



# Teacher Working Conditions in Guilford County Schools

February 2009

# Teacher Working Conditions Report from Guilford Education Alliance

*February 2009*

---

## Table of Contents

Letter from Guilford Education Alliance.....	3
Managing Human Capital.....	5
Overview of N.C. Teacher Working Conditions Survey.....	7
Snapshot of Guilford County's Public School Teachers.....	8
Teacher Profile	
Teacher Turnover	
Findings from the Guilford County Schools TWC Survey Results.....	11
1. Teacher working conditions are reported to have improved in many areas since 2006, but most responses remain below the state average and below the other urban districts.	
2. Teachers see some improvements in availability of non-instructional time, but most need more planning and collaborative time.	
3. Teachers are positive about the facilities and resources available, particularly related to technology.	
4. Teachers play a role in instructional decisions, but do not feel centrally involved in decision making.	
5. Teachers are clear about expectations from school leadership, but want more support with discipline and other areas.	
6. Teachers are generally positive about professional development received, but did not get what they needed most.	
7. Teachers remain uncertain about the use of TWC results at their schools.	
8. Teachers at small/redesigned high schools have the highest average of positive responses.	
9. Teachers at Mission Possible and Title I schools have the lowest average of positive responses.	
10. Principals report better perceived working conditions for teachers than teachers report.	
School Profile: Wiley Elementary.....	23
Feedback from Teacher Focus Groups.....	26

Principal Perceptions and Working Conditions.....	27
Real D.E.A.L. Principal Profile	
Focus Groups with Teachers and Principals Together	
Recommendations from Guilford Education Alliance.....	31
Appendix A: Standards for Working Conditions in North Carolina Schools.....	32
Appendix B: Data Tables for Survey Results.....	34
Average Domain Scores by Category of Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Elementary Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Middle Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS High Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Small/Redesigned High Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Magnet Elementary and Middle Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Title I Elementary Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Title I Middle Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible Elementary Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible Middle Schools	
Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible High Schools	
Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover: Elementary Schools	
Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover: Middle Schools	
Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover: High Schools	
Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions	
Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Teachers Roles	

# Teacher Working Conditions in Guilford County

---

***“We have to hold teachers accountable and monitor them, but we have to give them the resources and time to be successful.”***

***- Dr. LaToy Kennedy, GCS Principal of the Year***

---

## ***From the Guilford Education Alliance***

As part of our work on the importance of supporting and promoting quality education in our community, Guilford Education Alliance is pleased to present this report on the 2008 N.C. Teacher Working Conditions Survey. Our schools are molding the future for our individual children, but in a larger context the quality of the education we provide is molding the future of our community as a whole. We must be continually vigilant to identify ways we can improve our education system and support our schools.

There are many factors that influence our students' educational experience, but central is the quality of teaching in the classrooms. Teaching quality is dependent upon teachers' motivation and working conditions, or the broader context or situation in which they work. As former N.C. Governor Michael Easley stated several years ago in launching the Teacher Working Conditions Survey, "teacher working conditions are student learning conditions." Guilford Education Alliance and the larger community are focused on how we can support Guilford County Schools in its work so that all students are prepared to further their education or enter productive jobs and become contributing members of society through their work and citizenship.

Working conditions are first the physical classrooms in our schools, and with the passage of bond referenda, Guilford County Schools have made great progress toward making our schools comfortable places to work and learn. But more important to promoting high quality education is the professional context in which our teachers work, including both on-going formal training and cultivation of supportive school environments critical to professional job satisfaction and teacher retention. Policymakers, researchers and educators know that teaching quality is central to our students' learning. As a school district, we make investments in teacher training, continually improve the curriculum, and advocate for higher teacher salaries. However, according to state and national research conducted by Eric Hirsch and others, "Teachers cannot be as successful with students as they otherwise would be without the leadership, support, and collaborative environments that positive school contexts provide...the presence of positive work environments is significantly connected with increased student achievement."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Quotation from Hirsch, E. (2008). *Key Issue: Identifying professional contexts to support highly effective teachers*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. In reference to the following sources: Hirsch, E. (2006). *Recruiting and retaining teachers in Alabama: Educators on what it will take to staff all classrooms with quality teachers*. Hillsborough, NC: Center for Teaching Quality; and Hirsch, E. & Emerick, S. (with Church, K., & Fuller, E.). (2007a). *Creating conditions for student and teacher success: A report on the Kansas Teacher Working Conditions Survey*. Hillsborough, NC: Center for Teaching Quality; and Hirsch, E. & Emerick, S. (with Church, K., & Fuller, E.). (2007a). *Teacher working conditions are student learning conditions: A report on the 2006 North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey*. Hillsborough, NC: Center for Teaching Quality.

This report provides an analysis of the teacher and principal responses from Guilford County Schools to the 2008 Teacher Working Conditions Survey as compared with responses from other urban districts in the state and the state averages across the five domains found to impact working conditions: Time, Facilities and Resources, Decision Making, Leadership and Professional Development. The relationship to teacher turnover and retention will also be considered. Although improved in some areas, it is of grave concern that the perceptions of teachers in Guilford County Schools remain below the state average in each of the domains. As with the 2006 survey, we have a strong participation rate in the completion of the survey, indicating a vested interest in improving working conditions throughout the district.

Included in the report are recommendations related to the major findings identified. Working together, the Board of Education, district leadership and the larger community can build upon strengths identified to address concerns raised. Guilford Education Alliance is committed to working with Guilford County Schools and the larger community to improve working conditions and raising student achievement—we look forward to continuing to be part of the efforts to improve working conditions for all of our teachers, thereby improving the quality of the educational experience for all of our students.

### ***Acknowledgements***

This report was written by Cyndi Soter O'Neil, research consultant to Guilford Education Alliance, in collaboration with Margaret Arbuckle, the organization's Executive Director.

Particular appreciation is extended to the Guilford Association of Educators, led by President Mark Jewell, and its members who attended focus groups to analyze the findings from the survey and participate in discussion regarding their meaning; and to Eric Hirsch, New Teacher Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz, and Keri Church, LEARN North Carolina, for their support and assistance with survey data.

Principals from schools with the highest average scores also participated in focus groups and made recommendations regarding their leadership practices in their school that have positive impact.

Additional appreciation is extended to members of the faculty at the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and to Human Resource leadership from several local corporations, all of whom reviewed the data and provided their professional insights and recommendations.

## Managing Human Capital

Nearly 5,000 teachers work in the classrooms of Guilford County Schools. They are the human capital with the power to make the greatest difference in the academic achievement of the more than 71,000 students filling those classrooms. Research has consistently shown that teacher quality directly affects student achievement and identifies the teacher as the single most important factor that impacts student learning.<sup>2</sup>

Experts are concerned about the strategic management of human capital in schools to improve student achievement. While recruiting enough qualified teachers to fill vacancies presents one problem, experts say school districts must also create strategies to connect the varied components of their personnel systems, from recruitment, hiring and placement to induction, professional development, evaluation and compensation.

"When you're in a school district, you realize that people don't fundamentally acknowledge that things like recruiting, hiring, placement, and training have got to be connected," said David Sigler, a principal associate at the Annenberg Institute for School Reform in Providence, R.I. "So you have a lot of work on one or two pieces of the whole human-capital picture," he said, "but it breaks down somewhere else in the process, and districts end up with few payoffs." For example, a district's human-resources department may run a successful recruitment effort to attract new teachers, but those teachers may quickly leave if the induction and mentoring activities to support teachers in the first two years are weak.<sup>3</sup>

North Carolina faces a chronic and growing shortage of public school teachers and must actively work to retain more of the existing pool of teachers, according to the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research in a study released in 2004. The Center says the impending crisis is the results of the state's rapidly increasing school-age population, state-level efforts to reduce class size, growing pressures from the federal No Child Left Behind Act, and a 20 percent or more annual teacher turnover rate in some school districts. These factors will take the teacher shortage to crisis proportions if the state does not act quickly.

In 2004, the state's schools hired about 10,000 teachers just to staff existing classrooms, yet all the state's public and private universities *combined* produce only about 3,100 teachers a year. Only 2,200 of these graduates end up teaching in North Carolina, and only about 1,400 are still teaching three years later. "Sharply increasing the supply of teachers is a critical part of solving the teacher shortage, but just producing more teachers without doing better at retaining the teachers we have has been compared to pouring water into a leaky bucket," says the Center's Mike McLaughlin, editor of *North Carolina Insight* magazine, where the research is published.<sup>4</sup>

A 2003 study from the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy confirms this teacher turnover problem at the national level. Researcher Richard M. Ingersoll found that national data indicate that school staffing problems are not primarily due to teacher shortages, in the sense of an insufficient supply of qualified teachers. Rather, the data show that the problems are primarily due to a "revolving door" of qualified teachers leaving for reasons other than retirement, such as teacher job dissatisfaction and teachers pursuing other jobs.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See Marzano, R.J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. See also Sanders, W.L., & Rivers, J.C. (1996). *Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

<sup>3</sup> Maxwell, L.A. "Human Capital Key Worry for Reformers." *Education Week*. Dec. 3, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Press release from the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research at <http://www.nccppr.org/Teachershortage.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Ingersoll, R.M. (2003). *Is There Really a Teacher Shortage?* WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Report available online at <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail/PDFs/Shortage-RI-09-2003.pdf>.

Additional studies show that teacher turnover has financial costs for districts in addition to academic consequences for students. In 2007, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, a nonprofit group that seeks to increase the retention of quality teachers, estimated from a survey of several districts that teacher turnover was costing the nation's districts some \$7 billion annually for recruiting, hiring and training. Following a detailed study of turnover costs in five school districts, the commission developed a teacher turnover cost calculator, which estimates \$6,250 in central office costs per leaver and \$33,000 average costs per school for non-urban districts or \$8,750 in central office costs per leaver and \$70,000 average costs per school for urban districts.

Using the commission's teacher turnover cost calculator, Guilford County Schools could be spending between \$8 million and \$14 million to recruit, hire, process and train its new teachers—that means a 30 percent reduction in turnover could save more than \$2.5 million to \$4 million annually.

**The Annual Cost of Teacher Turnover: A Five District Study<sup>6</sup>**

School District	Number of Teachers	Cost Per Teacher Leaver
Chicago, Ill.	25,300	\$17,872
Granville County, N.C.	532	\$ 9,875
Jemez Valley, N.M.	41	\$ 4,366
Milwaukee, Wisc.	6,139	\$15,325
Santa Rosa, N.M.	58	unavailable

To improve public education in Guilford County—both for students and for taxpayers—it is critical that Guilford County Schools retain quality teachers in the classroom. Using data gathered from the 2008 N.C. Teacher Working Conditions Survey, we can better understand teachers' experiences, learn from examples of best practices, and take steps to improve conditions for teaching and learning.

---

<sup>6</sup> National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. "Policy Brief: The High Cost of Teacher Turnover." The cost of teacher leavers was calculated using district data on turnover and resources allocated to deal with turnover. Teachers who left the district altogether were considered leavers. In terms of costs, districts, along with a small subset of schools in each district, were asked to report time and money spent on activities associated with teacher leavers including: recruitment, hiring, administrative processing, professional development and separation. For more information about this study and the turnover cost calculator, visit [http://nctaf.org/resources/demonstration\\_projects/turnover/TeacherTurnoverCostStudy.htm](http://nctaf.org/resources/demonstration_projects/turnover/TeacherTurnoverCostStudy.htm).

## **Overview of N.C. Teacher Working Conditions Survey**

- The Teacher Working Conditions (TWC) Survey is a biennial survey conducted across all school districts in North Carolina by the Office of the Governor.
  - The survey began with a pilot program in 2002.
  - The current survey was administered between March 17 and April 21, 2008, using anonymous access codes, and includes a separate survey of principals.
  - Analyzes and defines domains that describe teacher working conditions, which directly affect student learning conditions.
- Significance of teacher working conditions:
  - Teacher working conditions are student learning conditions.
  - Teacher working conditions affect teacher retention.
  - Teacher working conditions are directly tied to school culture.
  - Teachers' perceptions of working conditions can differ greatly from principals' perceptions of the same conditions.
- Importance of conducting this survey:
  - Research shows that positive working conditions increase student achievement.
  - Data from previous TWC surveys was used to develop a new instrument to evaluate all school principals statewide beginning in the 2008-2009 school year.
  - Results are incorporated into the new 2008-09 School Improvement Plans as required by the State Board of Education.
- Questions on the survey are grouped into five domains that are inter-related and impact working conditions. All domain averages are on a 1 to 5 scale with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest for each of the factors described.
  - Time: Teacher efficacy relates to instructional and non-instructional time.
  - Facilities and Resources: Teachers must have access to resources to provide quality instruction.
  - Decision Making (Empowerment): Teachers should be able to influence and affect district decision-making related to student achievement.
  - Leadership: Teachers value strong, supportive leaders at the school and district levels.
  - Professional Development: Teachers have meaningful learning opportunities that enhance their craft.
- Survey response rates for Guilford County Schools are up, making data more complete – 80% in 2008 vs. 70% in 2006.
- Responses to each question vary widely by school. In focus groups, Guilford County School teachers report greater dissatisfaction than illustrated by the survey data.

