				
2020-21	March 1 – May 28, 2021				
2021-22	March 14 - June 10, 2022				

*Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all students transitioned to digital learning on March 16, 2020. This was in the middle of the survey window. The survey window was extended for all surveys, and respondents who had not already completed the survey were instructed to answer survey questions based on their overall experience for the entire school year.
^Assistant principals were included as a respondent group for the first time in 2020-21. They complete the same survey as principals.
#Administered for the first time in 2019-20.

To accommodate the diverse populations served by SDP, the parent/guardian survey is translated into nine languages,[14] and all ten languages (including English) are available online. The student survey is also translated into Spanish and Chinese and made available online.

---

[14] In 2021-22, the parent/guardian survey was translated into Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Arabic, Vietnamese, French, Russian, Khmer and Albanian.

The surveys are primarily administered online via SurveyMonkey. However, in recent years (with the exception of 2020-21[15]) schools have also been provided with paper copies of the parent/guardian survey, and ORE has made a limited number of paper copies of the Spanish and Chinese translations available to schools by request. Between 2015-16 and 2019-20, schools could request paper copies up to a maximum of 10% of their school's enrollment (photocopying or otherwise duplicating the surveys was prohibited). However, some schools provided feedback that it was difficult distributing the paper surveys to families and parents/guardians sometimes struggled to locate their student's ID number and enter it on the survey. In response to this feedback, in 2021-22, ORE produced scannable versions of the parent/guardian survey in English, Spanish and Chinese and mailed one survey to each SDP household in the relevant language (i.e. Spanish or Chinese if this was noted as the preferred language in the District data system; otherwise households received the English survey). These scannable surveys were pre-filled with the ID number of the oldest student in the household, with instructions to take the survey for additional students in the household online if those students attended different schools than the oldest child. In total, 107, 323 paper copies of the parent/guardian survey were mailed out, and 2,982 were returned by mail (3%). Parents/guardians of Asian students and parents of English Learners were overrepresented among the surveys returned by mail.

District teachers, support staff, and principals access the survey through their employee portal, while District students and parents can also access the survey via their portals. Accessing the survey through the official District portals allows each survey to be linked to individual students, staff and parent/guardian information. However, since not all students, staff and parents have access to or are familiar with these portals, additional ways to access the survey are offered. Charter teachers and principals are provided with secure individual links to the survey via their email accounts. The student and parent surveys are also offered on publicly accessible links for Charter students and both Charter and District parents/guardians. To ensure the validity of responses, students and parents/guardians who take the survey via our public website are required to enter a unique District Student ID number in order to access the surveys.

Since response rates are important to the validity of the survey results, a number of strategies are used to promote high response rates. In 2021-22, efforts to increase response rates included sending email reminders, mailing letters home, scheduling robocalls, and providing schools with posters and flyers with information about the surveys. School leaders were also provided with resources outlining strategies to increase response rates, such as offering a pizza party for the classroom with the most completed surveys. Beginning in 2018-19, teachers and parents/guardians who completed the survey could enter into a raffle for a chance to win a gift card.

---

[15] ORE did not offer paper copies in the 2020-21 school year since all students were provided with computing devices (typically Chromebooks) that could be used by parents or guardians to take the survey at home.

Response Rates

Before calculating response rates, duplicate responses are removed so that each individual has one response per survey group. The most complete, most recent response is retained for each individual. Following de-duplication, the following rules are applied to determine the response rates for each respondent group.

Student Survey
- The denominator for the student response rate is based on enrollment on a specific date in the survey window (in 2021-22 the date used was May 1, 2022).
- The numerator for the student response rate is based on the number of unique responses. Student responses are attributed to the school they were enrolled in at the time they took the survey.
- If a student changes schools during the survey window, they may count in the numerator for one school but in the denominator at a different school.

Parent/Guardian Survey
- The denominator for parents/guardians is based on the number of unique households at each school according to student enrollment on a specific date during the survey window (in 2021-22, the date used was May 1, 2022). Households may be counted more than once if students associated with that household attend different schools.
- The numerator for the parent/guardian response rate is based on the number of unique households within a school that submitted a response for at least one student. Parent/guardian responses are attributed to the school their student was enrolled in at the time they took the survey. (Parents/guardians may submit a separate response for each student in their household, but only one response per household will be counted in the response rate at each school.)
- If a student changes schools during the survey window, the parent/guardian survey connected to that student may count in the numerator for one school but in the denominator at a different school.

