Philly School Experience Survey

Technical Report

December 2023

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Philly School Experience Survey (PSES) is an annual survey program that has been administered in public schools in the city of Philadelphia since 2014-15. The PSES is organized by the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) and is administered to school communities serving grades K-12 that are directly operated by the District, contracted alternative schools, and charter schools.[1] Formerly known as the District-Wide Survey (DWS), we introduced the new name (PSES) in 2022-23 to emphasize the core purpose of this survey program: to gather feedback from students, staff, and parents/guardians about their experiences each year, and to monitor organizational conditions in schools associated with school improvement over time and across our school system.

Our overarching goal for the PSES is to collect rigorous, robust, reliable, and actionable data that can be used to improve our city's schools. To this end, this report describes the framework that has guided survey development, revisions to the 2022-23 survey instruments, survey administration processes, and the methods for calculating school-level scores for the core topics in the surveys. It also documents measures of the validity of these surveys, including response rates, representativeness of samples for each survey, and statistical reliability of core topics and subtopics.

History of the Survey Program

The PSES began in the 2014-15 academic year.[2] 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,[3] who found that five school improvement domains (now called the "5Essentials"[4]) were strongly related to student achievement gains in Chicago Public Schools and schools across Illinois.[5, 6] 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] Individual charter schools choose whether to participate in the PSES each year.
[2] As mentioned in the introduction, the survey program was originally called the District-Wide Survey, but was renamed in 2023 and will be referred to as Philly School Experience Survey (PSES) throughout this report.
[3] 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.
[4] See: https://uchicagoimpact.org/our-offerings/5essentials
[5] 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
[6] 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

In addition to the five core topics adapted from the 5Essentials, SDP added a new core topic in 2021-22: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. This core topic was developed in the winter of the 2020-21 school year by ORE and the newly established Equity Coalition to help us understand the perspectives and experiences of parents/guardians, students, teachers, principals, and school-based staff on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in SDP schools. Questions on this topic were adapted from items in existing validated staff and student instruments developed by Panorama Education.[7] The items were piloted in 2020-21, and topic scores were produced for the first time in 2021-22 after statistical analyses (factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha calculations) determined that the measures were reliable.

The stakeholder groups that are invited to complete a PSES survey have expanded over time. In 2014-15, the surveys were conducted with students, parents/guardians, teachers, and principals. In 2019-20, ORE developed and piloted a fifth survey for school-based support staff (referred to as "support staff" for brevity) in District and alternative schools. Initially, this respondent group was made up mainly of counselors, nurses, classroom aides, climate staff, psychologists, and secretaries. In 2022-23, in response to requests from school leaders, the positions included in this category were expanded to include food services, facilities, additional climate support, and other positions, increasing the number of District employees eligible to take the survey from around 3,700 in 2021-22 to around 6,800 in 2022-23 (the expanded list of positions is available in Appendix B). In 2020-21, the principal survey was also expanded to include assistant principals.

Survey Framework

Taken together, the five surveys administered in 2022-23 (student, parent/guardian, teacher, support staff, and principal/assistant principal) were designed to measure six core topics:[8]

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

2. **Instructional Environment[9]** – Student engagement and how students, parents/guardians, and teachers feel about the teaching and learning environment at their school.

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

---

[7] The Panorama Equity and Inclusion Surveys: https://go.panoramaed.com/thanks/measuring-equity-inclusion?submissionGuid=baac0511-51e1-4196-aabd-9c9669cf5dad
[8] The first five topics draw on Bryk and colleagues' (2010) work in Chicago, which identified five essential supports for school improvement. The original names of the five essential supports identified by Bryk and his colleagues were School Leadership, Parent-Community Ties, Professional Capacity, Student-Centered Learning Climate, and Instructional Guidance.
[9] This topic was called "Instruction" in previous years, and was renamed in 2022-23 to reflect its focus on student engagement and the nature of support in classrooms and across the school.

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. **Family Engagement**[10] – 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. **Diversity, 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. Different topics are generated from questions from different respondent groups; for example, students do not answer questions about Professional Capacity of school staff (see Table 1). In 2022-23, some topics were removed from some of the surveys to reduce survey length (see page 7 for more details). The names of some subtopics were also revised in 2022-23 for clarity (see Appendix A for a list of all topics and subtopics).

Table 1: Topics by respondent group

Respondent Groups	Topic					
	School Climate	Instructional Environment	School Leadership	Professional Capacity	Family Engagement	Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
Parent/Guardian			✔		✔	✔
Student	✔	✔				✔
Teacher	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Principal/ Assistant Principal*	✔			✔	✔	✔
Support Staff*	✔		✔	✔		✔

*Results from principals/APs and support staff are not included in overall topic scores.

The surveys also include questions that are not part of one of the six core topics and subtopics but are of interest to stakeholders across our schools and city. Key non-core topic areas in 2022-23 included neighborhood safety, health and nutrition, and School Safety Officers.

---

[10] This topic was previously referred to as "Parent/Guardian-Community Ties." It was renamed in 2022-23.