## Snapshot of Guilford County's Public School Teachers

### **Teacher Profile**

The following charts provide information about Guilford County Schools teachers for the 2007-08 school year:

**Percentage of Classroom Teachers by Demographic Group**

	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian/Pacific Islander	Other
<b>GCS</b>	22%	78%	71%	24%	2%	0%	1%	3%
<b>NC</b>	20%	80%	83%	14%	2%	1%	1%	0%

**Years of Teaching Experience**

School Level	0 – 3 Years	4 – 10 Years	10+ Years
<b>Elementary</b>	26%	28%	46%
<b>Middle</b>	26%	31%	43%
<b>High</b>	29%	27%	45%
<b>Elementary/Middle/High</b>	16%	26%	58%
<b>Elementary/Middle</b>	32%	33%	35%
<b>Middle/High</b>	28%	30%	42%

**Teachers with Specific Licenses, Degrees or Certifications**

	Elementary	Middle	High	Elementary/Middle/High	Elementary/Middle	Middle/High
<b>Percentage of Fully Licensed Teachers</b>	96%	89%	85%	90%	87%	86%
<b>Percentage of Teachers with Emergency/ Provisional Licenses</b>	1%	1%	4%	3%	N/A	N/A
<b>Percentage of Teachers Who Are Entering Teaching via Lateral Entry</b>	2%	8%	10%	8%	12%	14%
<b>Percentage of classes in your district taught by Highly Qualified teachers</b>	100%	99%	99%	100%	98%	98%
<b>Percentage of Teachers with Advanced Degrees</b>	24%	25%	23%	35%	22%	19%
<b>Average number of teachers and staff per school with National Board Certification<sup>8</sup></b>	5	5	6	6	4	2

<sup>7</sup> All information in these charts taken from the N.C. School Report Cards available online at <http://www.ncreportcards.org/src/>.

<sup>8</sup> A total of 517 GCS teachers have earned National Board Certification, placing GCS at 11<sup>th</sup> in the nation for its number of National Board Certified educators. For more information, visit [http://www.gcsnc.com/ind\\_success/educators/nbc.html](http://www.gcsnc.com/ind_success/educators/nbc.html).

## Teacher Turnover

Despite the significance and importance of teachers for student learning, many districts across North Carolina and throughout the nation struggle to find and keep the quality teachers needed for all students to learn at high levels. The turnover rate for Guilford County Schools (GCS) was 13.33 percent for 2006-07, with a five-year average rate of 12.04 percent—these numbers are lower than some urban districts in the state, but still represent hundreds of teaching positions that must be filled each year.<sup>9</sup> School-level turnover rates, which include teachers moving between schools within the district, vary widely from 0 percent to 73 percent, with an average of 28.8 percent.<sup>10</sup> While those moving within the district do not create staffing shortages for Guilford County Schools, they do create vacancies and instability at specific schools.

### System-Level Teacher Turnover

	Guilford	NC	Cumb	Durham	Forsyth	Meck	Wake
<b>2005-2006<sup>11</sup></b>							
<b>Total Teachers</b>	5,215	101,229	3,503	2,302	4,428	8,954.5	8,091
<b>Teachers Leaving</b>	709	12,730	464	442	418	1,349	757
<b>Leaving with Tenure</b>	288	3,917	157	107	0	348	267
<b>Turnover Percentage</b>	13.6	12.58	13.25	19.2	9.43	15.07	9.36
<b>Five-year average</b>	11.38	12.57	11.3	17.36	9.41	16.51	10.12
<b>2006-07<sup>12</sup></b>							
<b>Total Teachers</b>	5,538	103,765	3,544	2,233	3,931	8,921	8,644
<b>Teachers Leaving</b>	738	12,776	488	373	398	1,411	867
<b>Leaving with Tenure</b>	253	4,163	175	96	123	378	292
<b>Turnover Percentage</b>	13.33	12.31	13.78	16.70	10.12	15.82	10.03
<b>Five-year average</b>	12.04	12.53	12.11	17.86	9.39	15.82	10.23

Teachers leave the classroom for a variety of reasons—some turnover is initiated by the district, some could be reduced by the district and some turnover is beyond the district’s control. The following chart shows percentages of teachers who left in 2007 due to the following categories:

- “Staying in education” includes individuals resigning to teach in another NC public school district or charter school and individuals who moved to non-teaching positions in education;
- “Turnover beyond control” includes individuals who retired with full benefits, individuals who resigned for health reasons and individuals who resigned due to family responsibilities;

<sup>9</sup> District-level turnover numbers include personnel leaving for teaching positions in other districts as well as those leaving for retirement or other reasons. Data from turnover report online at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/recruitment/surveys/turnover/reasonsteachersleave06-07.pdf>.

<sup>10</sup> School-level turnover data in email from Stephen Foster, Guilford County Schools Human Resources Department, Dec. 22, 2008.

<sup>11</sup> Data from turnover report online at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/recruitment/surveys/turnover/2005-06turnoverreport.pdf>. Numbers in both sections of the chart include teachers with the Visiting International Faculty (VIF) program, who are assigned to three-year positions and teachers in non-classroom positions. Teachers are eligible for tenure after four consecutive years of employment by a public school system in North Carolina.

<sup>12</sup> Data from turnover report online at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/recruitment/surveys/turnover/reasonsteachersleave06-07.pdf>.

- “Turnover that might be reduced” includes individuals retiring with reduced benefits, individuals resigning to teach in a non-public school in NC, individuals resigning to teach in another state, individuals dissatisfied with teaching, individuals seeking a career change, and individuals who resigned for unknown or other reasons; and
- “Turnover initiated by the district” includes individuals who were non-renewed, dismissed, or resigned in lieu of dismissal.

**Percentage of Teachers Leaving by Category 2006-07<sup>13</sup>**

	<b>Guilford</b>	<b>NC</b>	<b>Cumber</b>	<b>Durham</b>	<b>Forsyth</b>	<b>Meck</b>	<b>Wake</b>
<b>Staying in education</b>	24.53%	22.07%	14.96%	32.98%	15.08%	6.16%	16.49%
<b>Turnover beyond control</b>	34.01%	43.19%	47.75%	36.19%	49.75%	38.27%	42.79%
<b>Turnover that might be reduced</b>	28.73%	27.99%	36.68%	29.76%	32.41%	48.41%	31.49%
<b>Turnover initiated by district</b>	12.74%	6.74%	0.61%	1.07%	2.76%	7.16%	9.23%

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

## **Findings from the Guilford County Schools TWC Survey Results**

1. Teacher working conditions are reported to have improved in many areas since 2006, but most responses remain below the state average and below the other urban districts.
2. Teachers see some improvements in availability of non-instructional time, but most need more planning and collaborative time.
3. Teachers are positive about the facilities and resources available, particularly related to technology.
4. Teachers play a role in instructional decisions, but do not feel centrally involved in decision making.
5. Teachers are clear about expectations from school leadership, but want more support with discipline and other areas.
6. Teachers are generally positive about professional development received, but did not get what they needed most.
7. Teachers remain uncertain about the use of TWC results at their schools.
8. Teachers at small/redesigned high schools have the highest average of positive responses.
9. Teachers at Mission Possible and Title I schools have the lowest average of positive responses.
10. Principals report better perceived working conditions for teachers than teachers report.

**1. Teacher working conditions are reported to have improved in many areas since 2006, but most responses remain below the state average and below the other urban districts.**

- Domain averages are higher for 2008 in four of the five areas: Time, Facilities and Resources, School Leadership and Professional Development. Decision Making/Empowerment was down from 2006.<sup>14</sup>

	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities & Resources	Decision Making/ Empowerment	School Leadership	Professional Development
<b>2006</b>	70%	2.85	3.59	3.25	3.43	3.27
<b>2008</b>	80%	3.07	3.88	2.73	3.65	3.51

- Results for many questions showed higher positive responses (strongly or somewhat agree) and lower negative responses (strongly or somewhat disagree) in 2008 over 2006. See the other findings for specific question data.
- Overall, nearly three-quarters of teachers (73%) say their school is a good place to teach and learn.
- Three-quarters of teachers (75%) plan to continue teaching in Guilford County Schools over the next two years, including 61% who say they will stay at their current school.
- Despite improvements, Guilford County Schools continues to lag behind the state averages for most questions in all domain areas and behind the other large urban districts for most domains.<sup>15</sup> Only Durham and Mecklenburg have lower average scores for some domains.

**Average Domain Scores for Urban Districts in 2008**

	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities & Resources	Decision Making/ Empowerment	School Leadership	Professional Development
<b>Guilford</b>	80%	3.07	3.88	2.73	3.65	3.51
<b>N.C.</b>	87%	3.31	3.94	2.91	3.82	3.59
<b>Cumberland</b>	93%	3.60	4.24	3.94	3.98	3.98
<b>Durham</b>	95%	3.14	3.66	2.89	3.55	3.44
<b>Forsyth</b>	90%	3.32	3.98	2.86	3.83	3.68
<b>Mecklenburg</b>	67%	3.28	3.78	2.64	3.64	3.53
<b>Wake</b>	95%	3.33	4.07	3.01	3.79	3.58

<sup>14</sup> Direct comparisons of domain averages between years should be made with caution. The domains were calculated using a different combination of questions in 2008 and 2006, although the questions themselves were repeated in both surveys.

<sup>15</sup> This chart is provided as context for understanding the Guilford County results, but direct comparisons among counties should be made with caution. Response rates and expectations vary by county.

## 2. Teachers see some improvements in availability of non-instructional time, but most need more planning and collaborative time.

- A state law passed in July 2006 provides for planning time and duty-free lunch for teachers: “The law does not mandate a daily duty-free lunch for every teacher, giving the school improvement team an option – either provide a daily duty-free lunch for every teacher, or establish alternative ways to provide some form of duty-free lunch. Thus, the law gives the school improvement team the discretion to decide what form of duty-free lunch would work best in that school. Similarly, although the new law does mandate that all full-time assigned classroom teachers receive duty-free instructional planning time, it does not mandate a specific amount of time. Rather, it establishes a weekly goal of 5 hours that the school improvement team should strive to attain.”<sup>16</sup>
- Positive responses to time-related questions are up from 2006 on nearly every question, however all questions continue to be less positive than the state average.

### Q2.1a. Teachers have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.

	2006	2008
<b>Agree</b>	43%	54%
<b>Neither</b>	7%	5%
<b>Disagree</b>	50%	42%

- Only 40% say the non-instructional time provided for teachers is sufficient. Half of all teachers report having three hours or less (51%), while 19% say they have more than five hours during the regular school day. Nine out of ten teachers report having three hours or less available for structured collaborative planning during the school day.
- During an average week, more than half of teachers (58%) say they spend more than five hours on school-related activities outside the regular school work day, including nearly one-third (30%) spending more than 10 hours each week.
- Less than half of teachers say they are protected from routine administrative paperwork (49%) or duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students (45%).
- Teachers report time is the second-most important working condition in promoting student learning (25%, after teacher empowerment with 29%).
- Concerns about time continue to be greater among elementary and middle school teachers than among high school teachers.

#### Average for “Time” Domain

<b>GCS Average</b>	3.15
<b>Elementary</b>	3.07
<b>Middle</b>	3.09
<b>High</b>	3.34

<sup>16</sup> McColl, A. “Q & A On Implementing H.B. 1151, S.L. 2006-135, Planning Time and Duty-Free Lunch for Teachers.” Prepared Aug. 1, 2006, for the N.C. School Boards Association. Available online at <http://www.ncsba.org/documents/HB1151QA.doc>.

### 3. Teachers are positive about the facilities and resources available, particularly related to technology.

- Most positive domain area with a 3.88 average.
- More than in 2006, teachers report generally having sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials (71% vs. 57%), communications technology (83% vs. 77%), and office equipment and supplies (68% vs. 57%).

