⚫ *CULTURE OF EXCELLENCE & ETHICS ASSESSMENT*™

School Culture Surveys

An **Excellence with Integrity Institute** Resource

PSYCHOMETRICS

PSYCHOMETRIC DATA

V. T. Khmelkov and M.L. Davidson

SURVEY HISTORY

Culture of Excellence & Ethics Assessment surveys were developed in 2009 by incorporating a range of items from the *Collective Responsibility for Excellence & Ethics* surveys (CREE, version 2.5). CREE surveys were used in several federally-funded research projects in 2005-2008. They included items and scales designed by the authors to measure school community and related constructs, used in earlier instruments and specific for this survey (Davidson and Khmelkov, 2002; Davidson and Khmelkov, 2003). CREE surveys also included several publicly available scales used in national and international studies—the 2000 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA, see Adams and Wu, 2002) and the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS, see Burns et al., 2003).

The external scales in the CREE student survey measured constructs, such as Preference for Cooperative Learning (developed for PISA by Marsh et al., 1999), Preference for Competitive Learning (developed by Owens and Barnes, 1982, 1992), subject-specific Intrinsic Interest scales (adapted from Baumert et al., 1998, see also Peschar et al., 1999), and subject-specific Self-Efficacy scales (adapted from the original MSLQ, Pintrich et al., 1993). The external scales in CREE faculty/staff survey included Leadership scale from the Schools and Staffing survey (Tourkin et al, 2004), Teaching for Understanding scale (Khmelkov, Power, and Power, 2001; adapted from the original pool of items in Bidwell et all, 1997), Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scales (OSTES, Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

The data from external scales collected in 2005-2008 were used to demonstrate discriminant and convergent validity (cf.,Trochim & Donnelly, 2006) of the CREE-specific scales, including School Climate (student social health and safety, social capital generated in community by adults), Ethical Learning Community among students, Faculty/Staff Practices promoting community and development of student character competencies, and Professional Ethical Learning Community (see review and analysis results in Khmelkov and Davidson, 2008).

CEEA survey design started by developing a conceptual model and framework of school climate and culture (Khmelkov and Davidson, 2009-2011). A pool of over 200 items was generated in summer 2009 to measure the constructs identified in the CEEA model. This pool was based on the original scales and items in CREE 2.5, but was expanded to match the conceptual model. No items from external scales, used in CREE 2.5, were included in CEEA surveys. Through a series of discussions with practitioners and research experts about the face validity of the emerging measurement scales, the survey was narrowed to 110 items on the student survey and 139 items on the faculty/staff survey. This version of the survey was identified as 4.2.

After the psychometric analysis of CEEA 4.2 (available from the authors) demonstrated excellent properties, a decision was made to reduce the number of items to make the surveys shorter and more manageable for administration and review of the results.

Version 4.5 of the student and staff surveys differs from version 4.2 in the fact that one scale was removed from it—student self-efficacy beliefs about their competencies and staff perceptions of students demonstrating those competencies (28 items). In addition, 7 items were removed from the student culture of ethics, 1 item from staff practices, 2 items from health and life balance set, and 1 item from staff collegiate relationships scale.

This report presents the data results for the analysis of version 4.5 of the CEEA surveys.

DATA SAMPLE

The student and faculty data used for these analyses come from five waves of data collection: Fall 2009, Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012. 15 high schools participated in the data collection in Fall 2009; 20 high schools— in Spring 2010; 28 high schools— in Fall 2010; 7 high schools— in Fall 2011; and 4 high schools —in Spring 2012. 3 middle schools participated in the data collection in Fall 2011, and 2 middle schools—in Spring 2012. Additional 48 high schools participated in data collection from faculty and staff in Fall 2011-Spring 2012. The parent survey data were collected from 67 high schools in Fall 2011-Spring 2012.

The majority of schools in the sample were public (several were charter schools; there were no private schools in this sample). Schools in this sample were located in the Midwest, North-East, and North-West, and included urban, suburban, and rural schools.