Changes to PSES Instruments in 2022-23

In 2022, PSES instruments were revised in keeping with a key recommendation from Superintendent Watlington's [Transition Team report](#) that SDP:

> *"Simplify surveys, set expectations for how data will be used, show evidence of how data/information is informing decision making. Otherwise, consider not doing it, in favor of other feedback options."*
>
> - Sub-Committee on Community Engagement and Communications Recommendation 4 (page 24)

The Transition Team recommendation echoed informal feedback from school leaders over the years that shortening the length of the student and parent/guardian surveys in particular would make it easier for schools to administer the surveys, achieve higher response rates, and ensure the validity of responses. A working group representing all relevant program offices as well as school staff was convened in January of 2023 to review the survey instruments and identify items that could be cut without undermining the objective of the PSES and other critical SDP data needs. Core topics with large numbers of items were trimmed down, and Chronbach's alphas were calculated on the 2021-22 data without the items proposed to be cut to ensure subtopics would still be reliable. For non-core topics, the PSES team consulted with the program offices and/or partners who originally requested them, and in many cases was able to confirm that questions were no longer needed, or could be trimmed down to a smaller number of items. Table 2 shows the results of this revision process: the length of the student survey was cut by 47%, parent/guardian survey length by 40%, the principal/AP survey by 26%, and teacher survey length by 23%. The support staff survey was the only survey where items were added in 2022-23, as it had historically been the shortest of the surveys. The full list of items included under each topic and subtopic in 2022-23 and prior years is available on the PSES website (philasd.org/pses).

Table 2: Number of PSES core and non-core items for each respondent group, 2021-22 and 2022-23

Respondent Group	2021-22			2022-23		
	Number of Core topic items	Number of Non-core items	Total Number of Survey Items	Number of Core topic items	Number of Non-core items	Total Number of Survey Items
Parent/ Guardian	46	41	87	28	24	52
Student*	49	104	153	41	40	81
Teacher	154	21	175	102	32	134
Principal/AP	100	21	121	51	39	90
Support Staff	54	1	55	44	24	68

*Students in grades 3-5 take an abridged version of the survey.

In some cases, shortening the surveys involved changes to the composition of topics. For example, parent/guardian survey results were removed from the School Climate and Instructional Environment topics. The Instructional Environment and School Leadership topics were also dropped from the Principal/AP survey. One subtopic was also removed from the School Leadership topic on the teacher survey.

In addition to reducing the number of items and topics in each survey, some subtopics were reorganized to reflect how issues are currently conceptualized in SDP. The "Safety and Building Conditions" subtopic on the student survey was split into two distinct subtopics: "School Safety" and "Building Condition." The teacher survey Professional Capacity questions related to professional development were reorganized to better distinguish between school-based and centralized District-led professional development activities. In response to feedback from school leaders, many of the School Climate items related to safety outside of the school grounds (those related to safety on the way to and from school or in the neighborhood) were removed from the School Climate topic and moved to a non-core "Neighborhood Safety" subtopic, to refocus the School Climate topic on safety issues inside of the school over which school leaders have greater influence.

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 2022-23, a strategic decision was made to shorten the survey window for most of the surveys to minimize the overlap with standardized testing administration and because most responses had been received toward the end of the survey window in recent years. The exception was the parent/guardian survey, which was launched on March 27, 2023 to allow schools to provide the survey during report card conferences.

Table 3: Survey administration windows, 2014-15 through 2022-23

Year	Parent/ Guardian	Student	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal^	Support Staff[#]
2014-15	April 20 – June 19, 2015	May 4 – 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				
2022-23	March 27 – June 12, 2023	May 1 – June 12, 2023			

*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.

Integration with Student Well-Being Survey

In 2022-23, the PSES administration window overlapped with the fourth administration window of the Student Well-Being Survey (SWBS), a five-minute survey which was introduced in 2021-22 and is now completed by District students in grades 3-12 multiple times each year.[11] To streamline data collection for schools, ORE and the School Climate Office agreed to integrate the two surveys in 2022-23 so that students could complete both surveys in one sitting. The SWBS questions were programmed into the PSES survey instrument (but were hidden from students in Charter and Opportunity Network schools). During data processing, the SWBS results were split from the PSES results and analyzed separately.

Survey Translation

To accommodate the diverse families served by SDP, efforts have been made to translate the parent/guardian survey into as many languages as possible. In 2022-23, the number of languages was expanded from 9 to 11 languages to include Uzbek and Bengali.[12] All 12 languages (including English) were available in the online parent/guardian survey, and the paper copies of the survey were available in English, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese.

In 2021-22 and prior years, the student survey was translated into Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. In 2022-23, seven additional translations were made available.[13] All translations of the parent/guardian and student surveys are available on the PSES website.[14]

Survey Modalities

The surveys were primarily administered online via SurveyMonkey. District students and staff (principals/APs, teachers, and support staff) accessed the survey through their student and employee portals, respectively. Accessing the survey through the official District portals allows each survey to be linked to individual student and staff information, ensuring the validity of responses.

However, since nearly all respondents from Charter and contracted schools do not have access to or are familiar with these portals, additional ways to access the survey were offered. Charter and contracted school teachers and principals were provided with secure individual links to the survey via their email accounts. The student survey was made available on a publicly accessible link for students at Charter and contracted schools. Students who took the survey via this public website were required to enter a unique District Student ID number in order to access the surveys.

Similar to the student survey for Charter and contracted schools, the parent/guardian survey was also made available on a public website, and this was the most common way that parents and guardians at District, Charter, and contracted schools accessed the survey. Parents and guardians at District schools had the option of accessing the survey via the online parent portal, similar to how

---

[11] For more information, see: https://www.philasd.org/schoolclimate/#studentsurvey

[12] In 2022-23, the parent/guardian survey was translated into Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Arabic, Vietnamese, French, Russian, Khmer, Albanian, Uzbek, and Bengali.

