

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alternative Education Program Administrators

FROM: Lisa Stengle
Helene Hartman
Amy Ramirez

CC: Patrick Murphy
Meg Tuccillo
Walter McKenzie
Kathy Wills

SUBJECT: Detailed Results and Methodology for the 2009 Site-Based Surveys

DATE: September 3, 2009

Attached are the detailed results for the 2009 Site-Based Surveys for the Alternative Education Programs. Individual program results were sent to the Program Administrators over the summer. This set of results contains detailed results for all programs by response groups, including students and teachers (Attachments A and B).

[Click here for Attachment A](#) (Students)

[Click here for Attachment B](#) (Teachers)

Both the .pdf files include the frequency of responses for every survey item, and each item is repeated in sections organized by the following groups:

- All sites
- Programs (results for each program)

Please note that both .pdf files include bookmarks, designed to help the viewer navigate by each of the groupings noted above.

Purpose of Site-Based Surveys

The policy for evaluating administrator and non-instructional professional staff (35-7.3) specifically identifies input related to customer satisfaction, and the site-based surveys respond to this requirement. Some examples of the ways schools use this information include: setting targets and measuring performance on their school management plans, monitoring change, and evaluating their performance in comparison to the performance by their school level.

The 2009 Process for Alternative Programs

In 2008, Planning and Evaluation worked with schools to conduct site-based surveys that were comparable to the system-wide Community Satisfaction Survey. The same questionnaires used for the schools were used for the 2009 site-based surveys of alternative programs. The process for alternative programs focused only on teachers and students. The Intake Center translated student surveys into Spanish. (Attachments **C1** & **C2**).

Sample sizes were established to reach the same level of confidence achieved on the 2007 Customer Satisfaction Survey, with a +/-4% margin of error at the 95% confidence level. Generally speaking, if the same survey were conducted 100 times, 95 times out of 100 the results

would fall within +/- 4% of the results reported. Table 1 shows the characteristics of the sample groups by school level.

Table 1. 2008 Site-Based Survey Samples for Alternative Programs by Response Group

| Response Group | |
|---|----------|
| Students | Teachers |
| Less than 300 student, survey all students in programs | All |
| Sample of students in programs with 300 or more students. | |

Surveys were administered in the late May/early June of 2009. Students received the survey during the identified classes. Teachers were surveyed via the web.

Student Surveys

The surveyed students at the secondary level were identified by whole site at programs with less than 300 students and via a sample of classrooms at larger alternative programs. The identified student population included 884 students. The surveys were distributed to larger programs with packages for each classroom. Upon request, Planning and Evaluation staff helped administer the surveys in smaller sites. A total of 555 student surveys were returned to Planning and Evaluation.

Each school had one coordinator responsible for administering all surveys or arranging a time for Planning and Evaluation to administer the survey. Concurrent sessions were offered for students wishing to take the Spanish version of the survey, allowing them to ask for help in understanding the questions.

The student response rate was 63% across the alternative programs. The margin of error across all surveys was +/-3% at the 95% confidence level, but this margin ranged from +/-3.4% to +/-11.4% by site. Table 2 shows the number of surveys distributed, the response rates, and the margin of error for each program. ***The student results for each program should be interpreted with caution, acknowledging the school's margin of error reported in Table 2.***

Table 2. Alternative Program Student Membership and Survey Response Rates by Site for the 2009 Site-Based Surveys, May/June 2009

| | Student Membership at time of survey | Survey Sample Size | Classroom Sample Selection | Returned Surveys | Response Rate | Margin of Error at the 95% Confidence Level |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|
| Arl. Mill Cont. | 273 | 273 | English classes | 146 | 53 | 5.5 |
| Career Center | 876 | 480 | Periods 1, 4, 6 | 300 | 63 | 4.6 |
| Langston Cont. | 60 | 60 | All students | 56 | 93 | 3.4 |
| New Directions | 31 | 31 | All students | 27 | 87 | 6.8 |
| Teen Parenting Program | 40 | 40 | All students | 26 | 65 | (11.4) |
| Alternative Program Total | 1280 | 884 | | 555 | 63 | 3.1 |

Notes: Results in parentheses do not provide reliable results and will not be posted on the APS website.

Adult students at Arlington Mill were included in the survey.

Students in the Stratford Program were not surveyed since the students have specialized education needs.

Teacher Surveys

Email invitations to participate in the surveys were sent to teachers via their APS GroupWise accounts. The email included a link to the on-line survey hosted remotely through K-12 Insight. The process was automated, and up to five reminders were emailed to teachers who had not completed the surveys.

The teachers selected for the survey were identified from the personnel system. 1,721 teachers were invited to participate in the survey, and 1,499 surveys were completed on-line.

The response rate for alternative program teachers was 73%, and the margin of error was +/-6.9% at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for teachers ranged from +/-5.6% to +/-49% by program. Table 3 shows the number of surveys distributed, the response rates and the margin of error for each site. It is important to note that smaller teaching populations must have higher participation rates to meet the same level of confidence that the data collected accurately reflect the population. ***The teacher results for each program should be interpreted with caution, acknowledging the school's margin of error reported in Table 3.***

Table 3. Alternative Program Teachers and Survey Response Rates by Site for the 2009 Site-Based Surveys, May/June 2009

| | Teaching Staff May '09 | Survey Sample Size | Returned Surveys | Response Rate | Margin of Error at the 95% Confidence Level |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------|---------------|---|
| Arl. Mill Cont. | 25 | All teachers were invited to participate in the survey | 15 | 60 | (16) |
| Career Center | 54 | | 46 | 85 | 5.6 |
| Langston Cont. | 10 | | 4 | 40 | (38) |
| New Directions | 4 | | 2 | 50 | (49) |
| Stratford | 13 | | 10 | 77 | (14.9) |
| Teen Parenting Program | 9 | | 7 | 78 | (17.5) |
| Alternative Program Total | 115 | | 84 | 73 | (6.9) |

Notes: Results in parentheses do not provide reliable results and will not be posted on the APS website.

Confidentiality

Planning and Evaluation designed the surveys to ensure the confidentiality of students and teachers responding to the survey. The detailed results were prepared for each school. The IDs assigned to teachers were randomly generated by K-12 Insight so there would be no way for schools to determine the identity of the respondent through the ID.