#### Q3.1a. Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials and resources.

	2006	2008
<b>Agree</b>	57%	71%
<b>Neither</b>	8%	7%
<b>Disagree</b>	35%	18%

#### Q3.1f. Teachers have adequate professional space to work productively.

	2006	2008
<b>Agree</b>	63%	70%
<b>Neither</b>	11%	8%
<b>Disagree</b>	26%	22%

- Three-quarters of teachers say they work in a school environment that is safe, and 70% say they have adequate professional space to work productively.
- Two questions regarding technology resources received higher positive responses than the state average:

#### Q3.1b. Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.

	GCS 2008	NC 2008
<b>Agree</b>	79%	76%
<b>Neither</b>	5%	4%
<b>Disagree</b>	16%	19%

#### Q3.1e. The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.

	GCS 2008	NC 2008
<b>Agree</b>	87%	79%
<b>Neither</b>	5%	5%
<b>Disagree</b>	8%	15%

- Concerns about facilities and resources are greater among high school teachers than among elementary and middle school teachers.

#### Average for “Facilities and Resources” Domain

<b>GCS Average</b>	3.90
<b>Elementary</b>	3.92
<b>Middle</b>	3.96
<b>High</b>	3.81

**4. Teachers play a role in instructional decisions, but do not feel centrally involved in decision making.**

- Lowest rated domain with a 2.73 average, yet respondents say that teacher empowerment is the most important domain for promoting student learning and the second-most important domain affecting their willingness to continue teaching at their school.

**Q7.1c. Which aspect of these five working conditions is MOST important to you in promoting student learning? (Select one.)**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Teacher empowerment</b>	26%	29%
<b>Time during the work day</b>	29%	25%
<b>School leadership</b>	15%	19%
<b>School facilities and resources</b>	21%	18%
<b>Professional development</b>	9%	8%

- While two-thirds of teachers (66%) say they are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction, just over half (52%) say they are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.

**Q4.1a. Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	43%	52%
<b>Neither</b>	19%	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	39%	32%

- Nearly two-thirds of teachers (62%) say their schools take steps to solve problems, while just over half (55%) say their faculty has an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.
- More than half of teachers report having little or no involvement (“no role at all” or “small role”) in the following areas:
  - Deciding how the school budget will be spent (68%)
  - Hiring new teachers (62%)
  - Determining the content of in-service professional development programs (51%)
- Teachers report the greatest involvement (“large role” or “primary role”) in the following areas:
  - Devising teaching techniques (57%)
  - Setting grading and student assessment practices (47%)
  - Selecting instructional materials and resources (41%)

**Q4.1e. Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) are available to me.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	46%	52%
<b>Neither</b>	28%	25%
<b>Disagree</b>	25%	23%

- Concerns about decision-making are strongest among middle school teachers.

**Average for “Decision Making” Domain**

<b>GCS Average</b>	2.77
<b>Elementary</b>	2.75
<b>Middle</b>	2.71
<b>High</b>	2.84

**5. Teachers are clear about expectations from school leadership, but want more support with discipline and other areas.**

- More teachers selected school leadership over the other domain areas as the number one aspect of their work environment that most affects their willingness to keep teaching at their school.

**Q7.1a. Which aspect of your work environment MOST affects your willingness to keep teaching at your school? (Select one.)**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>School leadership</b>	35%	33%
<b>Teacher empowerment</b>	21%	24%
<b>School facilities and resources</b>	21%	21%
<b>Time during the work day</b>	17%	17%
<b>Professional development</b>	4%	4%

- Most teachers believe they are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction (85%) and that their faculty is committed to helping every student learn (83%).
- About three-quarters feel positively about teacher performance evaluations and feedback; 76% say evaluations are handled in an appropriate manner, 73% say the procedures for evaluations are consistent, and 74% say they receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.
- Sixty-one percent of teachers report an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school – up from 55% in 2006, but still below the state average of 67%. Similarly, 63% say the school leadership consistently supports teachers – up from 58% in 2006, but below the state average of 71%.

**Q5.1h. The school leadership consistently supports teachers.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	58%	63%
<b>Neither</b>	20%	15%
<b>Disagree</b>	22%	22%

- While 70% say school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents, less than half report that school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct (49%) and only 59% say school leadership supports teachers’ efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.

**Q5.1d. The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	49%	57%
<b>Neither</b>	18%	13%
<b>Disagree</b>	33%	31%

- Teachers appear ambivalent about school improvement teams (SIT). Although 54% agree that their SIT provides effective leadership at their school, 19% disagreed and 26% gave a neutral response.
- Overall, just over half (57%) say the school leadership in their school is effective.
- Concerns about leadership are strongest among middle school teachers.

**Average for “Leadership” Domain**

<b>GCS Average</b>	3.70
<b>Elementary</b>	3.74
<b>Middle</b>	3.56
<b>High</b>	3.65

**6. Teachers are generally positive about professional development received, but did not get what they needed most.**

- All questions in this section received higher positive responses than in 2006, suggesting improvement has occurred in this area.<sup>17</sup>
- Most teachers agree that professional development has provided them with strategies that they have incorporated into their instructional delivery methods (70%) and that it has proven useful to them in their efforts to improve student achievement (68%) – these responses are at or near the state average.
- Just over half of teachers (52%) believe sufficient funds and resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.

**Q6.1a. Sufficient funds and resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	38%	52%
<b>Neither</b>	18%	17%
<b>Disagree</b>	45%	31%

- About two-thirds (64%) think adequate time is provided for professional development – the same response as the state average.

<sup>17</sup> “Professional development” was not defined in the survey and could include training requirements from the state or district, university coursework and/or in-school collaboration.

**Q6.1c. Adequate time is provided for professional development.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	57%	64%
<b>Neither</b>	18%	16%
<b>Disagree</b>	25%	19%

- Teachers reported having more professional development in the areas they reported needing least in the 2006 survey than in those areas they said they needed most:<sup>18</sup>
  - When asked in 2006 which areas of professional development teachers needed to teach their students more effectively, only 29% asked for reading strategies, 13% for content areas and 18% for methods of teaching. However, when asked in 2008 which areas teachers have had 10 hours or more of professional development since 2006, the most popular responses were reading strategies (57%), your content areas (49%) and methods of teaching (47%).
  - Conversely, in 2006 teachers asked most for professional development in special education (49%), closing the achievement gap (43%) and English language learners (42%). In 2008, only 13% reported 10 or more hours of professional development in special education (down from 17% in 2006), 25% in closing the achievement gap (down from 26% in 2006), and 9% in English language learners (up from 8% in 2006).

**Professional Development Requested vs. Professional Development Received  
(2006 and 2008 Teacher Working Conditions Surveys)**

	<b>2006: Professional development received</b>	<b>2006: Professional development needed</b>	<b>2008: Professional development received</b>	<b>2008: Professional development needed</b>
<b>Special Education</b>	17%	49%	13%	32%
<b>Gifted and Talented</b>	7%	22%	7%	24%
<b>English Language Learners</b>	8%	42%	9%	26%
<b>Closing the achievement gap</b>	26%	43%	25%	40%
<b>Your content area(s)</b>	43%	13%	49%	24%
<b>Methods of teaching</b>	56%	18%	47%	23%
<b>Student assessment</b>	28%	20%	24%	19%
<b>Classroom management techniques</b>	31%	28%	29%	28%
<b>Reading strategies</b>	70%	29%	57%	29%

<sup>18</sup> Exact wording for these questions: “In which of the following areas (if any) do you need professional development to teach your students more effectively? (Check all that apply.)” and “In the past 2 years have you had 10 clock hours or more of professional development in any of the following areas? (Check all that apply.)”

- Priority areas requested for professional development in 2008 are, in order from most requested to least requested:
  - Closing the achievement gap
  - Special education
  - Reading strategies
  - Classroom management techniques
  - English Language Learners
  - Gifted and talented
  - Your content area(s)
  - Methods of teaching
  - Student assessment
- Elementary teachers are more positive about professional development than are middle and high school teachers.

**Average for “Professional Development” Domain**

<b>GCS Average</b>	3.54
<b>Elementary</b>	3.60
<b>Middle</b>	3.42
<b>High</b>	3.52

**7. Teachers remain uncertain about the use of TWC results at their schools.**

- Positive responses have increased since 2006 survey, but negative responses are also up.
- Large numbers of teachers do not know if results of the survey are used for school improvement.

**Q7.3. At this school we utilize the results from the Teacher Working Conditions survey as a tool for school improvement.**

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Agree</b>	31%	34%
<b>Neither</b>	52%	45%
<b>Disagree</b>	17%	20%

**8. Teachers at small/redesigned high schools have the highest average of positive responses.**

- Average scores in all five domain areas are higher among teachers at small or redesigned high schools, such as academies, early colleges and middle colleges.
- These schools have smaller student populations than the district average, offer some specialized programs and receive additional support. The culture of the redesigned high schools emphasizes communication and relationships among teachers, administrators, students and parents.

	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
<b>GCS Average</b>	82	3.15	3.90	2.77	3.70	3.54	3.41
<b>High School Options</b>	88	4.12	4.10	3.28	4.04	3.94	3.89
<b>Traditional High Schools</b>	72	3.02	3.71	2.66	3.48	3.36	3.24

**9. Teachers at Mission Possible and Title I schools have the lowest average of positive responses.**

- Average scores in all five domain areas are lower among teachers at Mission Possible and Title I schools.

	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
<b>GCS Average</b>	82	3.15	3.90	2.77	3.70	3.54	3.41
<b>Mission Possible</b>	78	3.06	3.79	2.62	3.50	3.50	3.29
<b>Title I</b>	80	3.02	3.77	2.62	3.51	3.57	3.30

- According to the federal standards, schools enrolling at least 40 percent of students from families in poverty are eligible for federal Title I funding for schoolwide programs to raise academic achievement.
- Guilford County Schools launched the Mission Possible program in 2006 as a comprehensive teacher incentive plan that combines multiple components to keep and attract highly effective teachers and administrators for the ultimate goal of increasing student achievement in schools with critical needs.<sup>19</sup>
- Overall, teachers at Mission Possible schools report improved working conditions since the 2006 survey. The average score for all domains is up from 2006 for middle schools (3.14 to 3.17) and high schools (3.09 to 3.32) and stayed the same for elementary schools (3.34). When comparing 2006 to 2008 TWC survey data, 13 schools report higher TWC averages in 2008, 11 schools have lower TWC averages in 2008 and four schools do not have reports from 2006. Schools with the greatest increase in average scores from 2006 to 2008 include Cone Elementary, Kirkman Park Elementary, Wiley Elementary, Ferndale Middle, Jackson Middle, Middle College at Bennett, High Point Central High and Smith High.

<sup>19</sup> For more information about Mission Possible online, visit [http://gcsnc.com/depts/mission\\_possible/index.htm](http://gcsnc.com/depts/mission_possible/index.htm).

- Among Title I schools that are not also Mission Possible schools, the average score for all domains is down from 2006 (3.39 to 3.29), with eight schools reporting higher TWC averages in 2008, eight schools reporting lower TWC averages in 2008, one school holding at the same average in both surveys and one school without a report from 2006.
- “Life is a bit easier at a school that’s not highly impacted by poverty and other challenges, but no school is heaven on earth,” said Dr. Darcy Kemp, principal at Morehead Elementary and former principal at Gillespie Park Elementary. “You can still have happy teachers at an impacted school... I would hate for anyone to believe that you can’t have good teacher working conditions at a Title I school. They might not [have the highest] test scores, but they can still be good places to teach and learn.”
- It is significant to note that Middle College High at Bennett is both a Mission Possible school and a small high school. Teachers rate working conditions at the school very highly, with an average TWC score (4.02) among the top seven of all Guilford schools.

## **10. Principals report better perceived working conditions for teachers than teachers report.**

- Principals responded to parallel questions to the teacher survey, providing a comparison between teachers’ responses and principals’ perceptions of teacher working conditions. The results mirror responses from the 2006 surveys, with principals reporting more positive views of teacher working conditions than teachers do on every question asked.
- Principals also perceive teachers having a greater decision-making role in their schools—on everything from selecting instructional materials to hiring new teachers—than teachers perceive about their own role in the school.
- Although some discrepancy between principals and teachers can be expected, the differences on every question across all five domains suggest a more serious problem. Principals cannot positively impact teachers’ working conditions—or their perceived working conditions—if they are not aware of the problem.
- For a complete comparison of principal/teacher responses, see Appendix B. For a comparison of the ten questions with the greatest disparity, see the chart on the following page.

### Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions

*(Data reflects percentage of respondents who agreed with each statement.)*

Question	Teachers	Principals	Difference
The non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.	37.7%	84.5%	-46.9%
Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.	43.0%	89.3%	-46.3%
The school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct.	46.4%	90.5%	-44.1%
At this school we utilize the results from the Teacher Working Conditions survey as a tool for school improvement.	32.5%	76.2%	-43.6%
The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.	54.0%	97.6%	-43.6%
School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.	48.0%	90.5%	-42.5%
Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.	49.6%	90.5%	-40.9%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about empowering teachers.	55.3%	94.0%	-38.7%
The school leadership support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.	56.9%	95.2%	-38.4%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about the use of time in my school.	55.9%	94.0%	-38.1%

- When asked which aspect of the five working conditions most affects their willingness to remain as principal in their school, most Guilford County Schools principals selected “school empowerment/site-based decision making” (33%), followed by district leadership (27%) and time (24%).
- When asked which aspect of the five working conditions is most important in promoting student learning, most Guilford County Schools principals again selected “school empowerment/site-based decision making” (36%), followed by professional development (20%), school facilities/resources (20%) and time (20%).

## **School Profile: Wiley Elementary**

Located in southeast Greensboro, Wiley Elementary School offers an example of the many different factors that can impact teacher working conditions. With an enrollment of approximately 230 students, pre-kindergarten through fifth grade, the school staff includes 13 classroom teachers, four assistants and 23 support staff. Ninety percent of teachers are fully certified, and all classes are taught by teachers who met the federal definition of “Highly Qualified.” The majority of the school’s students are African-American and economically disadvantaged.

**Years of Teaching Experience<sup>20</sup>**

	<b>0 - 3 Years</b>	<b>4 - 10 Years</b>	<b>10+ Years</b>
<b>Wiley</b>	50%	23%	27%
<b>District</b>	26%	28%	46%
<b>State</b>	24%	29%	47%

**Teachers with Advanced Degrees or Certifications<sup>21</sup>**

	<b>Percent with Advanced College Degrees</b>	<b>Number with National Board Certification (Elem. School average for district and state)</b>
<b>Wiley</b>	13%	1
<b>District</b>	24%	5
<b>State</b>	27%	5

With many beginning teachers on staff, a relatively high teacher turn-over rate and a high-poverty student population, Wiley faces real challenges. Yet Dr. LaToy Kennedy, principal at Wiley since 2007, is the district’s Principal of the Year. She acknowledges Wiley’s difficulties, but demonstrates that a commitment to strong leadership and teacher support can make every school a good place to teach and learn.

“When Dr. Grier asked me to go to Wiley, I held a meeting with the leadership team and met with each faculty member to find out what was working and what they needed. We had so many brand new teachers with no structure and no focus and no one to go to for help—last year, there were no career teachers [with more than three years of experience] in the third, fourth and fifth grade. So I asked for help from the district in modeling instructional strategies and we were in and out of classrooms all the time,” Kennedy said. “We have to hold teachers accountable and monitor them, but we have to give them the resources and time to be successful. My teachers do a good job—they were very open and they worked hard. At the end of last year, they told me they really felt like teachers.”

Wiley is classified as both a Title I school and a Mission Possible school. The school mission states that they “are committed to maintaining a positive learning environment and actively involving parents, guardians, and the community in the education of each child.” Community and business involvement are important at Wiley. Older children at the school are supported by Community in Schools and the Big Brother / Big Sister Program. Degusa serves as the school’s special community business partner, offering financial and volunteer support.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Data from N.C. School Report Cards available online at <http://www.ncreportcards.org/src>.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> <http://schoolcenter.gcsnc.com/education/school/school.php?sectiondetailid=660>.

When asked how her teachers would describe her, Kennedy responded: “I hope they would say that I genuinely care about children and do what’s best for them no matter what. Some might say I’m mean because I can be blunt and to the point, but most like that I listen and am not afraid to say the truth, even if it hurts. My bluntness can be unnerving for people who don’t know me, but I always prefer to hear and speak the truth.”

In 2007-08, Wiley did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), but met 11 out of 13 target goals including making AYP in math. “Wiley achieved high growth last year [on the state ABC program] because we truly worked together as a faculty,” Kennedy said. “I’m not afraid to say, ‘I don’t know.’ I have to rely on others around me and we draw on each other’s strengths. I treat everyone with respect at Wiley – parents, students, staff, faculty, everyone.”

### 2007-08 AYP Results<sup>23</sup>

	Reading Grades 3-5			Math Grades 3-5		
	All Students	Black	Economically Disadvantaged	All Students	Black	Economically Disadvantaged
Target Goal Percent Proficient (At or Above Grade Level)	43.2%	43.2%	43.2%	77.2%	77.2%	77.2%
Percent Proficient (At or Above Grade Level)	22.6%	19.2%	20.5%	56.0%	55.1%	55.1%
Percent Proficient with Growth	26.2%	23.1%	24.4%	69.0%	67.9%	69.2%
Met AYP Proficiency Goal?	Met w/SH	Not Met	Not Met	Met w/SH	Met w/SH	Met w/SH

“It is very important to have good, positive relationships with my teachers. Wiley is a tough school to work in with a lot of different issues for teachers to deal with. I try to make the building climate a place where they want to come to work,” Kennedy said. “Sometimes it’s the little things—I try to put a note of encouragement in every teacher’s box each week. When we got our math scores back and learned we made high growth, we had a celebration with the teachers—cake and a ginger ale toast for all their hard work.”

When asked about Wiley’s teacher turnover rate of 39.3 percent in 2008, higher than the district average of 28.8 percent, Kennedy responded that turnover can be good. “Some teachers can’t work with this challenging population. My job is to provide the training teachers need and to recruit teachers who really want to be here,” Kennedy said. “This school is tough on teachers, especially new teachers. We have to work together to hold high expectations for our students and then help them attain those goals.”

Kennedy began her career as a teacher at Smith High School before working as an assistant principal at Dudley High School and as principal at Bluford Communications Magnet School. “When I first became a school administrator, a teacher at Dudley High School told me, ‘Don’t ever

<sup>23</sup> AYP results available from the N.C. Department of Public Instruction at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/nclb/abcayp/>. “Met w/SH” stands for “safe harbor,” a provisional status met when the student group meets the 95 percent participation rate, has reduced the percent of students not proficient by at least 10 percent from the previous year for that subject area, and shows progress on the Other Academic Indicator (OAI). Other demographic subgroups, including American Indian, Asian, Hispanic, Multiracial, White, Limited English Proficient and Students with Disabilities, were not calculated for Wiley due to insufficient data (fewer than 40 students in the subgroup).

forget you were a teacher.' I try to think about that with everything I do," said Kennedy. "Is this something I would want if I were a teacher? And I model behaviors that I expect from teachers when I'm working with our students."

"I try to meet with each teacher individually at least twice a year. I am willing to take advice and criticism. Last year, my teachers told me we needed unity at Wiley. So this year we had a staff retreat in the mountains before school started and we're planning another one in March. We worked hard while we were there, but we also had a great time together. Another area of concern was safety for teachers, so I've hired a retired policeman to work at the school."

When asked the three things she would do to improve teacher working conditions if she could, Kennedy knew exactly what her list would be. "I would make sure that there is a teacher assistant in every classroom to help with small group instruction and pull-outs for our Level I students. Twice a month, I'd set aside a big block of time during the school day—at least half a day—for teachers to work with their team to plan and develop strategies together," Kennedy said.

Then she paused a moment before adding her third request: "And I'd take us all to Vegas, or at least someplace to just relax and have a good time. I wrote to Oprah for help about that one, but I haven't heard back from her."

Although Wiley's average working conditions score is below the district average among elementary schools, the 2008 school results show improvement since 2006, particularly in the leadership and professional development domain areas.

**Teacher Working Conditions Survey Averages for Wiley Elementary**

	<b>Percent Response</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Facilities and Resources</b>	<b>Decision Making</b>	<b>Leadership</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Average for all domains</b>
<b>Elementary 2008 average</b>	84	3.07	3.92	2.75	3.74	3.60	3.41
<b>Wiley Elem 2008</b>	100	3.15	3.76	2.57	3.67	3.45	3.32
<b>Wiley Elem 2006</b>	94	3.14	3.36	2.84	2.79	3.00	3.03

## **Feedback from Teacher Focus Groups**

In small focus group meetings between Guilford County Schools teachers and the Guilford Education Alliance in fall 2008, teachers expressed greater concerns than those reflected in the survey data.<sup>24</sup> Teachers desire opportunity to speak out and be listened to about their concerns but do not feel they have the support or encouragement to do so. Teachers also said they felt micro-managed and believed they were not respected for their professional knowledge. They noted issues around mutual trust between principals and teachers, exacerbated by weak relationships formed due to frequent principal turnover.

Teachers listed the following characteristics as those that have the biggest positive effect on working conditions:

- Principal has an “open door” policy for teachers.
- Principal is “there” for us.
- Principal will work with teachers to solve issues.
- Principal is consistent with parents and students.
- Principal respects teachers as professionals.
- Principal communicates with teachers about expectations and explains decision-making.

When asked about their school community, teachers offered the following goals:

- School community built on trust.
- Collaboration among teachers, parents and principals.
- Regular meetings with principals, teachers and central administrators to share common concerns and solve problems.

Perhaps most significant about this feedback is the strong emphasis on the principal’s role in affecting working conditions for teachers. As reported in the survey data, more teachers (33%) selected school leadership over the other domain areas as the number one aspect of their work environment that most affects their willingness to keep teaching at their school.

In a separate focus group with former Guilford County Schools Teachers of the Year, participants offered the following recommendations:

- Create a consistent extended block for planning and collaboration in every school.
- Provide training in professional learning communities and collaboration so that teachers can make the best use of planning time.
- Ensure that planning time and professional development are implemented equitably across the district.
- Provide professional development in utilizing technology. Teachers need to know more than their students.
- Offer more compensation for professional development. Teachers need to be paid for their training time.
- Provide continuous support and training for implementing new programs. Teachers need continuous reinforcement to ensure academic success.
- Train principals to be instructional leaders, not just school managers.
- Cultivate a greater sense of professional responsibility by empowering teachers with decision-making opportunities.

---

<sup>24</sup> Teacher focus groups were comprised of teachers who volunteered to participate through the Guilford Association of Educators.

# **Principal Perceptions and Working Conditions**

## **Survey Results**

In addition to the questions asking about principals' perceptions of teachers' working conditions, principals also responded to a different set of survey questions specific to their role as school leaders. Overall, Guilford County Schools principals were less positive about their working conditions than the statewide principal average. The following questions highlight concerns among Guilford County Schools principals regarding time and leadership:

### **TIME**

**Q2.2a. Central office has streamlined procedures to minimize principals' time on non-instructional tasks.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	30%	55%
<b>Neither</b>	12%	12%
<b>Disagree</b>	58%	33%

**Q2.2d. Principals have sufficient time to focus on instructional leadership issues (i.e. data analysis, professional development, etc.).**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	45%	53%
<b>Neither</b>	6%	9%
<b>Disagree</b>	49%	38%

### **EDUCATOR LEADERSHIP**

**Q4.2b. Principals are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction in this district.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	56%	85%
<b>Neither</b>	13%	6%
<b>Disagree</b>	31%	10%

**Q4.2e. The district involves principals in decisions that directly impact the operations of my school.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	52%	79%
<b>Neither</b>	7%	8%
<b>Disagree</b>	41%	13%

**SCHOOL LEADERSHIP**

**Q5.2a. Central office supports appropriate school improvement decisions when challenged by parents and the community.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	56%	81%
<b>Neither</b>	23%	11%
<b>Disagree</b>	20%	7%

**Q5.2d. There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within this district.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	50%	75%
<b>Neither</b>	17%	10%
<b>Disagree</b>	33%	15%

Principals were generally more positive in their responses to questions about facilities/resources and professional development, although most questions still fell below the state average.