[13] Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Arabic, Vietnamese, French, Russian, Khmer, and Albanian

[14] https://www.philasd.org/research/programsservices/district-wide-surveys/survey-archive/

students and staff accessed the survey. Paper copies of the parent/guardian survey were also made available in English, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese at all District schools, as well as District and contracted schools who opted into the paper survey option. Schools were allowed to choose whether they would like to have the paper surveys mailed in a box to the school or mailed directly to each household. Although the paper survey was only translated into three languages, it was accompanied by a letter with information in 12 languages about how to access the survey in multiple languages online. About 15% of parent/guardian surveys were returned on paper, and an additional 13% were taken online following receipt of the paper survey and accompanying letter.[15] Spanish language surveys were more frequently submitted on paper than other survey languages—about 28% of Spanish surveys for elementary and middle schools were submitted on paper.

Parent/Guardian Survey Anonymity

Prior to 2022-23, the response rate for parents/guardians had not risen above 15% for many years. Each year, school administrators had to expend significant effort reminding families how to look up their student ID number. In 2022-23, the parent/guardian survey was made completely anonymous, removing this barrier and allowing parents and guardians to immediately take the survey as soon as they heard about it, without having to contact the school or spend time looking for their student's ID number. In previous years, staff had also reported that some parents/guardians might feel more comfortable responding knowing that their responses could not be traced back to them or to their students. This practice of making parent/guardian surveys anonymous is common across public school districts that have relatively high response rates, and it is worth noting that the PSES parent/guardian response rate increased by about 80% in 2022-23, with more than 15,000 more valid survey responses in 2022-23 than in 2021-22.

Strategies for Increasing Response Rates

Since response rates are important to the validity of the survey results, the PSES team used a number of strategies from prior years along with new strategies to increase response rates in 2022-23:

- **Online gift card raffle for parents/guardians and staff:** As in previous years, parents/ guardians and teachers who completed the survey were given the opportunity to enter a raffle to receive an online gift card. In 2022-23 the teacher raffle was expanded to all staff, including principals, assistant principals, and support staff.
- **Shortening surveys:** Four of the five surveys were shortened significantly, and the support staff survey was maintained at its historically reasonable length, so that respondents were not deterred by the length of the survey. Communications to school staff and families highlighted the reduction in length to attract respondents who may have been frustrated by longer surveys in prior years.

---

[15] This statistic is based on responses to a question on the parent/guardian survey asking respondents what led them to take the survey.

- **Parent/guardian survey anonymity**: As discussed in the preceding section, the practice of requiring families to look up their child's ID number was removed to ensure that parents could immediately take the survey without impediment.
- **Enhanced engagement with school staff, including new "Survey Champions":** Historically, the PSES Team communicated with schools via school principals, typically through the weekly District newsletter. However, most principals delegate the administration of surveys in their school to another staff member, such as an assistant principal, school secretary, teacher, or a member of the Climate staff. In fall of 2022, following favorable responses from school leaders in a poll, the PSES team began encouraging principals to nominate a staff member to serve as a "Survey Champion" to be in direct communication with the PSES team on matters of survey administration. A total of 111 principals nominated Survey Champions, who were offered training sessions and "office hours" with the PSES team and received regular email updates about key deadlines and administration procedures.
- **Streamlined resources and communications:** The PSES Team continued its historical practice of communicating regularly with school leaders and assistant superintendents throughout the survey administration window, but made a special effort in 2022-23 to simplify messaging and reorganize the available resources to make them easier to use.

Similar to prior years, schools also employed a range of strategies for generating strong response rates, including:
- **Email/phone reminders**: Most schools sent email reminders, and some used robocalls explaining the importance of the PSES and how to complete it.
- **School events**: Many schools used school events such as report card conferences, concerts, and sports activities as opportunities to distribute paper surveys and letters or direct families to the online survey via the short url or QR code.
- **Flyers:** Schools posted flyers provided by the PSES Team with QR codes linking to the surveys in the school front office or other prominent locations, and some schools created their own flyers and promotional materials.
- **Incentives:** Many schools organized incentives such as pizza parties for the grade level with the most completed student surveys.

Response Rates

For each survey group, we calculate response rates based on the number of individuals that submitted a survey out of the total population that was eligible to participate. Response rates are calculated separately for each survey group and reported by school, by network, by sector, and overall.

The numerator for each response rate is based on the number of individuals who submitted a valid survey. The survey platform allows multiple entries from the same respondent; however, for all respondents except parents and guardians, we removed duplicate entries by taking the most

complete or most recent response. Although parents and guardians were provided with guidance that each household should submit just one survey response for each school attended by their children, duplicate entries for the parent and guardian survey could not be identified in 2022-23 because the survey was made anonymous, and the parent and guardian response rate should be considered as an estimate.

The denominator for each response rate is based on the total population that was eligible to participate. The process for identifying this population involved data sources specific to each survey group:

- The student population was identified using an enrollment snapshot taken during the survey window. Each student enrolled on May 1, in grades 3-12, was counted once in the denominator.
- The parent and guardian population was identified by linking the same student enrollment snapshot to household information and counting each household once per school.
- The staff population (teachers, support staff, and principals/assistant principals) were identified differently for District and non-District (Charter and contracted) schools:
  - The District staff population was identified using internal employee records assigned to each school location with active employment on May 1.
  - The contracted and Charter school staff population was identified using staff lists provided by each school.