The data collection in Fall 2009 did not include Student Safety, Faculty/Staff Support for & Engagement of Students, and Professional Community and School/Home Partnership scales. This explains smaller Ns in the analyses of these scales.

Grade level, gender, and basic race/ethnicity was collected. Schools included students with disability and non-native English speaking students. However, these students were not identified during data collection, therefore, no information is available for analysis. Differences in means for gender and race/ethnicity groups are included.

With the exception of one school, all data was collected using online data collection system (hosted by Vovici). One school collected student surveys on paper-and-pencil forms.

PSYCHOMETRIC DATA

Table 1 presents information on the internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) and percent of variance accounted for by the items of the scales in factor analysis. All of the scales in this version of CEEA surveys have consistently high to excellent internal consistency. This is evidenced by Cronbach's alphas ranging from very high at .85 to exemplary at .91 in the high school sample, and from .80 to .93 in the middle school sample (see Robinson et al, 1991).

For the most part, the scales explain about 50% or more of the variance in the contributing items.

To explore convergent and discriminant validity, the pattern of relationships between various constructs measured by CEEA surveys can be established by examining bivariate correlations in the student, faculty/staff, and parent samples in Table 2. The goal of this analysis is to ascertain whether the observed pattern of relationships in the data corresponds to the theoretical pattern of relationships between constructs of interest, or whether constructs simultaneously demonstrate discriminant and convergent validity as could be predicted theoretically (Trochim & Donnelly, 2006).

The pattern of relationships observed is indeed consistent with what can be expected theoretically. For example, Student Safety scale in high school student data has relatively small correlations with student perceptions of faculty/staff practices (.199 and .212),

but moderate correlations with perceptions of peer student behaviors (.351 and .424). Similarly, student perceptions of faculty support and engagement of students scale has high correlations with student perceptions of staff practices in domains of excellence and ethics (.675 and .729), but lower correlations with perceptions of peer behaviors (.405 and .526). The parent data shows similar consistency in expected pattern of relationships.

Finally, Tables 3-6 show means, standard deviations, and results of t-test comparisons of differences in means for gender and major race/ethnicity groups in the student data from the high school sample.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, R. & Wu, M. (2002). *PISA 2000 Technical Report*. Paris: OECD.

Baumert, J., Fend, H., O'Neil, H.F., & Peschar, J.L. (1998). *Prepared for life-long learning: Frame of reference for the measurement of self-regulated learning as a cross-curricular competency (CCC) in the PISA project*. Paris: OECD.

Berger, R. (2003). *An ethic of excellence*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bidwell, C. E., Frank, K. A., & Quiroz, P. A. (1997). Teacher types, workplace controls, and the organization of schools. *Sociology of Education*, 70, 285-307.

Bidwell, C. E., & Yasumoto, J. Y. (1999). The collegial focus: Teaching fields, collegial relationships, and instructional practice in American high schools. *Sociology of Education*, 72, 234-256.

Bowen, N.K. & Bowen, G.L. (1999). Effects of crime and violence in neighborhoods and schools on the school behaviors and performance of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14, 319-342.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trsut in schools: A core resources for improvement*. New York: Russell Sage.

Burns, L. et al. (2003). *Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002: Base Year Field Test Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, NCES.

Connell, J. P., Halpern-Felsher, B. L., Clifford, E., Crichlow, W. & Usinger, P. (1995). Hanging in there: behavioral, psychological, and contex-

CULTURE OF EXCELLENCE & ETHICS ASSESSMENT™

tual factors affecting whether African-American adolescents stay in high school, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 10, 41–63.

Davidson, M. L. & Khmelkov, V. T. (2002). *Global Portraits of Social and Moral Health Questionnaire.*

Davidson, M. L. & Khmelkov, V. T. (2003). *GoodSport Youth Development Questionnaire.*

Davidson, M.L., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V.T. (2008). Smart & good schools: A new paradigm for high schools character education. In L.P. Nucci and D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook of moral and character education* (pp. 370-390). NY: Routledge.