**FACILITIES AND RESOURCES**

**Q3.2a. My school has a sufficient number of licensed staff provided by the district to meet the educational needs of our students.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	79%	83%
<b>Neither</b>	2%	2%
<b>Disagree</b>	19%	15%

**Q3.2e. My school receives instructional resources commensurate with other schools in the district.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	75%	81%
<b>Neither</b>	7%	6%
<b>Disagree</b>	18%	14%

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Q6.8. Professional development provides principals with the knowledge and skills most needed to be effective.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	75%	77%
<b>Neither</b>	10%	7%
<b>Disagree</b>	15%	16%

**Q6.10. Principal professional development is a priority in this district.**

	<b>GCS</b>	<b>NC</b>
<b>Agree</b>	67%	66%
<b>Neither</b>	13%	13%
<b>Disagree</b>	20%	21%

***Real D.E.A.L. Principal Profile***

During teacher focus groups, teachers asked to meet with principals of schools with the highest average scores to discuss what these school leaders did that resulted in reported better Teacher Working Conditions. As follow up to these principal focus groups, Guilford Education Alliance conducted interviews with two principals who have received special recognition for positive leadership as a principal. The interview with Dr. LaToy Kennedy is included in the earlier profile of Wiley Elementary, while the comments from Dr. Darcy Kemp are included here.

Dr. Kemp is principal at Morehead Elementary School, a Real D.E.A.L. finalist for 2008.<sup>25</sup> A three-time finalist for GCS Principal of the Year, she began teaching in 1989 and worked as an administrator at Archer Elementary School and Gillespie Park Elementary School before starting at Morehead in 2006. The following excerpts are from an interview with Dr. Kemp:

“My role as principal is to be a facilitator, in every sense of the word. My job is to make it as easy as possible for teachers to teach, whether through scheduling or managing relationships with parents or handling discipline. I’m here to help them meet the needs of kids.”

When asked how her teachers would describe her: “Open and very approachable—my door is always open. I have high expectations—I’m a task master, but I’m also willing to have fun. I hope they see me as somebody who helps them and hears them. Every morning I run the circuit, popping into every classroom, so my teachers know they can catch me at least once a day if they need to talk.”

“One of my strengths is relationship building at all levels, with teachers, parents and students. That doesn’t mean things are always fun and easy, but people here know that their voices will be heard. If you have strong relationships with teachers and advocate for them, they’re willing to work hard and stay with you, even through tough situations.”

When asked why the Teacher Working Conditions Survey is important: “Teachers need to have an anonymous voice. They need to be heard, but not in a punitive way. They need to be able to share perceptions and realities—as a school leader, I have to address their perceptions, even if that’s not the reality I see. Perception is reality.”

“Overall teacher working conditions are my responsibility—not everything is within my control, but it’s still my responsibility. Life is a bit easier at a school that’s not highly impacted by poverty and other challenges, but no school is heaven on earth. You can still have happy teachers at an impacted school and we still have challenges at Morehead. I would hate for anyone to believe that you can’t have good teacher working conditions at a Title I school. They might not be named a Real D.E.A.L. winner because of test scores, but they can still be good places to teach and learn.”

---

<sup>25</sup> Real D.E.A.L (Dedicated Educators, Administrators & Learners) schools are honored for outstanding student achievement and excellent teacher working conditions. Winning schools must 1) score at or above the state average on each of the factors in the 2008 Teacher Working Conditions Survey; 2) meet or exceed growth on the 2007-2008 state tests; and 3) meet AYP (as notified by NCDPI in July, 2008 for preliminary results). For more information, visit <http://ncteachingconditions.org/realDEAL.htm>.

When asked the three things she would do to improve teacher working conditions if she could: Facilities are always an issue in an older building—I'd give my teachers more space to do creative teaching. I'd give them more access to better technology to make their lives easier. And I'd give them more control over scheduling. Unfortunately, I can't do those things, so we do the best we can and we talk about why those decisions have to be made."

"Teachers are happy at Morehead because they know they have a voice. If it's in the best interest of children, we'll do everything we can to make it happen, and they know that. If we can't make it happen, we discuss why it can't be done—teachers are okay if they know why a decision has to be made. I love a good argument—I welcome the debate to get what's best for kids. They know I'm not going to ask them to do anything I haven't given them the training and the resources to do. They can tell me what needs to be changed, but they have to be willing to work and to try."

### ***Focus Groups with Teachers and Principals Together***

In small focus group meetings between Guilford County Schools' principals and the Guilford Education Alliance in fall 2008, principals said they work long hours and feel significant pressure to perform, particularly those on the "watch list" for academic performance.<sup>26</sup> Just as teachers expressed fear about principals, school leaders fear repercussions from district and state administrators. They said they often feel micro-managed and find it difficult to build relationships in larger schools. Principals also acknowledged that schools with higher working conditions scores tend to be those with fewer challenged students.

Principals identified the following best practices for cultivating relationships with teachers:

- Have honest conversations.
- Learn to listen and respect information shared in confidence.
- Communicate with individual teachers relevant to specific issues, not with the entire faculty.
- Seek input from teachers and give teachers responsibility when they participate in the decision making.
- "Know" your teachers so that you know when teachers are ready for a new step.
- "Be there" for the teachers and the student; principals are there to serve teachers.
- Explain decisions to teachers, then be strong enough to support your decision.
- Set the standard for professionalism.
- Ask for recommended solutions when teachers present problems.
- Employ team principles in management.

In addition, principals spoke of the need to support each other and to create more opportunities for sharing best practices and caring for each other as professionals. Training in shared or participatory leadership, peer observations and other leadership training could help principals be transformational leaders and develop a supportive culture within their schools.

---

<sup>26</sup> Principals were invited to participate in focus groups based on schools reporting the highest survey results within each level (elementary, middle and high schools).

## **Recommendations from Guilford Education Alliance**

- 1. Training for principals in transformational leadership should be expanded.**
  - a. Principals and teachers need training in participatory/shared leadership in order to facilitate team development built upon mutual support and trust.
  - b. Principals must be trained to be instructional leaders.
  - c. Principals must be trained to work collaboratively with teachers and parents to create schools built upon mutual trust and respect.
  
- 2. A focus on teacher working conditions must be a priority in this competitive climate to recruit and retain teachers in our district. Guilford County's continuing to be behind the state average in all domains of the survey is problematic in recruiting teachers.**
  - a. Consideration of working conditions needs to be integrated into principal evaluations in a manner that provides opportunity for training principals in addressing identified needs in their schools.
  - b. School climate assessments should be conducted and plans to address identified concerns developed and implemented.
  
- 3. The district must ensure the implementation of the state law allowing for planning time and duty-free lunch time for all teachers. This requires attention to scheduling.**
  - a. Additionally there must be an analysis of the quantity of non-instructional time and the quality of its use. Time for collaboration among grade level teams is important. Teachers need to be protected from non-instructional responsibilities.
  - b. Facilitate constructive use of paraprofessionals and resources through community involvement to support teachers and free them from non-instructional responsibilities.
  
- 4. Continued attention to facilities is critical.**
  - a. Maintenance assessments should be regular and identified needs addressed in a timely manner.
  - b. Teachers' perception that there is inequity of technology throughout the system is a problem and must be addressed. The technology assessment proposed in the Superintendent's Strategic Plan can begin addressing this concern.
  - c. Continued training on appropriate utilization of technology to improve instruction/curriculum is critical.
  
- 5. Teachers must be involved in school and district decisions that impact instruction.**
  - a. Teachers need instruction and support in using data as a basis for decision making regarding instruction.
  - b. Specifically, teachers should be involved in decisions regarding teaching techniques and curriculum selection; school-based budget decisions; in-service training; and school improvement strategies.
  
- 6. Developing and maintaining a school climate of professional trust and respect is critical to enhancing student achievement.**
  - a. Build strong school teams (all teachers and leadership) that routinely utilize thorough understanding and discussion of issues at all levels.
  - b. Facilitate collaborative decision making.
  - c. Commit to transforming schools into learning communities must be throughout the organization.

## **Appendix A: Standards for Working Conditions in North Carolina Schools**

*The following standards for teacher working conditions were developed by the N.C. Professional Teaching Standards Commission. These areas were the basis for Governor Easley's Teacher Working Conditions Survey and inform newly revised teacher and administrator standards. For more information, visit <http://ncptsc.org/>.*

### **Use of time**

In schools that are dedicated to recruiting, nurturing and retaining teachers, the following working conditions are evident:

- There is scheduled time in the day for teachers to focus on development of successful curriculum, classroom management, strategies, and techniques to individualize instruction for student success.
- Teachers have student loads that allow them to meet the educational needs of all students.
- Teachers are not assigned duties that interfere with their primary job of educating students.
- Planning time is provided for all teachers K-12.
- New teachers are provided effective mentors. There is time for the new teachers and the mentor to work together during the day, both within and outside the classroom.
- Standards and expectations for teachers are organized, simplified and streamlined to allow teachers to focus on developing skills that are most important for successful instruction.
- Teachers have time to collaborate with highly skilled, dedicated colleagues.

### **Facilities and Resources**

In schools where teachers are productive, creative, and satisfied, the following working conditions are in place:

- There is space for each teacher to work with students and with colleagues; there is also space for the teachers to work quietly and individually.
- Teachers have necessary office and instructional supplies and access to funds for purchasing supplies which allows them to involve students in meaningful work.
- Teachers have access to current technology that allows them to prepare students to be successful.
- Teachers have assistance for the clerical aspects of their jobs.
- The school environment is safe. The health of teachers, staff members and students is a top priority. The school is a secure place for the entire learning community.
- Teachers have help from educational support personnel such as tutors, family specialists, psychologists, nurses, counselors, administrators, social workers, mental health professionals, and others. This assistance allows teachers to meet all the needs of their students.
- Schools have community and business partnerships that support the learning process.
- Teacher salaries and supplements are competitive with equivalent professions.

### **Leadership**

Schools where teachers are enthusiastic and effective show evidence of the following:

- The principal is a strong and supportive leader with a clear vision of the central mission of the school. The principal utilizes the leadership potential of the teachers.
- All stakeholders (including teachers) participate in the decision-making process.
- There is a high level of leadership and support from the school board, central office, and parent, as well as from government officials, such as county commissioners, state

legislator, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Board of Education, and the Department of Public Instruction.

- Teachers are the recognized leaders of their classrooms and are supported in their classroom-based decisions and initiatives.
- School leaders at all levels shield educators from disruptive distractions in order to ensure that teachers can focus on what is best for their students and for learning.

### **Empowerment**

In schools where teachers are effective and where turnover is low, there is evidence of the following:

- There are many avenues available for educators to express their concerns and propose solutions.
- Reasoned educational risk-taking is encouraged and supported.
- Teachers are recognized as educational experts and are trusted to make sound professional decisions.
- Within the educational community there is an atmosphere of mutual respect, where each professional is empowered to do his/her work.

### **Professional Development**

In schools where learning is valued, teachers are encouraged and supported in their efforts to develop their skills and knowledge:

- Sufficient resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of important professional development opportunities.
- Professional growth of teachers is valued as the basis for improving student achievement.
- A variety of types of learning opportunities are recognized as valuable, including study groups and teacher research.
- The design and choice of professional development activities are research-based.
- Professional development is based on individual, school, and distinct goals.

## Appendix B: Data Tables for Survey Results

Data in these tables and throughout this report can be accessed online at <http://ncteachingconditions.org/index.htm>. Additional information provided by Eric Hirsch with the New Teacher Center at the University of California at Santa Cruz and Keri Church with LEARN North Carolina.