Teacher Survey
- The denominator for the teacher response rate relies on different data sources for District and non-District schools:
  - District teachers are included in the denominator if they had an active employment record on a specific date during the survey window (in 2021-22, the date used was May 1, 2022).
  - Non-District teachers are included in the denominator if they are identified by their school as an active member of the teaching staff.
- The numerator for the teacher response rate is based on the number of unique responses. Teacher responses are attributed to the school the teacher was assigned to at the time they took the survey.

Principal/Assistant Principal Survey
- The denominator for the principal/assistant principal response rate relies on different data sources for District and Non-District schools:
  - District principals/assistant principals are included in the denominator if they had an active employment record on a specific date during the survey window (in 2021-22, the date used was May 1, 2022).
  - Non-District principals/assistant principals are included in the denominator if they are identified by their school as an active school leader. Note that non-District schools may use slightly different titles for school leaders included in this survey (such as "chief executive officer").
- The numerator for the principal/assistant principal response rate is based on the number of unique responses. Principal/assistant principal responses are attributed to the school the individual was assigned to at the time they took the survey.

Support Staff Survey
- Only District and contracted schools are currently participating in the support staff survey. Charter schools do not currently participate.
- The denominator for the support staff response rate relies on different data sources for District and contracted schools (schools whose staff are not SDP employees):
  - District support staff are included in the denominator if they had an active employment record on a selected date during the survey window (in 2021-22, the date used was May 1, 2022).
  - Contracted school support staff are included in the denominator if they are identified by their school as an active member of the support staff.
- The numerator for the support staff response rate is based on the number of unique responses. Support staff responses are attributed to the school the individual was assigned to at the time they took the survey.

Table 4 shows survey response rates for each respondent group for 2014-15 through 2021-22 school years.

Year		Student	Parent/ Guardian[ii]	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal[iii]	Support Staff[iv]
2014-15	Rate	33%	7%	53%	64%	N/A
	Number	46,695	13,360	5,423	185	N/A
2015-16	Rate	50%	13%	51%	73%	N/A
	Number	73,187	25,911	5,688	241	N/A
2016-17	Rate	50%	16%	56%	57%	N/A
	Number	72,580	30,968	6,515	184	N/A
2017-18	Rate	54%	17%	54%	60%	N/A
	Number	80,101	33,334	6,652	199	N/A
2018-19	Rate	61%	23%	56%	56%	N/A
	Number	89,496	35,055	6,663	185	N/A
2019-20[i]	Rate	32%	16%	64%	48%	37%
	Number	47,439	25,915	6,986	168	1,311
2020-21	Rate	42%	16%	68%	45%	43%
	Number	62,353	24,313	8,267	242	1,525
2021-22	Rate	48%	14%	59%	68%	36%
	Number	67,180	20,682	7,065	419	1,381

Note: Parent & Guardian and Student response percentages are based on student enrollment records as of May 31 (May 1 beginning in 2020-21). Teacher response percentages are based on District teachers with an "active status" on record as of May 31 (May 1 beginning in 2020-21). For charter school teachers, the response percentage is based on the email addresses provided by Charter schools during the survey administration period.

[i] In response to the school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the enrollment and employee record snapshot date used to calculate teacher response rates in 2019-20 was changed to March 13, 2020. This was the last day that students were in school before the closures.

[ii] Beginning in 2018-19, the number of households (rather than the number of students) has been used to calculate the parent/guardian response rate.

[iii] Assistant principals were included as a respondent group for the first time in 2020-21. They complete the same survey as principals.

[iv] Administered for the first time in 2019-20.

Representativeness of Respondents

We examined the extent to which survey respondents were representative of the larger population, to identify whether certain groups' viewpoints may be given more weight than others. Respondent characteristics for each respondent group were compared to the characteristics of the corresponding target population to assess representativeness, or external validity.

Student Sample

Overall, the 2021-22 student survey sample had similar demographic characteristics to the target population, with some exceptions (see Table 5) which aligned with patterns observed in previous years.[16] The student respondents from District schools had nearly the same gender distribution as the broader student population. The District DWS student sample was roughly representative by race/ethnicity as well. However, Black/African American students were slightly under-represented—only 45% of District respondents were Black/African American, compared to 48% of all grade 3-12 students.[17]

The Charter school sample was roughly representative of Charter school students by gender, with the percentage of male and female respondents falling within three percentage points of the student population. The sample was less representative with respect to race/ethnicity: although 59% of grade 3-12 Charter students were Black/African American, only 49% of students who responded to the DWS were Black/African American.