Davidson, M.L., Lickona, T., & Khmelkov, V.T. (2010). The power of character: Needed for, and developed from, teaching and learning. In T. Lovat & R. Toomey (Eds.), *International handbook on values education and student well-being*. New York: Springer.

De Bruyn, Eddy H. (2005). Role strain, engagement and academic achievement in early adolescence. *Educational Studies*, 31(1), 15-27.

DeFour, R., and R. Eaker. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Elbot, C., & Fulton, D. (2008). *Building an intentional school culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Epstein, J. L. (2005). *Developing and sustaining research-based programs of school, family, and community partnerships: Summary of five years of NNPS research*. Baltimore, MD: National Network of Partnership Schools.

Epstein, J. L., and Sheldon, S. B. (2006). Moving forward: Ideas for research on school, family, and community partnerships. In C. F. Conrad & R. Serlin (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of research in education: Engaging ideas and enriching inquiry* (pp. 117-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel.* London: Falmer Press.

Gamoran, A., Secada, W. G., & Marrett, C. B. (2000). The organizational context of teaching and learning: Changing theoretical perspectives. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), *Handbook of the sociology of education* (pp. 37-63). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Glew, G., Fan, F., Katon, W., Rivara, F., Kernic, M. (2005). Bullying, psychosocial adjustement, and academic performance in elementary school.

Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 159, 1026-1031.

Herman, K. C., C. M. Tucker. (2000). Engagement in learning and academic success among at-risk Latino American students. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 33(3), 129-136.

Hill, Nancy E., Domini R. Castellino, Jennifer E. Lansford, Patrick Nowlin, Kenneth A. Dodge, John E. Bates, and Gregory S. Pettit. (2004). Parent Academic Involvement as Related to School Behavior, Achievement, and Aspirations: Demographic Variations Across Adolescence. *Child Development*, 75(5), 1491-1509.

Jackson, P., Boostrom, R.E., & Hansen, D.T. (1998). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jenks, C., Crouse, J., & Mueser, P. (1983). The Wisconsin model of status attainment: A national replication with improved measures of ability and aspiration. *Sociology of Education*, 56, 3-19.

Kessler, R. (2001). Soul of students, soul of teachers: Welcoming the inner life to school. In Lantieri, L. (Ed.), *Schools with spirit: Nurturing the inner lives of children and teachers.* (pp. 107-131). Boston: Beacon Press.

Khmelkov, V.T. & Davidson, M.L. (2008). *Collective Responsibility for Excellence and Ethics (CREE): Reliability and Validity (version 2.5).*

Khmelkov, V.T. & Davidson, M.L. (2009-2011). *Culture of Excellence& Ethics Assessment (CEEA): Conceptual model.*

Khmelkov, V. T., Power, A. & Power, F. C. (2001). Teacher candidates' incoming beliefs about teaching: Comparing Catholic service-learning and traditional programs. *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, 5(2): 206-228.

Langer, J. A. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high schools: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 397-439.

Lee, Valerie E., Julia B. Smith, Tamara E. Perry, Mark A. Smylie. (1999). *Social support, academic press, and student achievement: A view from the middle grades in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Lickona, T. & Davidson, M. (2005). *Smart & good high schools: Integrating excellence and ethics for success in school, work, and beyond*. Cortland, NY: Center for the 4th and 5th Rs (Respect and Responsibility)/Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.

Louis, K.S., H.M. Marks, and S.E. Kruse. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(4): 757-798.

Marsh, H.W., Shavelson, R.J. and Byrne, B.M. (1992). A multidimensional, hierarchical self-concept. In: R.P. Lipka and T.M. Brinthaupt (eds.), *Studying the Self: Self-perspectives Across the Life-Span*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

McNeal, R. B., Jr. (1999). Parental involvement as social capital: Differential effectiveness on science achievement, truancy, and dropping out. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 117-144.

Narvaez, D. (2010). Building a sustaining classroom climate for purposeful ethical citizenship. In T. Lovat and R. Toomey (Eds.), *International research handbook of values education and student well-being*. New York: Springer.