In some cases, an individual was associated with a different school location in the numerator and the denominator. This can occur if a student enrolls in a different school after the enrollment snapshot date and submits a survey response at their new school. In such cases, the denominator was adjusted so that the individual was counted in both the numerator and the denominator for the school where their response is attributed (and not counted in any other school).

Table 4 shows the response rates (and number of responses) for each respondent group over time, from 2014-15 to 2022-2023.

Table 4: Response rates from 2014-15 to 2022-23 (number of responses shown in parentheses)

Year	Student	Parent/ Guardian[i]	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal[ii]	Support Staff[iii]
2014-15	33% (46,695)	7% (13,360)	53% (5,423)	64% (185)	-
2015-16	50% (73,187)	13% (25,911)	51% (5,688)	73% (241)	-
2016-17	50% (72,580)	16% (30,968)	56% (6,515)	57% (184)	-
2017-18	54% (80,101)	17% (33,334)	54% (6,652)	60% (199)	-
2018-19	61% (89,496)	23% (35,055)	56% (6,663)	56% (185)	-
2019-20	32% (47,439)	16% (25,915)	64% (6,986)	48% (168)	37% (1,311)
2020-21	42% (62,353)	16% (24,313)	68% (8,267)	45% (242)	43% (1,525)
2021-22	48% (67,180)	14% (20,682)	59% (7,065)	68% (419)	36% (1,381)
2022-23	55% (75,636)	25% (36,384)	68% (8,141)	80% (540)	45% (3,078)

[i] Two key changes have occurred in the parent/guardian response rate calculation: Prior to 2018-19, the response rate for this group was based on the total number of enrolled students. Since 2018-19, this response rate has been based on households rather than individual students. Additionally, in 2022-23, this survey became anonymous and duplicate entries can no longer be identified. As a result, the response rate should now be considered an estimate, since it may contain multiple entries from the same household.
[ii] The principal survey began including responses from assistant principals beginning in 2020-21.
[iii] The support staff survey was first administered in 2019-20. Charter schools do not participate in this survey. In 2022-23, the list of title codes eligible for this survey was expanded significantly to include food services, facilities, and other positions.

Minimum Thresholds

Minimum response rate thresholds are used to ensure that our sample sizes are large enough for valid analysis. Additionally, we require a minimum number of responses for reporting results for a given group of respondents in order to protect the confidentiality of each individual respondent. If the thresholds in Table 5 are not met, we suppress the survey results and do not publish them. Note that these thresholds have differed in prior years; Table 5 shows the rules applied to all products in 2022-23.

Table 5: 2022-23 survey participation thresholds

Survey	Threshold
Student	25% response rate and at least 5 responses
Parent/Guardian	10% response rate and at least 5 responses
Teacher	25% response rate and at least 5 responses
Support Staff	25% response rate and at least 5 responses
Principal/Assistant Principal	25% response rate and at least 5 responses

Parent/Guardian Survey Data Quality Checks

Because the parent/guardian survey was publicly accessible, we took additional steps to ensure data quality in 2022-23. First, we removed incomplete responses to ensure that any respondent who did not complete the survey and returned to complete it later would not be duplicated in the results. To detect any responses generated by Internet bots, we built an automated data quality assessment script which identified suspicious response characteristics, such as survey responses with school names not present in the District, responses indicating a student grade level not available in the selected school, responses submitted more quickly than humanly possible, or clusters of surveys submitted in close succession with characteristics which were both identical and unlikely.[16]

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 2022-23 student survey sample had similar demographic characteristics to the target population, with some exceptions (see Table 6) which aligned with patterns observed in previous years.[17] The student respondents from District schools had nearly the same gender distribution as the broader student population. The District PSES student sample was representative of most race/ethnicity groups as well. However, Black/African American were slightly under-represented—

---

[16] Examples of such patterns include a succession of surveys with identical demographic characteristics submitted for the same school in a short time frame, or a succession of surveys with the same IP address submitted late at night.

[17] See the 2021-22 Technical Report and this 2019-20 study: https://www.philasd.org/research/2021/10/12/ representativeness-of-the-2019-20-district-wide-student-and-parent-guardian-survey-results-2/

43% of District respondents were Black/African American, compared to 46% of all grade 3-12 students.[18]

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 58% of grade 3-12 Charter students were Black/African American, only 50% of students who responded to the PSES were Black/African American.

Table 6. Distribution of all grade 3-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2022-23 by race/ethnicity and gender compared to student PSES respondents

	District Students in Grades 3-12 (n=86,891)			Charter Students in Grades 3-12 (n=62,307)		
	% 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	46%	43%	-3	58%	50%	-8
Hispanic/Latine	25%	25%	0	20%	20%	0
White	14%	16%	+2	12%	18%	+6
Asian	10%	12%	+1	3%	6%	+3
Multi-Racial/Other*	4%	4%	0	6%	6%	0
Gender						
Male	51%	50%	-1	50%	49%	-2
Female	49%	50%	+1	50%	51%	+1
Non-Binary	<1%	<1%	0	i.s.	i.s.	i.s.

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
Note: District and Charter enrollment and PSES respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 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, 46% of grade 3-12 District students were Black/African American in 2022-23 and 43% of all District PSES respondents were Black/African American.