---

[16] See https://www.philasd.org/research/2021/10/12/representativeness-of-the-2019-20-district-wide-student-and-parent-guardian-survey-results-2/

[17] The differences between survey respondent and target population characteristics which are directly discussed in this section have been confirmed to be statistically significant (p<.05) using a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit test.

Table 5. Distribution of all grade 3-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2021-22 by race/ethnicity and gender compared to student DWS respondents

	District Students in Grades 3-12 (n=89,221)			Charter Students in Grades 3-12 (n=62,427)		
	% of total students enrolled (a)	% of student respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)	% of total students enrolled (d)	% of student respondents (e)	Difference (% points) (f)
Race/Ethnicity						
Black/African American	48%	45%	-3	59%	49%	-10
Hispanic/ Latinx	23%	24%	+1	19%	19%	0
White	14%	15%	+1	12%	19%	+7
Asian	10%	11%	+1	3%	6%	+3
Multi-Racial /Other*	5%	4%	-1	6%	6%	0
Gender						
Male	51%	50%	-1	51%	48%	-3
Female	49%	50%	+1	49%	52%	+3
Non-Binary	<1%			i.s.		

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total students enrolled (columns a and d) to the percentage of student respondents (columns b and e). The percentage point differences between the columns are in columns c and f. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of students of that race/ethnicity or gender completed the survey compared to the percentage of students of that race/ethnicity or gender enrolled. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true. For example, 48% of grade 3-12 District students were Black/African American in 2021-22 and 45% of all District DWS respondents were Black/African American.

High school students from both District and Charter schools were underrepresented in the student survey, whereas elementary school students were overrepresented (Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of all grade 3-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2021-22 by grade level compared to student DWS respondents

Grade	District Students in Grades 3-12 (n=89,221)			Charter Students in Grades 3-12 (n=62,427)		
	% of total students enrolled (a)	% of student respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)	% of total students enrolled (d)	% of student respondents (e)	Difference (% points) (f)
3	10%	14%	+3	10%	14%	+4
4	10%	14%	+3	10%	14%	+4
5	10%	14%	+4	10%	15%	+4
6	10%	13%	+3	11%	14%	+3
7	10%	11%	+1	11%	14%	+3
8	10%	12%	+2	11%	12%	+1
9	12%	7%	-5	9%	5%	-4
10	10%	5%	-5	9%	4%	-5
11	9%	4%	-5	9%	5%	-4
12	9%	6%	-3	9%	4%	-5

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment. Students in grades K-2 do not participate in the DWS.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total students enrolled (columns a and d) to the percentage of student respondents (columns b and e). The percentage point differences between the columns are in columns c and f. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of students in that grade completed the survey compared to the percentage of students enrolled in that grade. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true. For example, grade 5 District students represent 10% of all grade 3-12 District students and 14% of grade 3-12 District DWS responses. On the other hand, grade 10 District students represent 10% of grade 3-12 District students and 5% of District DWS responses.

Parent/Guardian Sample

Since parents/guardians completing the DWS are not asked to provide demographic information, we use student demographic information as a proxy for parent/guardian demographics. Although parents/guardians do not necessarily have the same characteristics as their children, comparing the characteristics of students whose parents responded to those of the broader student population provides an estimate of the extent to which the parent/guardian sample is representative.

In 2021-22, the parent/guardian survey sample included a broad representation of students of different races/ethnicities and grade levels, but the characteristics of the sample of students whose parents/guardians responded differed from the student population in two key dimensions. First, parents of Black/African American students were underrepresented in the survey: while 48% of District students were Black/African American, only 37% of the parent/guardian respondents were

parents of Black/African American students, and this pattern was even stronger for the Charter parent/guardian sample (Table 7). Second, parents of District and Charter middle and high school students were underrepresented in the sample (Table 8).