Natriello, Gary. (1984). Problems in the evaluation of students and student disengagement from secondary schools. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 17 (4), 14–24.

Newmann, F. M., and Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Owens, L. & Barnes, J. (1982). The relationship between cooperative, competitive, and individualized learning preferences and students' perceptions of classroom learning atmosphere. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19: 182-200.

Owens, L. & Barnes, J. (1992). *Learning preferences scales*. Hawthorn, Vic.: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Peschar, J. L., Veenstra, R., Boomsma, A., Huisman, M., & van derWal, M. (1999). *Self-regulated learning as a cross-curricular competency: The construction of instruments in 22 countries for the PISA main study 2000*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A.F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W.J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MLSQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53: 801-813.

Power, F.C., Higgins, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1989). *Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R., & Wrightsman, L.S. (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V., & Solomon, D. (1997). School as a caring community: A key to character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *The construction of children's character* (pp. 127-139). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sebring, Penny B. and Anthony S. Bryk. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81 (6), 440–443.

Secada, W.G., and L.B. Adajian. (1997). Mathematics teachers' change in the context of their professional communities. Pp. 193-219 in B.S. Nelson and E. Fennema (Eds.), *Mathematics Teachers in Transition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Seligman, M., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14.

Sewell, W. H., Haller, A. O., & Portes, A. (1969). The educational and early occupational attainment process. *American Sociological Review*, 34, 82-92.

Shouse, R. C. (1996). Academic press and sense of community: Conflict, congruence, and implications for student achievement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 1, 47-68.

Solomon, D., Watson, J., & Battistich, V.A. (2002). Teaching and school effects on moral/prosocial development. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook for research on teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Talbert, J. E., and M. W. McLaughlin. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. *American Educational Research Journal*, 102, 123-153.

Tourkin, S. C., et al. (2004). *1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) data file user's manual*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Trochim, W. M. K. & Donnelly, J. P. (2006). *The research methods knowledge base*. Atomic Dog.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

Yair, G. (2000). Educational battlefields in America: The tug-of-war over students' engagement with instruction. *Sociology of Education*, 73(4), 247-269.

Yan, W., and Q. Lin. (2005). Parent involvement and mathematics achievement: Contrast across racial and ethnic groups. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99(2), 116-127.

Table 1A: Student Survey Means, Reliability Alphas, and Variance Explained in Factor Analysis

High School Sample	Valid N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	% Variance Explained	N of Items
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	7,103	2.75	1.082	.85	63.1	5
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	7,003	3.43	.849	.91	54.4	10
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	7,573	2.97	.634	.85	51.5	14
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	7,539	3.51	.772	.91	47.5	14
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	7,527	3.03	.704	.87	48.7	14
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	7,704	3.39	.812	.90	48.3	12

Middle School Sample	Valid N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	% Variance Explained	N of Items
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	604	3.18	1.222	.87	66.3	5
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	601	3.52	.942	.93	61.2	10
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	585	3.01	.613	.80	53.8	14
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	592	3.77	.800	.92	48.8	14
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	603	3.09	.808	.88	55.5	14
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	607	3.61	.874	.91	51.7	12

Table 1B: Faculty & Staff Survey Means, Reliability Alphas, and Variance Explained in Factor Analysis