---

[18] With the exception of parent/guardian responses, the differences between survey respondent and target population characteristics that are directly discussed in this section have been confirmed to be statistically significant (p<.05) using a Chi-Square Goodness of Fit test.

High school students from both District and Charter schools were underrepresented in the student survey, whereas elementary school students were overrepresented (Table 7).

Table 7. Distribution of all grade 3-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2022-23 by grade level compared to student PSES respondents

Grade	District Students in Grades 3-12 (n=86,891)			Charter Students in Grades 3-12 (n=62,307)		
	% 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%	13%	+3	10%	12%	+2
4	10%	13%	+3	10%	12%	+2
5	10%	13%	+3	10%	13%	+3
6	10%	12%	+2	11%	13%	+3
7	10%	11%	+1	11%	13%	+3
8	10%	11%	+1	11%	10%	+1
9	12%	8%	-4	10%	7%	-3
10	11%	7%	-4	9%	7%	-2
11	9%	6%	-3	8%	6%	-3
12	9%	7%	-2	9%	6%	-3

Note: District and Charter enrollment and PSES respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 enrollment. Students in grades K-2 do not participate in the PSES.

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 13% of grade 3-12 District PSES responses. On the other hand, grade 10 District students represent 11% of grade 3-12 District students and 7% of District PSES responses.

Parent/Guardian Sample

Because demographic information on the full population of parents and guardians is not available, we use student demographic information as a proxy for parent/guardian demographics in reviewing the parent/guardian PSES sample. 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. Once the parent/guardian survey was made

anonymous in 2022-23, we could not link households' responses with their students' demographic information. Instead, we relied on questions in the parent/guardian survey.

In 2022-23, the parent/guardian survey sample included a broad representation of students of different races/ethnicities and grade levels. However, while 44% of District students were Black/African American, only 32% of the parent/guardian respondents said their students were Black/African American, and a similar pattern was found for parents of Hispanic/Latine students (see Table 8). The percentage of District and Charter families who reported their students were multi-racial or a race other than Black/African American, Hispanic/Latine, White, or Asian was much higher than the percentage of students identified under these categories in District administrative records. These differences could be due in part to the fact that the race/ethnicity distribution for the population is estimated using administrative data on student characteristics, whereas the student characteristics information used for assessing the parent/guardian PSES samples is reported by parents as part of the survey.

Table 8. Distribution of all District and Charter students enrolled in 2022-23 by race/ethnicity compared to students whose parents/guardians responded to the PSES

	District Students in Grades K-12 (n=113,369)			Charter Students in Grades K-12 (n=80,029)		
	% 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	44%	32%	-12	59%	53%	-6
Hispanic/Latine	26%	22%	-5	19%	19%	0
White	15%	22%	+7	12%	12%	0
Asian	10%	12%	+1	4%	5%	+1
Multi-Racial/Other*	4%	13%	+9	6%	11%	+5

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
Notes: District and Charter enrollment is based on May 1, 2023 enrollment. PSES respondent information was self-reported by parents and guardians on questions within the survey. 486 District responses and 101 Charter responses were removed due to missing data on the race/ethnicity question.
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 PSES sample, the parent/guardian sample was not fully representative of the population with respect to student grade levels. The proportion of parents/guardians of students in grades 1-3 who took the survey was higher than the proportion of parents/guardians of high school students (Table 9).

Table 9. Distribution of all grade K-12 District and Charter students enrolled in 2022-23 by grade level compared to students with parents/guardians who responded to the PSES

Grade	District Students in Grades K-12 (n=113,369)			Charter Students in Grades K-12 (n=80,029)		
	% 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)
K	7%	12%	5	7%	10%	+3
1	8%	12%	+4	8%	10%	+2
2	8%	11%	+4	7%	10%	+3
3	8%	13%	+5	8%	9%	+2
4	8%	11%	+3	8%	10%	+2
5	8%	10%	2	8%	9%	1
6	7%	7%	0	9%	9%	0
7	7%	6%	-1	9%	9%	0
8	7%	6%	-1	9%	8%	-1
9	9%	4%	-5	8%	4%	-4
10	8%	3%	-5	7%	4%	-3
11	7%	3%	-4	7%	4%	-3
12	7%	3%	-4	7%	4%	-3

Note: District and Charter enrollment and PSES respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 enrollment.
How to read this table: This table allows you to compare the % 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 2022-23 PSES were largely representative of the broader teaching population with respect to race/ethnicity and gender as identified in the employee administrative records (Table 10), although White teachers responded at slightly higher rates than Black/African American teachers and female teachers responded at slightly higher rates than male teachers. Demographic data was not available for Charter and contracted school teachers.

Table 10. Demographic characteristics of teachers employed at District schools compared to District teachers who completed the PSES in 2022-23

	District Teachers (n = 7,899)		
	% of total teachers (a)	% of teacher respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
White	62%	65%	+2
Black/African American	21%	20%	-1
Hispanic/Latino	4%	4%	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	3%	0
Multi Racial/Other*	9%	9%	0
Gender			
Female	73%	74%	+1
Male	27%	26%	-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 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 11).