Table 7. Distribution of all District and Charter students enrolled in 2021-22 by race/ethnicity compared to students whose parents/guardians responded to the DWS

	District Students in Grades K-12 (n=114,902)			**Charter Students** in Grades K-12 (n=79,902)		
	% of total students enrolled (a)	% of students of parent/ guardian respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)	% of total students enrolled (d)	% of students of parent/ guardian respondents (e)	Difference (% points) (f)
Race/Ethnicity						
Black/African American	48%	37%	-11	59%	45%	-15
Hispanic/Latinx	23%	23%	0	19%	12%	-7
White	14%	22%	+8	12%	13%	+1
Asian	10%	13%	+3	3%	25%	+22
Multi-Racial/ Other*	5%	5%	0	6%	5%	-1

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.
How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total students enrolled (columns a and d) to the percentage of students whose parent/guardian responded to the survey (columns b and e). The percentage point differences between the columns are in columns c and f. When the difference is positive, a higher percentage of students of that race/ethnicity had a parent or guardian who completed the survey compared to the percentage of students of that race/ethnicity who are enrolled. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Similar to the student DWS sample, the parent/guardian sample was not proportional to the population with respect to student grade levels. The proportion of parents/guardians of students in grades 1-3 who took the survey was significantly higher than the proportion of parents/guardians of high school students (Table 8).

Table 8. Distribution of all grade K-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2021-22 by grade level compared to students who parents/guardians responded to the DWS

Grade	District Students in Grades K-12 (n=114,902)			Charter Students in Grades K-12 (n=79,902)		
	% of total students enrolled (a)	% of students of parent/guardian respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)	% of total students enrolled (d)	% of students of parent/guardian respondents (e)	Difference (% points) (f)
1	7%	11%	+4	7%	10%	+3
2	7%	12%	+5	7%	11%	+4
3	8%	11%	+3	8%	10%	+2
3	8%	10%	+2	8%	10%	+2
4	8%	9%	+1	8%	9%	+1
5	8%	8%	0	8%	9%	0
6	7%	7%	0	9%	8%	-1
7	7%	6%	-1	9%	7%	-2
8	8%	6%	-2	9%	7%	-2
9	9%	6%	-3	7%	5%	-2
10	8%	5%	-3	7%	5%	-2
11	7%	5%	-2	7%	5%	-2
12	7%	4%	-3	7%	4%	-3

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total students enrolled (columns a and d) to the percentage of students whose parent/guardian responded to the survey (columns b and e). The percentage point differences between the columns are in columns c and f. When the difference is positive, that means there is a higher percentage of students in that grade whose parent or guardian completed the survey compared to the percentage of students who are enrolled in that grade. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Teacher Sample

District teachers who responded to the 2021-22 DWS were largely representative of the broader teaching population with respect to race/ethnicity and gender (as identified in the District employee database); although White teachers were slightly over-represented compared to Black/African-American teachers and female teachers were slightly over-represented compared to male teachers in the survey sample (Table 9). Demographic data was not available for Charter school teachers.

Table 9. Demographic characteristics of teachers employed at District schools compared to teachers who completed the DWS in 2021-22

	District Teachers (n = 7,919)		
	% of total teachers (a)	% of teacher respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
White	65%	67%	+2
Black/African American	23%	21%	-2
Hispanic/Latino	4%	4%	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	3%	0
Multi Racial/Other*	5%	5%	0
Gender			
Female	73%	75%	+2
Male	27%	25%	-2

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and "Prefer not to disclose"

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total teachers (column a) to the percentage of teacher respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of teachers with that demographic characteristic completed the survey compared to the percentage of teachers with that demographic characteristic overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

High school teachers were less likely to respond to the survey than teachers at Elementary/Middle schools (Table 10).

Table 10. School level of all District teachers compared to teacher DWS respondents, 2021-22.

School Level (Grades Served)	District Teachers (n = 7,919)		
	% of total teachers (a)	% of teacher respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Elementary (K-2, K-4, K-5, K-6, 3-5)	24%	24%	0
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	41%	43%	-2
Elementary-Middle-High (K-12)	> 1%	> 1%	0
Middle (5-8, 6-8, 7-8)	6%	7%	+1
Middle-High (5-12, 6-12, 7-10, 7-12)	3%	3%	0
High (9-12)	25%	23%	-2

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total teachers (column a) to the percentage of teacher respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of teachers from schools in that grade level completed the survey compared to the percentage of teachers from schools in that grade level overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Principal/Assistant Principal Sample

The gender distribution of District school leaders in the 2021-22 DWS was proportional to the broader population of school leaders, with 69% of respondents identified as female in the District employee database, compared to 68% of the broader District principal/assistant principal population (Table 11). The proportion of Black/African-American principals and assistant principals in the sample was five percentage points lower than the population, while White principals/Assistant principals were over-represented.