High School Sample						
	Valid N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	% Variance Explained	N of Items
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Faculty/Staff	2,531	2.72	.983	.86	64.8	5
1.2 Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Reported by Staff	3,003	4.04	.618	.90	53.2	10
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Faculty/Staff	3,211	2.97	.686	.90	56.6	14
2.2 Practices in Support of Learning & Academic Engagement Reported by Faculty/Staff	3,038	4.28	.548	.90	53.4	14
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Faculty	3,308	3.25	.605	.87	47.2	14
3.2 Practices in Support of Prosocial Behavior Reported by Faculty/Staff	2,960	4.19	.593	.88	56.6	12
4.1 Professional Community: Leadership Practices	3,082	3.88	.967	.92	70.5	6
4.2 Professional Community: Staff Beliefs & Practices	2,870	3.70	.776	.92	60.4	13
4.3 Professional Community: School/Home Communication & Support	2,928	3.57	.756	.88	52.2	9
Middle School Sample						
	Valid N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	% Variance Explained	N of Items
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Faculty/Staff	65	2.87	1.050	.86	65.7	5
1.2 Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Reported by Staff	88	3.95	.552	.87	57.2	10
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Faculty/Staff	74	2.90	.658	.88	60.3	14
2.2 Practices in Support of Learning & Academic Engagement Reported by Faculty/Staff	73	4.31	.475	.86	62.4	14
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Faculty	77	3.17	.580	.83	67.8	14
3.2 Practices in Support of Prosocial Behavior Reported by Faculty/Staff	63	4.24	.495	.81	69.6	12
4.1 Professional Community: Leadership Practices	87	3.90	.900	.89	64.2	6
4.2 Professional Community: Staff Beliefs & Practices	83	3.59	.795	.92	68.9	13
4.3 Professional Community: School/Home Communication & Support	79	3.53	.756	.86	64.3	9

Table 1C: Parent Survey Means, Reliability Alphas, and Variance Explained in Factor Analysis

High School Sample						
	Valid N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	% Variance Explained	N of Items
1.3 School Climate of Safety & Health Perceived by Parents	6,159	3.90	.805	.68	62.1	3
2.3 School Culture of Academic Engagement Perceived by Parents	6,060	4.12	.720	.85	57.7	6
2.4 Learning Supports at Home	5,944	4.28	.678	.84	64.6	8
3.3 School Culture of Prosocial Engagement Perceived by Parents	6,133	3.76	.696	.73	65.7	6
3.4 Social Engagement & Positive Behavior Supports at Home	6,118	4.83	.328	.87	59.9	8
4.4 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Learning	6,102	3.54	.854	.69	52.6	4
4.5 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Social Development	5,736	3.64	.892	.87	53.3	8
4.6 Parent Participation in School Activities	5,783	3.29	.935	.74	49.1	5

Table 2A: Correlations between Student Survey Scales:
High School Sample

High School Sample	1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	.251(**)				
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	.351(**)	.405(**)			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	.199(**)	.675(**)	.344(**)		
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	.424(**)	.526(**)	.658(**)	.401(**)	
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	.212(**)	.729(**)	.369(**)	.784(**)	.459(**)

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2B: Correlations between Faculty/Staff Survey Scales: High School Sample

High School Sample

	1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Faculty/Staff	1.2 Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Reported by Staff	2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Faculty/Staff	2.2 Practices in Support of Learning & Academic Engagement Reported by Faculty/Staff	3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Faculty	3.2 Practices in Support of Prosocial Behavior Reported by Faculty/Staff	4.1 Professional Community: Leadership Practices	4.2 Professional Community: Staff Beliefs & Practices
1.2 Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Reported by Staff	.351(**)							
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Faculty/Staff	.361(**)	.440(**)						
2.2 Practices in Support of Learning & Academic Engagement Reported by Faculty/Staff	.087(**)	.319(**)	.199(**)					
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Faculty	.458(**)	.534(**)	.725(**)	.200(**)				
3.2 Practices in Support of Prosocial Behavior Reported by Faculty/Staff	.096(**)	.325(**)	.197(**)	.726(**)	.216(**)			
4.1 Professional Community: Leadership Practices	.317(**)	.457(**)	.342(**)	.177(**)	.393(**)	.197(**)		
4.2 Professional Community: Staff Beliefs & Practices	.294(**)	.639(**)	.386(**)	.260(**)	.448(**)	.284(**)	.625(**)	
4.3 Professional Community: School/Home Communication & Support	.287(**)	.568(**)	.350(**)	.244(**)	.411(**)	.262(**)	.469(**)	.651(**)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 2C: Correlations between Parent Survey Scales:
High School Sample