Table 11. School level of all District teachers compared to teacher PSES respondents, 2022-23

School Level (Grades Served)	District Teachers (n = 7,899)		
	% of total teachers (a)	% of teacher respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Elementary (K-2, K-4, K-5, K-6, 3-5)	18%	21%	+2
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	44%	46%	-1
Elementary-Middle-High (K-12)	1%	0%	0
Middle (5-8, 6-8, 7-8)	6%	6%	0
Middle-High (5-12, 6-12, 7-10, 7-12)	4%	3%	-1
High (9-12)	27%	24%	-3

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 race/ethnicity and gender distribution of District school leaders in the 2022-23 PSES was proportional to the overall population of school leaders. The gender distribution of respondents matched the gender distribution of all principals and assistant principals in employee records, and the proportion of respondents of each race/ethnicity was within two percentage points of the proportion in the broader population (Table 12). Demographic data was not available for Charter and contracted school leaders.

Table 12. Demographic characteristics of principals and assistant principals employed at District schools, compared to District principals and assistant principals who completed the PSES in 2022-23

	District Principals and Assistant Principals (n = 493)		
	% of total principals and assistant principals (a)	% of principal and assistant principal respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black/African American	51%	49%	-2
White	38%	40%	+2
Hispanic/Latino	6%	6%	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	1%	1%	0
Multi Racial/Other*	4%	4%	0
Gender			
Female	68%	68%	+0
Male	32%	32%	0

*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.

The proportion of District principals and assistant principals serving each school level category who responded to the PSES was within one percentage point of the proportion of the principal population (Table 13).

Table 13. School level of all District principals and assistant principals compared to District principal and assistant principal PSES respondents, 2022-23

School Level (Grades Served)	District Principals and Assistant Principals (n = 493)		
	% 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)	18%	19%	+1
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	42%	42%	0
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%	2%	-1
High (9-12)	29%	28%	-1

Note: District employment, and PSES respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 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. Charter schools did not participate in the support staff survey in 2022-23 (Table 14).

Table 14. Demographic characteristics of support staff employed at District schools compared to support staff who completed the PSES in 2022-23

	District Support Staff (n = 6,691)		
	% of total support staff (a)	% of support staff respondents (b)	Difference (% points) (c)
Race/Ethnicity			
Black/African American	62%	56%	-6
White	20%	26%	+6
Hispanic/Latino	9%	9%	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	2%	2%	0
Multi Racial/Other*	7%	7%	0
Gender			
Female	78%	85%	+6
Male	22%	15%	-6

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

Note: Support staff employment and District employment, and PSES respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 employee records.

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 elementary schools (those serving grades K-2, K-4, K-5, K-6, 3-5) were overrepresented in the PSES results (by about 5 percentage points) compared to support staff from high schools (Table 15).

Table 15. School level of all District support staff compared to support staff PSES respondents, 2022-23.

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)	20%	25%	+5
Elementary-Middle (K-8)	48%	50%	+1
Elementary-Middle-High (K-12)	1%	1%	0
Middle (5-8, 6-8, 7-8)	6%	6%	0
Middle-High (5-12, 6-12, 7-10, 7-12)	3%	1%	-1
High (9-12)	22%	17%	-4

Note: Support staff employment and respondent information is based on May 1, 2023 employee records..
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

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 on the 2014-15 results and repeated the analysis again with the results from the 2018-19, 2020-21, 2021-22, and 2022-23 survey administrations.[19]

Most scale reliabilities fell within the 0.70 and 0.97 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 Family Engagement topic on the principal/AP 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 principal/AP

---

[19] Technical reports for previous years are available here: https://www.philasd.org/research/ programsservices/ district-wide-surveys/district-wide-survey-technical-reports/

topic scores are not included in District- or school-level overall Family Engagement scores, and principal/AP results are not provided to schools or used for school-level decision-making. Table 16 provides the alphas for the six topics as measured across the five surveys.

Table 16. Cronbach's Alpha for survey constructs (topics), 2022-23

Topics	Student	Parent/ Guardian	Teacher	Principal/ Assistant Principal	Support Staff
School Climate	.90	--	.93	.89	.89
Instructional Environment	.94	--	.87	--	--
School Leadership	--	.95	.97	--	.95
Professional Capacity	--	--	.92	.89	.92
Family Engagement	--	.92	.84	.66	--
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	.87	.82	.88	.80	.89

Topic Validity and Factor Analysis

In 2014-15, 2016-17, and 2018-19, 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.

In 2022-2023, we used confirmatory higher order factor analysis to provide evidence that the factors constructed in previous years were still a reasonable structure to organize the survey data.

Each survey was organized into higher order factors and associated sub factors.[20] Higher order factors were correlated. Fit indices including the Comparative Fit index (Bentler, 1990), the Tucker-Lewis Index (Tucker & Lewis, 1973), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (Steiger & Lind, 1980), and the Standardized Root Mean Square (CITE) were used to assess overall fit of these models. Because students in grade 3 through 5 do not answer all of the items in the student survey, separate models were constructed for grades 3 through 5 and grades 6 through 12. Due to the large number of items in the teacher survey, distributional parceling was utilized (CITE).

Overall, the model for grades 3 through 5 student survey responses (CFI = .96, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .04, and SRMR = .03) and the parent survey (CFI = .96, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .05, and SRMR = .04) had very good model fit . The model for grades 6 through 12 student responses (CFI = .92, TLI = .91, RMSEA = .05, and SRMR = .07), the support staff survey (CFI = .91, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .06, and SRMR = .06), and the teacher survey (CFI = .91, TLI = .90, RMSEA = .06, and SRMR = .07) had acceptable fit. Finally, the principal survey fell below acceptable fit (CFI = .88, TLI = .87, RMSEA = .05, and SRMR = .06). These results support the current policy of excluding principal results from overall topic scores, and indicate a need for further review of the principal survey topics and the items within them. The acceptable model fit and topic score reliability for the support staff survey suggest we could consider including support staff results in overall topic scores in future years.