Table 11. Demographic characteristics of principals and assistant principals employed at District schools, compared to principals and assistant principals who completed the DWS in 2021-22.

	District Principals and Assistant Principals (n = 468)		
	% of total principals and assistant principals (a)	% of principal and assistant principal respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black/African American	49%	44%	-5
White	41%	45%	+4
Hispanic/Latino	6%	5%	-1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	2%	+1
Multi Racial/Other*	3%	3%	0
Gender			
Female	68%	69%	+1
Male	32%	31%	-1

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and "Prefer not to disclose"

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total principals and assistant principals (column a) to the percentage of principal and assistant principal respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of principals and assistant principals with that demographic characteristic completed the survey compared to the percentage of principal and assistant principals with that demographic characteristic overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Principals and assistant principals in the 2021-22 DWS represented all school levels, although K-8 schools were slightly underrepresented compared to elementary and middle schools (Table 12).

Table 12. School level of all District principals and assistant principals compared to principal and assistant principal DWS respondents, 2021-22.

School Level (Grades Served)	District Principals and Assistant Principals (n = 468)		
	% of total principals and assistant principals (a)	% of principal and assistant principal respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Elementary (K-2, K-4, K-5, K-6, 3-5)	22%	23%	+1
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	39%	36%	-3
Elementary-Middle-High (K-12)	1%	0%	-1
Middle (5-8, 6-8, 7-8)	7%	8%	+1
Middle-High (5-12, 6-12, 7-10, 7-12)	4%	3%	-1
High (9-12)	28%	29%	+1

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total principals and assistant principals (column a) to the percentage of principal and assistant principal respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools serving those grade levels completed the survey compared to the percentage of principals and assistant principals from schools serving those grade levels overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Support Staff Sample

Female and White support staff in District schools were slightly overrepresented in the support staff survey compared to male and Black/African American support staff.

Table 13. Demographic characteristics of support staff employed at District schools compared to support staff who completed the DWS in 2021-22

	District Support Staff (n = 3,703)		
	% of total support staff (a)	% of support staff respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black/African American	59%	56%	-3
White	25%	28%	+3
Hispanic/Latino	9%	9%	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	3%	+1
Multi Racial/Other*	5%	4%	-1
Gender			
Female	87%	90%	+3
Male	13%	10%	-3

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and "Prefer not to disclose"

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total support staff (column a) to the percentage of support staff respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of support staff with that demographic characteristic completed the survey compared to the percentage of support staff with that demographic characteristic overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Support staff from K-8 schools were overrepresented (by about 4 percentage points) compared to support staff from other school levels (Table 14).

Table 14. School level of all District support staff compared to support staff DWS respondents, 2021-22

School Level (Grades Served)	District Support Staff (n = 3,703)		
	% of total support staff (a)	% of support staff respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Elementary (K-2, K-4, K-5, K-6, 3-5)	25%	24%	-1
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	45%	49%	+4
Elementary-Middle-High (K-12)	1%	0%	-1
Middle (5-8, 6-8, 7-8)	6%	7%	+1
Middle-High (5-12, 6-12, 7-10, 7-12)	2%	2%	0
High (9-12)	21%	19%	-2

Note: District and Charter enrollment is based on the October 1, 2021 snapshot of enrollment. DWS respondent information is based on May 1, 2022 enrollment.

How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the percentage of total support staff (column a) to the percentage of support staff respondents (column b). The percentage point differences between the columns are in column c. When the difference is positive, that means a higher percentage of support staff from schools in those grade levels completed the survey compared to the percentage of support staff from schools in those grade levels overall. When the difference is negative, the reverse is true.

Data Validation and Reliability Testing

Item Reliability

In order to assess the internal consistency of the survey items within each topic and subtopic, ORE calculated Cronbach's alphas for each of the six topics by combining all questions related to that topic. Cronbach's alpha is a common measure of reliability that can be used to evaluate the extent to which a group of items are related (Cronbach, 1951). We originally ran reliability testing in 2014-2015 and updated it again in 2018-2019, 2020-21, and 2021-22.

All scale reliabilities, with the exception of one, fell within the 0.70 and 0.96 range, which indicates an acceptable internal consistency between items within each topic and subtopic without item redundancy (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The lower alpha level for the Parent/Guardian Community Ties topic on the principal survey may be explained by the limited number of questions included in the topic (usually, the more items a dimension has the higher the reliability). This low alpha is mitigated by the fact that school-level Parent/Guardian Community Ties scores are calculated as an average of the scores from the three respondent groups (parent/guardian, teacher and principal/assistant principal). Table 15 provides the alphas for the five topics as measured across the five surveys.