High School Sample

	1.3 School Climate of Safety & Health Perceived by Parents	2.3 School Culture of Academic Engagement Perceived by Parents	2.4 Learning Supports at Home	3.4 School Culture of Prosocial Engagement Perceived by Parents	3.5 Social Engagement & Positive Behavior Supports at Home	4.4 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Learning	4.5 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Social Development
2.3 School Culture of Academic Engagement Perceived by Parents	.691(**)						
2.4 Learning Supports at Home	.157(**)	.193(**)					
3.4 School Culture of Prosocial Engagement Perceived by Parents	.723(**)	.721(**)	.160(**)				
3.5 Social Engagement & Positive Behavior Supports at Home	.183(**)	.255(**)	.456(**)	.214(**)			
4.4 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Learning	.533(**)	.630(**)	.333(**)	.540(**)	.193(**)		
4.5 School Partnership with Parents in Support of Social Development	.577(**)	.620(**)	.180(**)	.602(**)	.171(**)	.714(**)	
4.6 Parent Participation in School Activities	.279(**)	.300(**)	.389(**)	.298(**)	.217(**)	.458(**)	.447(**)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3A: Student Survey Scales by Gender:
High School Sample

High School Student Survey

Scale	Statistic	Male	Female	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	2.77	2.69	2.53	.03	.01
	Std.Deviation	(1.06)	(1.04)			
	N	2,602	2,535			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.37	3.47	-4.08	.02	.00
	Std.Deviation	(.84)	(.81)			
	N	2,627	2,544			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.04	3.03	.29	.02	.78
	Std.Deviation	(.61)	(.64)			
	N	3,040	2,924			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.48	3.49	-.54	.02	.59
	Std.Deviation	(.78)	(.77)			
	N	3,060	2,922			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.09	3.07	.74	.02	.46
	Std.Deviation	(.69)	(.70)			
	N	3,011	2,913			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.36	3.37	-.33	.02	.74
	Std.Deviation	(.82)	(.80)			
	N	3,053	2,920			

Table 3B: Student Survey Scales by Gender:
Middle School Sample

Middle School Student Survey

		Male	Female	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	3.12	3.24	-1.30	.10	.19
	Std.Deviation	(1.23)	(1.21)			
	N	339	317			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.49	3.55	-.77	.07	.44
	Std.Deviation	(.99)	(.89)			
	N	344	322			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.01	3.01	.17	.05	.86
	Std.Deviation	(.58)	(.65)			
	N	352	328			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.73	3.81	-1.31	.06	.19
	Std.Deviation	(.83)	(.77)			
	N	352	329			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.11	3.08	.54	.06	.59
	Std.Deviation	(.80)	(.81)			
	N	346	325			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.60	3.63	-.48	.07	.63
	Std.Deviation	(.91)	(.84)			
	N	354	328			

Table 4A: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity
(Asian vs White): High School Sample

High School Student Survey

		White	Asian	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	2.71	3.00	-5.44	.05	.00
	Std.Deviation	(1.02)	(1.11)			
	N	3,346	462			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.44	3.51	-1.69	.04	.09
	Std.Deviation	(.82)	(.85)			
	N	3,364	466			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.02	3.10	-2.59	.03	.01
	Std.Deviation	(.64)	(.61)			
	N	3,991	476			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.52	3.50	.59	.04	.56
	Std.Deviation	(.75)	(.81)			
	N	3,995	477			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.09	3.12	-.95	.03	.34
	Std.Deviation	(.70)	(.69)			
	N	3,977	475			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.39	3.35	1.24	.04	.21
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.83)			
	N	3,988	477			

*Table 4B: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity
(Asian vs White): Middle School Sample*

Middle School Student Survey

		White	Asian	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	3.40	2.70	2.71	.26	.01
	Std.Deviation	(1.10)	(1.38)			
	N	360	20			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.58	3.54	.23	.21	.82
	Std.Deviation	(.91)	(.91)			
	N	373	19			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.06	2.78	2.02	.14	.04
	Std.Deviation	(.61)	(.67)			
	N	376	20			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.78	3.71	.39	.18	.70
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.82)			
	N	376	20			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.18	2.85	1.82	.18	.07
	Std.Deviation	(.78)	(.94)			
	N	373	20			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.63	3.46	.87	.20	.38
	Std.Deviation	(.86)	(.93)			
	N	377	20			