Subtopic and Topic Scoring

The survey results for each subtopic and topic area can be represented as a single numeric score on a scale from 0-10. Higher values indicate more favorable responses, while lower values indicate more unfavorable responses. Note that not all subtopics and topics are relevant to all respondent groups; each respondent group contributes to a different set of topic scores. The following types of scores are calculated and reported:
- Subtopic scores for each survey respondent group
- Topic scores for each survey respondent group
- Topic scores produced from subtopic scores from all *applicable* respondent groups

In 2022-23, the respondent groups applicable to each topic score were revised as part of the instrument revision process (see Table 1).

Scoring Procedure
Responses for each survey question are first converted to a numeric scale from 0-10, where 10 represents the most favorable response. For example, for the student question "I feel welcome in my school," a response of "most or all of the time" is assigned the value 10. Subtopic scores are calculated separately for each respondent group by taking the average scaled response value for all question responses within the subtopic. Each individual question response carries equal weight and skipped questions (or "N/A" type answers) are disregarded. If the minimum reporting thresholds are not met for the respondent group (i.e., the respondent group within the school, group of schools,

---

[20] In the rest of this report and in other PSES products, we refer to these as "topics" and "subtopics."

or a given demographic group), the subtopic scores are suppressed and not reported. Additionally, some schools or groupings may not receive a subtopic score because the relevant questions are not applicable. For example, schools serving only lower grades do not receive Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion subtopic scores for students because these questions are only for grades 6 and above.

Topic scores are based on the average of all subtopic scores from each topic area. This calculation is made for each respondent group separately, as well as overall for all respondent groups combined. In both cases, each subtopic score carries equal weight. If any subtopic score is unavailable, either due to suppression or non-applicability, the topic score is suppressed and not reported. This step ensures that topic scores are always calculated in a consistent manner using the same subtopics.

Because the survey instruments and procedures change from year to year, subtopic and topic scores are recalculated for prior years using current year rules and question assignments. For example, a student question in the Instructional Environment topic ("I learn things in my classes that are interesting to me") was removed from the survey in 2022-23. To ensure valid comparisons across years, the topic score for prior years was recalculated with this question excluded in all 2022-23 reporting. All such changes to scoring procedures are applied retroactively so that year-over-year differences in topic scores can be attributed to changes in respondent sentiment rather than to changes in survey design or scoring procedures.

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: 2022-23 Survey Topics and Subtopics by Respondent Type

Student		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
School Climate	Belonging	4
	Building Condition	3
	Bullying	7
	School Safety	5
	Overall	**19**
Supplemental Climate Information	Bullying (Pilot) / **Overall**	**4**
Instructional Environment	Supportive Classrooms / **Overall**	**13**
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Cultural Awareness and Action	4
	Educating all Students	4
	Overall	**8**
Other	College and Career	2
	Demographics	2
	Extracurricular Activities	3
	Food Insecurity	1
	Food Services	4
	Mode of Transportation	1
	Neighborhood Safety	2
	Nutrition	4
	Physical Activity	1
	School Counselors	1
	School Safety Officers	3
	Technology Access	2
	Other	11

Parent/Guardian		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
School Climate	Family Perceptions of School Climate **/ Overall**	**6**
Instructional Environment	Evaluation of Teaching and Learning **/ Overall**	**4**
Supplemental Instructional Environment Information	Family Perceptions of Instructional Environment **/ Overall**	**4**
Family Engagement	Communicating with Families	7
	Parent/Guardian Involvement	4
	School-Family Relationships	5
	Overall	**16**
School Leadership	Inclusive Leadership **/ Overall**	**5**
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	4
	Overall	**7**
Other	Demographics	2
	Food Insecurity	5
	Technology Access	2
	Other	5

Teacher		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
School Climate	Attendance	4
	Classroom Level Challenges to Student Learning	5
	Respect	8
	School Level Challenges to Student Learning	13
	School-Wide Learning Climate	7
	Overall	**37**

Teacher		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
Supplemental Climate Information	Discipline / **Overall**	**7**
Instructional Environment	Student Engagement **/ Overall**	**12**
Family Engagement	Teacher Outreach to Parents/Guardians **/ Overall**	**6**
School Leadership	Expectations and Feedback	6
	Inclusive Leadership	5
	Overall	**11**
Professional Capacity	District-Led PD Quality	7
	District-Led PD Relevance	5
	School-Based PD	3
	Support for Innovation	3
	Teacher Collaboration	7
	Overall	**25**
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Anti-Racist Professional Culture	4
	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	4
	Overall	**11**
Other	Attendance and Dropout	2
	Implementation/Awareness of Goals and Guardrails	9
	Neighborhood Safety	1
	Other External Challenges	2
	School Safety Officers	3
	Other	8