Table 15. Cronbach's Alpha for Survey Topics (Topics), 2021-2*2*

Topics	Student	Parent/ Guardian	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal	Support Staff
Climate	.84	.71	.96	.92	.91
Instruction	.92	.91	.78	.83	--
Leadership	--	.95	.92	.80	.92
Professional Capacity	--	--	.92	.89	.93
Parent/Guardian-Community Ties	--	.88	.85	.61	--
Equity and Inclusion	.87	.87	.88	0.78	0.88

Topic Validity and Factor Analysis

In 2014-2015, 2016-2017, 2018-2019, we used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to explore the dimensionality of the five original topics. EFA is used to explore the possible underlying factor structure (Child, 1990; Thorndike, Cunningham, Thorndike, & Hagen, 1991). In our data validation, we used EFA to explore whether each of the five topics related to school improvement represented a latent factor. EFA was purposely chosen as the type of analysis to analyze the surveys to provide an unbiased, theory-neutral validity check on our survey topics and subtopics.

An oblique rotation method—"direct oblim"—was used in order to simplify the structure of the factor loadings. In their research, Bryk and colleagues (2010) found that the five essential supports (analogous to our five topics) all related to one another and correlated with student achievement. Consequently, oblique rotation was chosen over other rotation methods as it allows for factors to be correlated (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Following best practice, in our EFA, we specified a minimum loading value of 0.3 (Costello & Osborne, 2005), and used the Kaiser criterion, specifying that all factors must have eigenvalues greater than 1.0 (Ford, MacCallum, & Tait, 1986; Kaiser, 1970).

Overall, the EFAs confirmed the validity of the five original topics and their subtopics. In the few cases where the EFAs did not, we refined the survey scales by eliminating the questions that did not align with the other questions in that topic. In this way we were able to ensure we had reliable measures of each topic and subtopic.

After the new Equity and Inclusion questions were piloted in 2020-21, a similar EFA process was used to explore the dimensionality of this sixth topic and identify any sub-constructs that may exist. Overall, the EFAs confirmed the validity of the constructs and identified question groups within them that can be considered sub-constructs. The grouping of questions into sub-constructs aligned to the item groupings from the Panorama surveys. Then, we ran factor analyses to identify

questions that, when removed, could increase the validity of the constructs. For the Principal/AP survey, the findings indicated that the removal of three items increased the overall construct reliability from 0.81 to 0.83. For the Support Staff survey, removing two items increased the overall construct reliability from 0.83 to 0.84.

Topic Scoring

In 2018-19, we developed a system that provides each school with a score for each of the six topics with the goal of maximizing the ability to use the data to target areas for school improvement.

Thresholds

To ensure that school-level scores were representative of a school's community, we applied the thresholds shown in Table 16 to the survey to determine if a school had enough survey responses to warrant analysis. If these school-level thresholds are not met, then that school's data is suppressed for that respondent group. Question-level and topic/subtopic scores are also suppressed for groups with fewer than five respondents.

Table 16. Survey Participation Rate Thresholds

Survey	Threshold
Student	25% of students at a school
Parent/Guardian	10% of a school's enrollment
Teacher	25% of teaching staff at a school
Support Staff^	25% of non-teaching staff at a school
Principal/Assistant Principal*	N/A

^See Appendix B for a list of the title codes that are included in the Support Staff respondent category.
*Assistant principals were included as a respondent group for the first time in 2020-21. They complete the same survey as principals.

Scoring Procedure

Most survey items use response options that can be scaled numerically (for example, "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree"). For such questions, the response values are converted to a numeric scale from 0-10 (where "10" represents the most positive response). The questions are then grouped into subtopics and combined into a single average score for each subtopic. The subtopic scores are then grouped into topics and averaged to produce topic-level scores for each survey group, and overall across all survey groups. For an example of the scoring procedure, see Box 1.

Overall scores reflect an average of the scores for each respondent group. For example, a school's overall Climate score is equal to the average of all of the subtopic Climate scores from the Student,

Parent/Guardian, and Teacher surveys. Each subtopic score carries equal weight. If the response rate thresholds are met, schools receive a score for each of the six topics related to improvement (Climate, Instruction, Leadership, Professional Capacity, Parent/Guardian-Community Ties, and Equity and Inclusion).