**Average Domain Scores by Category of Schools**

	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
<b>GCS</b>	82	3.15	3.90	2.77	3.70	3.54	3.41
<b>Elementary</b>	84	3.07	3.92	2.75	3.74	3.60	3.41
<b>Middle</b>	84	3.09	3.96	2.71	3.56	3.42	3.35
<b>High</b>	77	3.34	3.81	2.84	3.65	3.52	3.43
<b>Small High</b>	86	3.98	4.02	3.20	4.00	3.83	3.81
<b>Magnets</b>	84	3.33	3.87	2.84	3.70	3.61	3.47
<b>Title I</b>	80	3.02	3.77	2.62	3.51	3.57	3.30
<b>Mission Possible</b>	78	3.06	3.79	2.62	3.50	3.50	3.29

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Elementary Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Alamance Elementary	53	2.75	3.76	2.91	4.29	4.11	3.56
Edwin A Alderman Elem	78	3.04	3.79	2.63	3.26	3.45	3.23
Allen Jay Elementary	100	3.01	3.64	2.77	3.06	3.53	3.20
Archer Elementary	89	2.94	3.32	2.49	3.45	3.43	3.13
Bessemer Elementary	55	3.05	3.42	2.62	3.57	3.74	3.28
Bluford Elementary	100	2.97	3.47	2.76	3.86	3.47	3.31
Brightwood Elementary	57	3.15	4.08	2.39	3.40	3.42	3.29
Brooks Global Magnet	95	3.15	3.72	2.68	3.97	3.61	3.43
Monticello-Brown Summit Elem	100	4.06	4.76	3.16	4.45	4.26	4.14
Claxton Elementary	74	2.49	3.32	2.78	4.19	3.65	3.29
Colfax Elementary	49	2.89	3.89	2.63	3.42	3.68	3.30
Cesar Cone Elementary	58	2.82	4.07	2.44	3.34	3.49	3.23

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Erwin Montessori Elementary	79	2.91	3.73	2.87	3.95	3.71	3.43
Fairview Elementary	87	3.33	4.11	2.62	3.71	3.54	3.46
Waldo C Falkener Sr Elem	45	2.71	4.20	2.56	3.48	3.67	3.32
Florence Elementary	88	2.53	4.13	2.34	2.93	3.20	3.03
Julius I Foust Elementary	45	2.60	3.13	2.16	2.56	3.43	2.78
Cyrus P Frazier Elementary	100	2.81	3.96	2.76	3.71	3.50	3.35
Gibsonville Elementary	97	3.62	4.61	3.45	4.36	4.15	4.04
Gillespie Park Elementary	79	2.91	4.48	2.99	3.88	3.83	3.62
General Greene Elementary	95	3.01	4.02	2.92	3.55	3.48	3.40
Guilford Primary School	79	3.16	4.50	2.64	3.99	3.87	3.63
W M Hampton Elementary	91	3.12	2.96	2.94	3.64	3.53	3.24
Hunter Elementary	74	3.12	3.85	3.01	3.90	4.00	3.58
Irving Park Elementary	94	2.67	3.75	2.90	3.88	3.15	3.27
Jamestown Elementary	73	2.96	3.61	2.54	3.74	3.42	3.25
Jefferson Elementary	91	2.66	4.23	2.59	3.31	3.30	3.22
Jesse Wharton Elem	78	2.38	3.93	2.47	3.37	3.23	3.08
Johnson Street Elementary	70	2.66	3.98	2.45	3.40	3.41	3.18
David D Jones Elementary	84	2.47	3.91	2.94	3.90	3.78	3.40
James Y Joyner Elementary	82	3.16	3.65	2.85	3.79	3.16	3.32
Kirkman Park Elementary	100	3.42	3.77	2.67	3.70	3.74	3.46
John Van Lindley Elementary	50	2.47	4.00	2.85	4.14	3.17	3.33
Madison Elementary	100	3.84	4.21	3.20	4.32	3.78	3.87
McLeansville Elementary	100	3.24	3.84	2.80	3.45	3.52	3.37
Millis Road Elementary	95	3.10	4.34	2.78	4.24	3.70	3.63

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Montlieu Avenue Elementary	68	2.38	3.50	2.27	2.10	3.04	2.66
Morehead Elementary	100	3.85	4.57	3.14	4.51	4.27	4.07
Murphey Traditional Acad	100	3.60	3.44	2.64	3.72	3.79	3.44
Nathanael Greene Elem	100	2.60	3.55	2.50	3.72	3.33	3.14
Northern Elementary	100	3.94	4.63	3.16	4.44	3.73	3.98
Northwood Elementary	100	2.89	3.66	2.35	3.38	3.47	3.15
Oak Hill Elementary	100	3.02	3.62	2.99	3.66	3.78	3.41
Oak Ridge Elementary	88	3.10	4.43	2.78	4.05	3.51	3.57
Oak View Elementary	68	2.92	4.12	2.93	3.74	3.95	3.53
Parkview Village Elementary	53	2.78	3.49	2.44	3.36	3.42	3.10
Pearce Elementary	100	2.96	4.26	2.44	3.93	3.70	3.46
Clara J Peck Elementary	83	3.17	3.89	2.84	3.51	3.77	3.44
Peeler Open Elementary	88	3.68	3.94	3.48	3.55	3.60	3.65
Pilot Elementary	100	2.80	4.19	3.01	3.68	3.60	3.46
Pleasant Garden Elementary	100	3.07	4.21	2.47	3.79	3.83	3.47
Rankin Elementary	63	3.18	3.91	2.32	3.63	3.91	3.39
Reedy Fork Elementary	100	4.13	4.64	3.43	4.68	4.29	4.23
Sedalia Elementary	100	2.87	4.12	2.69	4.06	3.61	3.47
Sedgefield Elementary	87	2.79	3.42	2.74	3.59	3.41	3.19
Shadybrook Elementary	53	2.94	4.10	2.88	3.62	2.92	3.29
Southern Elementary	81	3.09	3.99	2.89	4.14	3.91	3.60
Southwest Elementary	88	3.70	4.63	2.72	4.34	4.03	3.88
Sternberger Elementary	97	3.31	3.61	3.13	3.87	3.09	3.40
Stokesdale Elementary	100	2.85	4.18	2.97	4.21	3.68	3.58
Summerfield Elementary	100	2.48	3.17	2.53	3.76	3.09	3.01

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Sumner Elementary	100	3.36	4.04	2.70	3.65	3.66	3.48
Triangle Lake Montessori Elem	79	3.45	4.06	2.60	3.23	3.50	3.37
Union Hill Elementary	90	3.38	3.99	2.74	3.53	3.63	3.45
Vandalia Elementary	74	3.25	3.31	2.41	3.39	3.32	3.14
Washington Elementary	72	3.60	4.04	2.97	4.69	3.67	3.79
Wiley Accel/Enrichment	100	3.15	3.76	2.57	3.67	3.45	3.32
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.41</b>
<b>MAX</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.13</b>	<b>4.76</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>4.29</b>	<b>4.23</b>
<b>MIN</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2.38</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>2.10</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>2.66</b>

#### Average Domain Scores for GCS Middle Schools

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Allen Middle	77	2.58	3.15	2.34	2.73	3.13	2.79
Aycock Middle	79	2.22	3.48	2.29	2.73	2.82	2.71
Brown Summit Ctr	100	3.57	4.05	2.86	3.78	3.50	3.55
Eastern Middle	96	3.44	4.19	2.92	3.91	3.31	3.55
Ferndale Middle	75	3.13	4.04	2.87	3.81	3.78	3.53
Penn-Griffin Middle	81	3.59	4.09	2.96	3.57	3.40	3.52
Guilford Middle	85	3.01	3.84	3.11	3.92	3.43	3.46
Otis L Hairston Mid	100	2.84	3.96	2.36	3.25	3.56	3.19
Jackson Middle	80	3.05	3.91	2.53	3.68	3.39	3.31
Jamestown Middle	81	2.78	3.59	2.36	3.16	3.24	3.03
Kernodle Middle	72	2.93	4.48	3.02	3.60	3.62	3.53
Kiser Middle	94	3.36	3.87	2.76	3.66	3.45	3.42
Lincoln Academy	71	2.99	3.49	2.68	3.73	3.11	3.20
Mendenhall Middle	93	2.88	3.85	2.86	3.89	3.49	3.39
Northeast Guilford Mid	89	2.71	3.96	2.78	3.91	3.33	3.34

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Northern Guilford Mid	92	3.85	4.69	2.94	3.86	3.72	3.81
Northwest Guilford Mid	89	3.04	4.15	2.74	3.77	3.58	3.46
Southeast Guilford Mid	91	2.90	4.18	2.72	3.80	3.73	3.47
Southern Middle	79	3.59	4.64	2.84	4.04	3.91	3.80
Southwest Guilford Mid	64	3.29	3.59	2.39	3.01	2.97	3.05
Laurin Welborn Mid	69	3.06	3.88	2.48	3.03	3.43	3.18
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>2.71</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.35</b>
<b>MAX</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3.85</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>3.81</b>
<b>MIN</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>2.22</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.82</b>	<b>2.71</b>

**Average Domain Scores for GCS High Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Andrews High	80	2.88	3.64	2.32	3.16	3.36	3.07
Middle College High at Bennett	100	4.05	4.03	3.19	4.68	4.13	4.02
Dudley High	69	3.10	3.65	2.46	3.29	3.21	3.14
Eastern Guilford High	87	2.80	3.74	2.69	3.56	3.29	3.22
GC Middle College High	92	4.16	4.18	3.83	4.10	3.98	4.05
Grimsley High	55	2.55	3.28	2.52	2.76	2.95	2.81
The Early College at Guilford	80	4.18	4.19	3.44	3.71	4.03	3.91
GTCC Middle College High	100	4.71	4.38	3.71	4.56	4.70	4.41
Guilford Co. Acad. at HP Central EC	94	4.13	4.15	3.08	4.59	3.40	3.87
High Point Central High	63	3.43	3.76	2.63	3.67	3.57	3.41
High Point GTCC Middle College	67	4.48	3.86	3.33	3.57	4.08	3.86
Northeast Guilford High	84	3.03	3.60	2.67	3.53	3.43	3.25
Northern High	47	2.98	4.07	2.56	3.07	3.40	3.22

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Northwest Guilford High	50	3.09	3.89	2.74	3.34	3.57	3.33
Page High	73	2.77	3.69	2.81	3.61	3.42	3.26
Lucy Ragsdale High	68	2.73	3.44	2.63	3.83	3.23	3.17
Ben L Smith High	93	2.95	3.62	2.51	3.36	3.48	3.18
Smith Academy	84	3.12	3.90	2.35	3.08	3.23	3.14
Southeast Guilford High	89	2.74	3.13	2.62	3.47	3.15	3.02
Southern Guilford High	66	3.12	4.11	2.64	3.48	3.42	3.35
Southwest Guilford High	42	3.38	3.68	2.96	3.85	3.42	3.46
Philip J Weaver Ed Center	91	4.01	4.10	3.00	4.13	3.72	3.79
Western Guilford High	100	2.79	3.96	2.74	3.49	3.14	3.22
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>3.43</b>
<b>MAX</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>4.41</b>
<b>MIN</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>2.55</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>2.76</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.81</b>

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Small/Redesigned High Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Middle College High at Bennett	100	4.05	4.03	3.19	4.68	4.13	4.02
GC Middle College High	92	4.16	4.18	3.83	4.10	3.98	4.05
The Early College at Guilford	80	4.18	4.19	3.44	3.71	4.03	3.91
GTCC Middle College High	100	4.71	4.38	3.71	4.56	4.70	4.41
High Point GTCC Middle College	67	4.48	3.86	3.33	3.57	4.08	3.86
Guilford Co. Acad. At HP Central EC	94	4.13	4.15	3.08	4.59	3.40	3.87
Smith Academy	84	3.12	3.90	2.35	3.08	3.23	3.14
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>3.89</b>
<b>MAX</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.71</b>	<b>4.38</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>4.70</b>	<b>4.41</b>
<b>MIN</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>2.35</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.14</b>

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Magnet Elementary and Middle Schools**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>Percent Responded</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Facilities and Resources</b>	<b>Decision Making</b>	<b>Leadership</b>	<b>Professional Development</b>	<b>Average for all domains</b>
Bluford Elementary	100	2.97	3.47	2.76	3.86	3.47	3.31
Brooks Global Elementary	95	3.15	3.72	2.68	3.97	3.61	3.43
Erwin Montessori	79	2.91	3.73	2.87	3.95	3.71	3.43
Waldo C Falkener Elem	45	2.71	4.20	2.56	3.48	3.67	3.32
General Greene Elem	95	3.01	4.02	2.92	3.55	3.48	3.40
W M Hampton Elementary	91	3.12	2.96	2.94	3.64	3.53	3.24
Johnson Street Elementary	70	2.66	3.98	2.45	3.40	3.41	3.18
David D Jones Elementary	84	2.47	3.91	2.94	3.90	3.78	3.40
Kirkman Park Elementary	100	3.42	3.77	2.67	3.70	3.74	3.46
Montlieu Avenue Elementary	68	2.38	3.50	2.27	2.10	3.04	2.66
Morehead Elementary	100	3.85	4.57	3.14	4.51	4.27	4.07
Murphey Traditional Acad	100	3.60	3.44	2.64	3.72	3.79	3.44
Northwood Elementary	100	2.89	3.66	2.35	3.38	3.47	3.15
Parkview Village Elementary	53	2.78	3.49	2.44	3.36	3.42	3.10
Peeler Open Elementary	88	3.68	3.94	3.48	3.55	3.60	3.65
Triangle Lake Montessori Elem	79	3.45	4.06	2.60	3.23	3.50	3.37
Washington Elementary	72	3.60	4.04	2.97	4.69	3.67	3.79
Aycock Middle	79	2.22	3.48	2.29	2.73	2.82	2.71
Brown Summit Center	100	3.57	4.05	2.86	3.78	3.50	3.55
Lincoln Academy	71	2.99	3.49	2.68	3.73	3.11	3.20
Penn-Griffin Middle	81	3.59	4.09	2.96	3.57	3.40	3.52
Otis L Hairston Sr Middle	100	2.84	3.96	2.36	3.25	3.56	3.19
Ferndale Middle	75	3.13	4.04	2.87	3.81	3.78	3.53