Principal/Assistant Principal		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
School Climate	Attendance	4
	Respect	7
	School Level Challenges to Student Learning	14
	Overall	**32**
Family Engagement	Principal Relationship with Parents/Guardians / **Overall**	**4**
Professional Capacity	Coaching and Collaboration	5
	PD for School Leaders	7
	Overall	**12**
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	7
	Overall	**10**
Other	Attendance and Dropout	15
	Awareness/Implementation of Goals and Guardrails	10
	Food Insecurity	1
	Health	1
	Mental Health	1
	Neighborhood Safety	1
	Other External Challenges	4
	School Safety Officers	3
	Other	3

School Support Staff		
Topic	**Subtopic**	**Number of Items**
School Climate	Challenges to Student Learning	12
	Respect	9
	Overall	**21**
School Leadership	Inclusive Leadership / **Overall**	**6**
Professional Capacity	Trauma-Informed Practices	4
	Knowledge of Student Supports	5
	Overall	**9**
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	Belonging	3
	Cultural Awareness and Action	5
	Overall	**8**
Other	Attendance and Dropout	2
	Awareness/Implementation of Goals and Guardrails	9
	Neighborhood Safety	1
	Support Staff Resources	3
	Support Staff Role Clarity	5
	Other	4

Appendix B: List of Support Staff Title Codes

TITLE CODE	TITLE GROUP	TITLE
0199	T100	ACADEMIC COACH*
0230	Y100	ASSISTANT PROGRAM COORD*
0486	T100	SCHOOL COUNSELOR, 10 MONTHS
0487	T100	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COUNSELOR
0502	E100	COMMUNITY RELATION LIAISON, FT
0503	E100	CONFLICT RESOLUTION SPECIALIST
0507	E100	BILINGUAL VOC SUPPORT ASST
0510	E100	INTERP, DEAF/HARD OF HEARING
0522	K101	STEP CASE MANAGER*
0529	M101	STEP CLINICAL SOCIAL WK CRD*
0529	M101	STEP CLINICAL COORDINATOR*
0531	K101	STEP SCHOOL BEHAVIORAL CONSULT*
0536	T103	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST
0538	K101	PROGRAM COORDINATOR*
0541	T103	SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST, BILINGUAL
0554	E100	LIFEGUARD
0558	Y100	SCHOOL CLIMATE LIAISON*
0597	K101	STEP FAMILY PEER*
0807	E100	SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ASST, 4 HR
0812	E100	CLASSROOM ASST,SP ED,HEAR IMP
0815	E100	SUPPORTIVE SERVICES ASST, 3 HR
0816	E100	SCHOOL COMMUNITY COORD, FT
0819	E100	CLIMATE SUPPORT SPECIALIST
0825	E100	CAREER & TECHNICAL EDUC ASST
0839	E100	CLASSROOM ASST
0844	E100	LIBRARY INSTR MTRLS ASST, FT

TITLE CODE	TITLE GROUP	TITLE
0858	E100	COUNSELING ASST, BILINGUAL
0863	E100	ONE TO ONE ASST, SPECIAL ED
0863	E100	SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSISTANT
0885	E100	SCHOOL IMPROV SUPPORT LIAISON
1111	S100	SECRETARY I
1114	S100	SECRETARY III (GENERAL)
1133	S100	EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
1243	E100	SCHOOL-BASED TECH MAINT ASST
1706	E100	HEALTH ROOM TECHNICIAN
1709	T102	OCCUP THERAPIST*
1709	T102	THERAPIST (OCCUP/PHYS)*
1711	T102	PHYSICAL THERAPIST*
1712	N100	SCHOOL NURSE
1715	N100	SCHOOL NURSE PRACTITIONER
1817	P106	SCHOOL CLIMATE MANAGER
1860	K300	INSTRUCTOR, JROTC*
5002	C102	CUSTODIAL ASSISTANT*
5007	C102	BUILDING ENGINEER-GROUP I*
5009	C102	BUILDING ENGINEER-GROUP II*
5011	C102	BUILDING ENGINEER-GROUP III*
5013	C102	BUILDING ENGINEER-GROUP IV*
5020	C102	GENERAL CLEANER, 8 HOURS*
6005	E100	AGRICULTURAL MECH & STOCK CLK
6992	H101	FARMER*
7602	F100	FOOD SVCS WORKER II*
7603	F100	FOOD SVCS UTILITY WORKER*
7605	F100	FOOD SVCS ASSISTANT*
7607	F101	STUDENT CLIMATE STAFF, 3 HOURS*

TITLE CODE	TITLE GROUP	TITLE
7607	F101	NOON TIME AIDE, 3 HRS*
7608	F101	STUDENT CLIMATE STAFF, 3.5 HRS*
7610	F101	STUDENT CLIMATE STAFF, 4 HOURS*
7610	F101	NOON TIME AIDE, 4 HRS*
7614	F100	FOOD SVCS WORKER III*
7619	F100	FOOD SVCS WORKER SENIOR*
7621	F101	STUDENT CLIMATE STAFF, 5 HOURS*
7621	F101	NOON TIME AIDE, 5 HRS*
7633	D100	FOOD SVCS MANAGER I*
7634	D100	FOOD SVCS MANAGER II*
7635	D100	FOOD SVCS MANAGER III*
7636	D100	FOOD SVCS MANAGER IV*
7668	F101	STUDENT CLIMATE STAFF, 6 HOURS*
8232	C102	CUSTODIAL ASSISTANT*
8233	C102	CUSTODIAL ASSISTANT*
0230S	Y100	ASSISTANT PROGRAM COORD*
0877S	S102	PROG ASSISTANT

*Newly added for the 2022-2023 survey