Box 1: How do we create District-Wide Survey topic and subtopic scores?

Calculating topic and subtopic scores helps us compare responses across different topics. To calculate the subtopic scores, we first assign each possible response a numeric value, with the most positive response assigned the highest value and the least positive the lowest. Next, we add these values for all of the items in the subtopic. Finally, the sum is divided by the total count of survey items comprising that subtopic (excluding those with missing values). The topic score is calculated by averaging all the subtopic scores.

Take for example, the **External Challenges to Student Learning** subtopic on the teacher survey. For each of the five items of this subtopic, there are four response options (A great challenge, A slight challenge, A moderate challenge, and Not a challenge). Each response corresponds with a number from 0-10, with 0 being the most negative and 10 being the most positive (i.e., A great challenge = 0 and Not a challenge =10). To get the subtopic score, we add up all the response values (each ranging from 0-10) and then divide by five (total number of items). We repeat this process with each of the subtopics, so each sub-construct has a score from 0-10. See below for an example on calculating the average for the External Challenges to Student-learning subtopic:

External Challenges to Student Learning subtopic average score:

$(0+3.33+10+6.66+6.66)/5 = 5.33$

Contact Information

If you have any questions, please contact The Office of Research and Evaluation at schoolsurveys@philasd.org.

References

Aleamoni, L. M. (1976). The relation of sample size to the number of variables in using factor analysis techniques. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 36*, 879–883.

Baggaley, A. R. (1983). Deciding on the ratio of number of subjects to number of variables in factor analysis. *Multivariate Experimental Clinical Research, 6*(2), 81–85.

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Child, D. (1990). *The essentials of factor analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Cassel Educational Limited.

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation, 10*(7).

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*(3), 297–334.

Ford, J. K., MacCallum, R. C., & Tait, M. (1986). The application of exploratory factor analysis in applied psychology: A critical review and analysis. *Personal Psychology,* 39, 291–314.

Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A. second generation Little-Jiffy. *Psychometrika, 35*, 401–415.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thorndike, R. M., Cunningham, G. K., Thorndike, R. L., & Hagen E. P. (1991). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Appendix A: 2021-22 Survey Topics and Subtopics by Respondent Type

Student

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
School Climate	Bullying	10
	Safety/Building Condition	7
	Belonging	5
	Overall	22
Instruction	Evaluation of Teaching & Learning / **Overall**	17
Equity and Inclusion	Educating all Students	5
	Cultural Awareness and Action	5
	Overall	10
Other	Student Beliefs	9
	College and Career Readiness	9
	Food Services	13
	Health and Nutrition	9
	Technology	3
	Safe Routes to School	10
	School Counselor	9
	School Police	4
	Other	7

Parent/Guardian

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
School Climate	Bullying	3
	Safety/Building Condition	3
	Overall	**6**
Instruction	Evaluation of Teaching and Learning **/Overall**	**7**
Parent/Guardian Community Ties	Communication Quality	9
	Parent/Guardian-School Relationship	5
	Parent/Guardian Involvement	4
	Overall	**18**
School Leadership	School Leadership **/ Overall**	**6**
Equity and Inclusion	Belonging	4
	Cultural Awareness and Action	5
	Overall	**9**
Other	Attendance Challenges	**8**
	Community Services	7
	Healthy Food Access	5
	Reading	5
	Technology Access	5
	Safe Routes to School	9
	Other	2

Teacher

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
School Climate	Student-Centered Learning Climate	13
	Respect	9
	Classroom Level Challenges to Student Learning	7
	School Level Challenges to Student Learning	17
	External Challenges to Student Learning	5
	Attendance	4
	School Discipline	9
	Overall	**64**
Instruction	Student Engagement **/ Overall**	**17**
Parent/Guardian-Community Ties	Outreach/Communication **/Overall**	7
School Leadership	Expectations and Feedback	6
	Inclusive Leadership	5
	Classroom-level Decision Making	11
	Overall	**22**
Professional Capacity	Innovation	5
	Quality of PD	8
	Quality of PD: Delivery	6
	Quality of PD: Consistency	5
	Peer Collaboration	7
	Overall	**31**
Equity and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Educating all Students	5
	Anti-racist Professional Culture	5
	Overall	**13**

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
Other	School Police	6
	Trauma-Informed Practices	3
	Pilot Questions	6
	Other	2