Table 5A: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity (Black vs White): High School Sample

High School Student Survey		White	Black	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	2.71	2.73	-.44	.06	.66
	Std.Deviation	(1.02)	(1.10)			
	N	3,346	358			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.44	3.34	2.36	.05	.02
	Std.Deviation	(.82)	(.84)			
	N	3,364	357			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.02	3.04	-.58	.03	.56
	Std.Deviation	(.64)	(.55)			
	N	3,991	378			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.52	3.51	.27	.04	.79
	Std.Deviation	(.75)	(.83)			
	N	3,995	376			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.09	3.06	.66	.04	.51
	Std.Deviation	(.70)	(.66)			
	N	3,977	375			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.39	3.39	.01	.04	.99
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.82)			
	N	3,988	377			

Table 5B: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity
(Black vs White): Middle School Sample

Middle School Student Survey

Scale	Statistic	White	Black	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	3.40	2.90	2.94	.17	.00
	Std.Deviation	(1.10)	(1.34)			
	N	360	73			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.58	3.51	.63	.12	.53
	Std.Deviation	(.91)	(.78)			
	N	373	70			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.06	2.96	1.43	.08	.15
	Std.Deviation	(.61)	(.59)			
	N	376	74			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.78	3.82	-.42	.10	.67
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.75)			
	N	376	73			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.18	3.00	1.85	.10	.07
	Std.Deviation	(.78)	(.76)			
	N	373	71			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.63	3.68	-.39	.11	.70
	Std.Deviation	(.86)	(.77)			
	N	377	74			

*Table 6A: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity
(Latino/a vs White): High School Sample*

High School Student Survey

		White	Latino/a	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	2.71	2.85	-2.01	.07	.04
	Std.Deviation	(1.02)	(1.03)			
	N	3,346	228			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.44	3.50	-.97	.06	.33
	Std.Deviation	(.82)	(.78)			
	N	3,364	227			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.02	3.13	-2.96	.04	.00
	Std.Deviation	(.64)	(.56)			
	N	3,991	257			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.52	3.50	.42	.05	.68
	Std.Deviation	(.75)	(.78)			
	N	3,995	257			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.09	3.14	-1.23	.05	.22
	Std.Deviation	(.70)	(.66)			
	N	3,977	256			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.39	3.40	-.22	.05	.83
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.77)			
	N	3,988	257			

Table 6B: Student Survey Scales by Race/Ethnicity (Latino/a vs White): Middle School Sample

Middle School Student Survey

		White	Latino/a	t-test for Equality of Means t	t-test for Equality of Means Std. Error Difference	Sig.
1.1 Student Safety Perceived by Students	Mean	3.40	3.08	1.65	.19	.10
	Std.Deviation	(1.10)	(1.31)			
	N	360	37			
1.2 Faculty & Staff Support for & Engagement of Students Perceived by Students	Mean	3.58	2.96	3.90	.16	.00
	Std.Deviation	(.91)	(1.00)			
	N	373	36			
2.1 Culture of Excellence Perceived by Students	Mean	3.06	2.85	2.05	.10	.04
	Std.Deviation	(.61)	(.46)			
	N	376	37			
2.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support for Learning & Academic Engagement	Mean	3.78	3.46	2.40	.13	.02
	Std.Deviation	(.79)	(.82)			
	N	376	39			
3.1 Culture of Ethics Perceived by Students	Mean	3.18	2.87	2.39	.13	.02
	Std.Deviation	(.78)	(.65)			
	N	373	38			
3.2 Student Perceptions of Staff Support of Prosocial Behavior	Mean	3.63	3.33	2.10	.15	.04
	Std.Deviation	(.86)	(.83)			
	N	377	38			

CULTURE OF EXCELLENCE & ETHICS ASSESSMENT™
School Culture Surveys

An **Excellence with Integrity Institute** Resource

Excellence with Integrity™
INSTITUTE