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Laurin Welborn Middle	69	3.06	3.88	2.48	3.03	3.43	3.18
<b>AVERAGE</b>	83	3.09	3.81	2.72	3.58	3.53	3.34
<b>MAX</b>	100	3.85	4.57	3.48	3.58	4.27	4.07
<b>MIN</b>	45	2.22	2.96	2.72	2.10	2.82	2.66

### Average Domain Scores for GCS Title I Elementary Schools

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Edwin A Alderman Elem	78	3.04	3.79	2.63	3.26	3.45	3.23
Allen Jay Elementary	100	3.01	3.64	2.77	3.06	3.53	3.20
Archer Elementary	89	2.94	3.32	2.49	3.45	3.43	3.13
Bessemer Elementary	55	3.05	3.42	2.62	3.57	3.74	3.28
Bluford Elementary	100	2.97	3.47	2.76	3.86	3.47	3.31
Brightwood Elementary	57	3.15	4.08	2.39	3.40	3.42	3.29
Cesar Cone Elementary	58	2.82	4.07	2.44	3.34	3.49	3.23
Fairview Elementary	87	3.33	4.11	2.62	3.71	3.54	3.46
Waldo C Falkener Sr Elem	45	2.71	4.20	2.56	3.48	3.67	3.32
Julius I Foust Elementary	45	2.60	3.13	2.16	2.56	3.43	2.78
Cyrus P Frazier Elementary	100	2.81	3.96	2.76	3.71	3.50	3.35
Gillespie Park Elementary	79	2.91	4.48	2.99	3.88	3.83	3.62
Guilford Primary	79	3.16	4.50	2.64	3.99	3.87	3.63
W M Hampton Elementary	91	3.12	2.96	2.94	3.64	3.53	3.24
Hunter Elementary	74	3.12	3.85	3.01	3.90	4.00	3.58
Johnson Street Elementary	70	2.66	3.98	2.45	3.40	3.41	3.18
Kirkman Park Elementary	100	3.42	3.77	2.67	3.70	3.74	3.46
Montlieu Avenue Elementary	68	2.38	3.50	2.27	2.10	3.04	2.66
Murphey Traditional Acad	100	3.60	3.44	2.64	3.72	3.79	3.44

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Northwood Elementary	100	2.89	3.66	2.35	3.38	3.47	3.15
Oak Hill Elementary	100	3.02	3.62	2.99	3.66	3.78	3.41
Oak View Elementary	68	2.92	4.12	2.93	3.74	3.95	3.53
Parkview Village Elementary	53	2.78	3.49	2.44	3.36	3.42	3.10
Rankin Elementary	63	3.18	3.91	2.32	3.63	3.91	3.39
Sedgefield Elementary	87	2.79	3.42	2.74	3.59	3.41	3.19
Sumner Elementary	100	3.36	4.04	2.70	3.65	3.66	3.48
Union Hill Elementary	90	3.38	3.99	2.74	3.53	3.63	3.45
Vandalia Elementary	74	3.25	3.31	2.41	3.39	3.32	3.14
Washington Elementary	72	3.60	4.04	2.97	4.69	3.67	3.79
Wiley Accel/Enrichment	100	3.15	3.76	2.57	3.67	3.45	3.32
<b>AVERAGE</b>	79	3.04	3.77	2.63	3.53	3.59	3.31
<b>MAX</b>	100	3.60	4.50	3.01	4.69	4.00	3.79
<b>MIN</b>	45	2.38	2.96	2.16	2.10	3.04	2.66

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Title I Middle Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Allen Middle	77	2.58	3.15	2.34	2.73	3.13	2.79
Ferndale Middle	75	3.13	4.04	2.87	3.81	3.78	3.53
Otis L Hairston Sr Middle	100	2.84	3.96	2.36	3.25	3.56	3.19
Jackson Middle	80	3.05	3.91	2.53	3.68	3.39	3.31
<b>AVERAGE</b>	83	2.90	3.77	2.53	3.37	3.47	3.20
<b>MAX</b>	100	3.13	4.04	2.87	3.81	3.78	3.53
<b>MIN</b>	75	2.58	3.15	2.34	2.73	3.13	2.79

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible Elementary Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Bessemer Elementary	55	3.05	3.42	2.62	3.57	3.74	3.28
Cesar Cone Elementary	58	2.82	4.07	2.44	3.34	3.49	3.23
Fairview Elementary	87	3.33	4.11	2.62	3.71	3.54	3.46
Waldo C Falkener Elem	45	2.71	4.20	2.56	3.48	3.67	3.32
Julius I Foust Elementary	45	2.60	3.13	2.16	2.56	3.43	2.78
Gillespie Park Elementary	79	2.91	4.48	2.99	3.88	3.83	3.62
W M Hampton Elementary	91	3.12	2.96	2.94	3.64	3.53	3.24
Kirkman Park Elementary	100	3.42	3.77	2.67	3.70	3.74	3.46
Oak Hill Elementary	100	3.02	3.62	2.99	3.66	3.78	3.41
Parkview Village Elem	53	2.78	3.49	2.44	3.36	3.42	3.10
Union Hill Elementary	90	3.38	3.99	2.74	3.53	3.63	3.45
Washington Elementary	72	3.60	4.04	2.97	4.69	3.67	3.79
Wiley Accel/ Enrichment	100	3.15	3.76	2.57	3.67	3.45	3.32
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>2.67</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>3.34</b>
<b>MAX</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>4.48</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.79</b>
<b>MIN</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2.60</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>2.16</b>	<b>2.56</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>2.78</b>

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible Middle Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Allen Middle	77	2.58	3.15	2.34	2.73	3.13	2.79
Aycock Middle	79	2.22	3.48	2.29	2.73	2.82	2.71
Ferndale Middle	75	3.13	4.04	2.87	3.81	3.78	3.53
Penn-Griffin Middle	81	3.59	4.09	2.96	3.57	3.40	3.52
Otis Hairston Middle	100	2.84	3.96	2.36	3.25	3.56	3.19
Jackson Middle	80	3.05	3.91	2.53	3.68	3.39	3.31

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
Laurin Welborn Mid	69	3.06	3.88	2.48	3.03	3.43	3.18
<b>AVERAGE</b>	80	2.92	3.79	2.55	3.26	3.36	3.17
<b>MAX</b>	100	3.59	4.09	2.96	3.81	3.78	3.53
<b>MIN</b>	69	2.22	3.15	2.29	2.73	2.82	2.71

**Average Domain Scores for GCS Mission Possible High Schools**

School Name	Percent Responded	Time	Facilities and Resources	Decision Making	Leadership	Professional Development	Average for all domains
T Wingate Andrews High	80	2.88	3.64	2.32	3.16	3.36	3.07
Middle College High at Bennett	100	4.05	4.03	3.19	4.68	4.13	4.02
Dudley High	69	3.10	3.65	2.46	3.29	3.21	3.14
Eastern Guilford High	87	2.80	3.74	2.69	3.56	3.29	3.22
High Point Central High	63	3.43	3.76	2.63	3.67	3.57	3.41
Ben L Smith High	93	2.95	3.62	2.51	3.36	3.48	3.18
Smith Academy	84	3.12	3.90	2.35	3.08	3.23	3.14
Southern Guilford High	66	3.12	4.11	2.64	3.48	3.42	3.35
<b>AVERAGE</b>	80	3.18	3.81	2.60	3.54	3.46	3.32
<b>MAX</b>	100	4.05	4.11	3.19	4.68	4.13	4.02
<b>MIN</b>	63	2.80	3.62	2.32	3.08	3.21	3.07

**Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover<sup>27</sup>  
Elementary Schools**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>Leadership Average</b>	<b>Average for all domains</b>	<b>Teacher Turnover Rate</b>	<b>Number of Teachers Who Left</b>
Alamance Elementary	4.29	3.564	14.3%	7
Edwin A Alderman Elem	3.26	3.234	15.8%	6
Allen Jay Elementary	3.06	3.202	23.3%	10
Archer Elementary	3.45	3.126	16.2%	6
Bessemer Elementary	3.57	3.28	31.6%	12
Bluford Elementary	3.86	3.306	30.3%	10
Brightwood Elementary	3.4	3.288	24.6%	16
Brooks Global Elementary	3.97	3.426	6.5%	2
Monticello-Brown Summit Elem	4.45	4.138	35.6%	16
Claxton Elementary	4.19	3.286	13.6%	6
Colfax Elementary	3.42	3.302	44.3%	27
Ceasar Cone Elementary	3.34	3.232	31.1%	14
Erwin Montessori Elementary	3.95	3.434	32.0%	8
Fairview Elementary	3.71	3.462	40.4%	23
Waldo C Falkener Sr Elem	3.48	3.324	34.0%	17
Florence Elementary	2.93	3.026	6.7%	3
Julius I Foust Elementary	2.56	2.776	41.2%	14
Cyrus P Frazier Elementary	3.71	3.348	25.7%	9
Gibsonville Elementary	4.36	4.038	35.5%	11

<sup>27</sup> Teacher turnover rate is calculated by comparing the teaching staff at a school in March 2007 with the teaching staff at that same school in March 2008. If the teacher was at a school in March 2007 and not at the same school in March 2008, then it is counted as turnover, even if the teacher is still employed with GCS. Data sent in email from Stephen Foster, Guilford County Schools Human Resources Department, on Dec.22, 2008.

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Gillespie Park Elementary	3.88	3.618	41.9%	13
General Greene Elementary	3.55	3.396	19.4%	6
Guilford Primary	3.99	3.632	26.5%	9
W M Hampton Elementary	3.64	3.238	25.8%	8
Hunter Elementary	3.9	3.576	22.2%	10
Irving Park Elementary	3.88	3.27	29.2%	14
Jamestown Elementary	3.74	3.254	28.2%	11
Jefferson Elementary	3.31	3.218	30.2%	16
Jesse Wharton Elem	3.37	3.076	30.6%	19
Johnson Street Elementary	3.4	3.18	44.4%	20
David D Jones Elementary	3.9	3.4	28.6%	14
James Y Joyner Elementary	3.79	3.322	26.7%	8
Kirkman Park Elementary	3.7	3.46	73.1%	19
John Van Lindley Elementary	4.14	3.326	30.8%	12
Madison Elementary	4.32	3.87	59.5%	22
McLeansville Elementary	3.45	3.37	29.6%	8
Millis Road Elementary	4.24	3.632	6.5%	2
Montlieu Avenue Elementary	2.1	2.658	40.5%	17
Morehead Elementary	4.51	4.068	25.7%	9
Murphey Traditional Acad.	3.72	3.438	20.6%	7
Nathanael Greene Elem	3.72	3.14	17.9%	5
Northern Elementary	4.44	3.98	0.0%	*
Northwood Elementary	3.38	3.15	19.1%	9

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Oak Hill Elementary	3.66	3.414	36.1%	13
Oak Ridge Elementary	4.05	3.574	15.2%	7
Oak View Elementary	3.74	3.532	23.4%	11
Parkview Village Elementary	3.36	3.098	19.0%	8
Pearce Elementary	3.93	3.458	0.0%	*
Clara J Peck Elementary	3.51	3.436	30.6%	11
Peeler Open Elementary	3.55	3.65	29.0%	9
Pilot Elementary	3.68	3.456	17.0%	9
Pleasant Garden Elementary	3.79	3.474	15.0%	6
Rankin Elementary	3.63	3.39	36.1%	22
Reedy Fork Elementary	4.68	4.234	0.0%	*
Sedalia Elementary	4.06	3.47	30.0%	9
Sedgefield Elementary	3.59	3.19	30.4%	14
Shadybrook Elementary	3.62	3.292	24.4%	10
Southern Elementary	4.14	3.604	28.6%	6
Southwest Elementary	4.34	3.884	29.6%	16
Sternberger Elementary	3.87	3.402	34.4%	11
Stokesdale Elementary	4.21	3.578	14.7%	5
Summerfield Elementary	3.76	3.006	20.0%	9
Sumner Elementary	3.65	3.482	23.9%	11
Triangle Lake Montessori Elem	3.23	3.368	34.3%	12
Union Hill Elementary	3.53	3.454	30.3%	10
Vandalia Elementary	3.39	3.136	48.3%	14

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Washington Elementary	4.69	3.794	32.0%	8
Wiley Accl/Enrichment	3.67	3.32	39.3%	11

\* School opened in fall 2007, so turnover numbers are not yet available.

**Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover  
Middle Schools**

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Allen Middle	2.73	2.786	28.3%	17
Aycock Middle	2.73	2.708	34.6%	18
Brown Summit Center	3.78	3.552	35.3%	6
Ferndale Middle	3.81	3.526	30.2%	16
Penn-Griffin Middle	3.57	3.522	23.4%	11
Guilford Middle	3.92	3.462	37.5%	27
Otis L Hairston Sr Middle	3.25	3.194	50.9%	29
Jackson Middle	3.68	3.312	40.4%	19
Jamestown Middle	3.16	3.026	29.9%	23
Kernodle Middle	3.6	3.53	13.6%	9
Kiser Middle	3.66	3.42	47.1%	33
Lincoln Academy	3.73	3.2	37.7%	20
Eastern Middle	3.91	3.554	34.3%	23
Mendenhall Middle	3.89	3.394	20.6%	14
Northeast Guilford Middle	3.91	3.338	43.3%	29
Northern Guilford Middle	3.86	3.812	0.0%	0
Northwest Guilford Middle	3.77	3.456	30.1%	22
Southeast Guilford Middle	3.8	3.466	22.1%	15

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Southern Middle School	4.04	3.804	24.0%	12
Southwest Guilford Middle	3.01	3.05	27.4%	20
Laurin Welborn Middle	3.03	3.176	33.3%	15

**Leadership and Domain Average Compared to Teacher Turnover High Schools**

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
T Wingate Andrews High	3.16	3.072	28.6%	22
Middle College High at Bennett	4.68	4.016	41.7%	5
Dudley High	3.29	3.142	27.9%	29
Eastern Guilford High	3.56	3.216	18.9%	14
GC Middle College High	4.1	4.05	30.0%	3
Grimsley High	2.76	2.812	28.4%	33
Early College at Guilford	3.71	3.91	0.0%	0
GTCC Middle College High	4.56	4.412	18.2%	2
High Point Central High	3.67	3.412	22.5%	23
Academy at High Point Central EC	4.59	3.87	11.1%	1
High Point GTCC Middle College	3.57	3.864	20.0%	2
Middle College High at NC A&T	n/r	n/r	45.5%	5
Northeast Guilford High	3.53	3.252	21.6%	16
Northern High	3.07	3.216	0.0%	*
Northwest Guilford High	3.34	3.326	27.8%	35
Page High	3.61	3.26	27.6%	29

School Name	Leadership Average	Average for all domains	Teacher Turnover Rate	Number of Teachers Who Left
Ragsdale High	3.83	3.172	33.0%	30
Ben L Smith High	3.36	3.184	35.4%	34
Smith Academy	3.08	3.136	35.3%	6
Southeast Guilford High	3.47	3.022	19.3%	16
Southern Guilford High	3.48	3.354	19.7%	14
Southwest Guilford High	3.85	3.458	27.5%	25
Philip J Weaver Ed Center	4.13	3.792	19.2%	10
Western Guilford High	3.49	3.224	26.9%	25

\* School opened in fall 2007, so turnover numbers are not yet available.

### Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions

(Data reflects percentage of respondents who agreed with each statement.)

Question	Teacher	Principal	Difference
Opportunities for advancement within the teaching profession (other than administration) are available to me.	51.1%	68.7%	-17.5%
Teachers are centrally involved in decision making about educational issues.	49.6%	90.5%	-40.9%
Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	65.4%	94.0%	-28.6%
In this school we take steps to solve problems.	60.0%	94.0%	-34.0%
The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions and solving problems.	53.5%	90.5%	-37.0%
Teachers have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials and resources.	69.6%	96.4%	-26.9%
Teachers have sufficient access to instructional technology, including computers, printers, software and internet access.	78.1%	94.0%	-15.9%
Teachers have sufficient access to communications technology, including phones, faxes, email and network drives.	82.5%	86.9%	-4.4%
Teachers have sufficient access to office equipment and supplies such as copy machines, paper, pens, etc.	66.3%	94.0%	-27.7%

<b>Question</b>	<b>Teacher</b>	<b>Principal</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is clean and well-maintained.	67.8%	83.1%	-15.3%
Teachers and staff work in a school environment that is safe.	72.9%	95.2%	-22.3%
Teachers have adequate professional space to work productively.	69.4%	76.8%	-7.5%
The reliability and speed of Internet connections in this school are sufficient to support instructional practices.	86.2%	90.5%	-4.3%
There is an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school.	59.4%	92.9%	-33.4%
The school leadership communicates clear expectations to students and parents.	67.5%	95.2%	-27.7%
The faculty are committed to helping every student learn.	82.2%	91.6%	-9.3%
The school leadership consistently enforces rules for student conduct.	46.4%	90.5%	-44.1%
Opportunities are available for members of the community to actively contribute to this school's success.	73.7%	95.2%	-21.6%
The school improvement team provides effective leadership at this school.	51.9%	86.9%	-35.0%
Teachers receive feedback that can help them improve teaching.	73.4%	100.0%	-26.6%
Teachers are held to high professional standards for delivering instruction.	84.1%	98.8%	-14.7%
The procedures for teacher performance evaluations are consistent.	72.7%	100.0%	-27.3%
The school leadership shields teachers from disruptions, allowing teachers to focus on educating students.	54.0%	97.6%	-43.6%
The school leadership support teachers' efforts to maintain discipline in the classroom.	56.9%	95.2%	-38.4%
The faculty and staff have a shared vision.	63.5%	88.1%	-24.6%
Teacher performance evaluations are handled in an appropriate manner.	75.7%	100.0%	-24.3%
The school leadership consistently supports teachers.	61.1%	98.8%	-37.7%

Question	Teacher	Principal	Difference
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Leadership issues	56.8%	94.0%	-37.2%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Facilities and resources	64.2%	96.4%	-32.2%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: The use of time in my school	55.9%	94.0%	-38.1%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Professional development	63.6%	97.6%	-34.1%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Empowering teachers	55.3%	94.0%	-38.7%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: New teacher support	55.8%	88.1%	-32.2%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Overall, the school leadership in my school is effective.	55.2%	81.7%	-26.5%
The school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about: Overall, my school is a good place to teach and learn.	71.5%	91.7%	-20.2%
At this school we utilize the results from the Teacher Working Conditions survey as a tool for school improvement.	32.5%	76.2%	-43.6%
Sufficient funds and resources are available to allow teachers to take advantage of professional development activities.	51.9%	89.3%	-37.4%
Professional development provides teachers with the knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively.	61.2%	91.5%	-30.3%
Teachers are provided with opportunities to learn from one another.	68.7%	91.7%	-23.0%
Adequate time is provided for professional development.	64.3%	78.3%	-14.1%
Professional development has provided YOU with strategies that you have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods.	70.0%	(81.0%)	-10.9%
Professional development has provided teachers with strategies that that they have incorporated into your instructional delivery methods.	(70.0%)	81.0%	-10.9%
Professional development has proven useful to YOU in your efforts to improve student achievement.	67.6%	(83.3%)	-15.7%
Professional development has proven useful to teachers in their efforts to improve student achievement.	(67.6%)	83.3%	-15.7%

Question	Teacher	Principal	Difference
Teachers have reasonable class sizes, affording them time to meet the educational needs of all students.	52.5%	82.1%	-29.6%
Teachers have time available to collaborate with their colleagues.	52.3%	89.3%	-37.0%
Teachers are protected from duties that interfere with their essential role of educating students.	43.0%	89.3%	-46.3%
The non-instructional time provided for teachers in my school is sufficient.	37.7%	84.5%	-46.9%
School leadership tries to minimize the amount of routine administrative paperwork required of teachers.	48.0%	90.5%	-42.5%

### Comparison of Principal and Teacher Perceptions of Teachers Roles

*(Respondents were asked to indicate how large a role teachers have at their school in each of the following areas.)*

Area	Role	Teachers	Principals	Difference
<b>Selecting instructional materials and resources</b>	No role at all	5.6%	0.0%	5.6%
	Small role	21.4%	3.6%	17.9%
	Moderate role	33.0%	25.0%	8.0%
	Large role	29.9%	51.2%	-21.3%
	The primary role	10.1%	20.2%	-10.1%
<b>Devising teaching techniques</b>	No role at all	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%
	Small role	12.1%	2.4%	9.6%
	Moderate role	27.7%	24.1%	3.6%
	Large role	38.5%	51.8%	-13.3%
	The primary role	18.4%	21.7%	-3.3%
<b>Setting grading and student assessment practices</b>	No role at all	7.5%	1.2%	6.3%
	Small role	17.3%	9.5%	7.8%
	Moderate role	27.1%	22.6%	4.4%
	Large role	33.0%	50.0%	-17.0%
	The primary role	15.2%	16.7%	-1.5%
<b>Determining the content of in-service professional development programs</b>	No role at all	22.2%	0.0%	22.2%
	Small role	30.8%	16.9%	13.9%
	Moderate role	29.3%	34.9%	-5.7%
	Large role	14.9%	41.0%	-26.0%
	The primary role	2.8%	7.2%	-4.4%
<b>Hiring new teachers</b>	No role at all	60.4%	14.6%	45.7%
	Small role	23.6%	31.7%	-8.1%
	Moderate role	11.8%	40.2%	-28.5%
	Large role	3.8%	8.5%	-4.8%
	The primary role	.5%	4.9%	-4.4%

<b>Area</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Teachers</b>	<b>Principals</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Establishing and implementing policies and student discipline</b>	No role at all	17.8%	1.2%	16.6%
	Small role	29.2%	3.6%	25.6%
	Moderate role	27.1%	32.5%	-5.4%
	Large role	20.9%	54.2%	-33.3%
	The primary role	4.9%	8.4%	-3.5%
<b>Deciding how the school budget will be spent</b>	No role at all	37.6%	1.2%	36.4%
	Small role	33.3%	19.0%	14.2%
	Moderate role	20.3%	35.7%	-15.4%
	Large role	7.8%	38.1%	-30.3%
	The primary role	1.1%	6.0%	-4.9%
<b>School improvement planning</b>	No role at all	13.8%	0.0%	13.8%
	Small role	28.7%	1.2%	27.5%
	Moderate role	31.6%	8.3%	23.3%
	Large role	21.9%	72.6%	-50.7%
	The primary role	3.9%	17.9%	-13.9%
<b>Members of the school improvement team are elected.</b>	Yes	43.5%	95.2%	-51.7%
	No	20.9%	2.4%	18.5%
	Don't know	35.6%	2.4%	33.2%

## 2008-2009 Guilford Education Alliance Board of Directors

Chris Adams  
Uma Avva  
Jane Blackwell  
Doug Boike  
Sherri Brown  
Ann Busby  
Larry Craven  
Nathan Duggins  
Penni Foust  
Barbara Frye  
Joe Graves  
Martin Green  
Maria Haggarty  
Jarvis Harris  
Ed Kitchen  
Father Philip Kollithanath  
Holly Lindsey  
Nolo Martinez  
James McNeil  
Davis Montgomery  
Skip Moore  
Jim Morgan  
Ivan Mosley  
Gary Palmer  
Alan Pike  
Bob Powell  
Michael Prioleau  
Pam Sessoms  
Jack Shields  
Pam Sprinkle  
Marti Sykes  
Doug Thorne  
Judy Wicker  
Laura Wiley

### **Ex-Officio Board Members**

Superintendent of Guilford County Schools  
Chair, Guilford County Board of Education  
President, Guilford County Council of PTAs  
President, Guilford County Association of Educators

A special thanks to Lincoln Financial Foundation for funding the research, design and printing of this report





Guilford Education Alliance  
902 Bonner Drive, Jamestown, NC 27282  
P 336.841.4332 F 336.841.3696  
[www.GuilfordEducationAlliance.org](http://www.GuilfordEducationAlliance.org)