Principal/Assistant Principal

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
School Climate	School Level Challenges to Student Learning	18
	External Challenges to Student Learning	9
	Attendance	4
	Interpersonal Relationships	7
	Overall	**38**
Instruction	Data Use	10
	External Supports	6
	Overall	**16**
Parent/Guardian-Community Ties	Parent/Guardian-Community Ties / **Overall**	4
School Leadership	Management	8
	Instructional Leadership	4
	School Level Decision-Making	9
	Overall	**21**
Professional Capacity	Peer Collaboration	4
	Quality of PD: Delivery	7
	Overall	**11**

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
Equity and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	7
	Overall	**10**
Other	District Assistance	5
	Student and Family Interactions	3
	Student Discipline	4
	School Police	6
	Pilot Questions	1
	Other	1

School Support Staff Survey

Topic	Subtopic	Number of Items
School Climate	Challenges to Student Learning	14
	Respect	9
	Overall	**23**
School Leadership	Inclusive Leadership	6
	Communication of Expectations	8
	Overall	**14**
Professional Capacity	Knowledge of Trauma Informed Practices	4
	Knowledge of Student Supports	5
	Overall	**9**
Equity and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	5
	Overall	**8**
Other	Pilot Questions	1

Appendix B: List of Support Staff Title Codes

Title Code	Title Name	Title Group
0486	SCHOOL COUNSELOR, 10 MONTHS	T100
0487	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COUNSELOR	T100
0502	COMMUNITY RELATION LIAISON,FT	E100
0503	CONFLICT RESOLUTION SPECIALIST	E100
0507	BILINGUAL VOC SUPPORT ASST	E100
0510	INTERP, DEAF/HARD OF HEARING	E100
0536	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST	T103
0541	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST, BILINGUAL	T103
0554	LIFEGUARD	E100
0807	SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ASST, 4 HR	E100
0812	CLASSROOM ASST,SP ED,HEAR IMP	E100
0815	SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ASST, 3 HR	E100
0816	SCHOOL COMMUNITY COORD, FT	E100
0819	CLIMATE SUPPORT SPECIALIST	E100
0825	CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUC ASST	E100
0839	CLASSROOM ASST	E100
0844	LIBRARY INSTR MTRLS ASST,FT	E100
0858	COUNSELING ASST,BILINGUAL	E100
0863	SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSISTANT	E100
0877S	PROG ASSISTANT	S102
0885	SCHOOL IMPROV SUPPORT LIAISON	E100
1111	SECRETARY I	S100
1114	SECRETARY III (GENERAL)	S100
1133	EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	S100
1243	SCHOOL-BASED TECH MAINT ASST	E100
1706	HEALTH ROOM TECHNICIAN	E100
1712	SCHOOL NURSE	N100
1715	SCHOOL NURSE PRACTITIONER	N100
1817	SCHOOL CLIMATE MANAGER	P106
6005	AGRICULTURAL MECH & STOCK CLK	E100

Appendix C: Summary of Questions Removed in 2020-21 and Reinstated in 2021-22

Survey	Summary of Reinstated Items
Student survey	Six items in the Safety/Building Condition subtopic (e.g., "I feel safe in the hallways," "My school is clean,") and assorted questions outside of the six main topics (e.g. questions related to Food Services, School Safety Officers, or extracurricular activities)
Teacher survey	Three questions under the School-Level Challenges to Student Learning and Classroom-Level Challenges to Student Learning subtopics which involved issues in schools or classrooms (e.g. "My class is interrupted by announcements or messages from the office or colleagues"), one question under the Classroom Level Decision-Making subtopic ("Determining how classroom space is used"), and questions about School Safety Officers (which were not part of one of the six main survey topics)
Parent/ guardian survey	Two items under the Evaluation of Teaching and Learning subtopic (e.g. "I am pleased with the before/after school activities my school offers"), two under Safety/Building Condition (e.g. "My child's school is clean"), two under Parent/Guardian involvement (e.g." Since the beginning of the school year, has any adult in your child's household served as a volunteer in your child's school?"), along with some ad hoc questions about transportation challenges
Principal/ assistant principal survey	Three Climate items (related to External Challenges to Student Learning and School Level Challenges to Student Learning, e.g. neighborhood crime/safety), along with questions about School Safety Officers and Student Discipline which fell outside of the six main DWS topics
Support Staff survey	Two questions: one under the Respect subtopic relating to the extent to which support staff feel respected by School Safety Officers and one under Challenges to Student Learning related to school crime/safety