



E&R Report No. 11.03

April 2011

## WCPSS 2010–11 HIGH FIVE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING TEAMS (PLT) SURVEY RESULTS: IMPLEMENTATION OVER TIME

Author: Andrew Jackl, Ph.D.

### ABSTRACT

*The Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) continues to implement Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) as a research-based method of improving teacher effectiveness and increasing student achievement. Over each of the last four years, a survey of educators was conducted in WCPSS and the other four High Five districts. As in previous years, this year’s data showed strong support among teachers for the PLT model; between 73% and 91% of respondents indicating that they “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statements pertaining to the six PLT themes. Viewed longitudinally, positive responses for each theme have increased between four and eight percentage points since 2007-08. When 2010-11 results were compared with 2009-10, the results were less dramatic, with smaller changes in the percentage of positive responses.*

### SUMMARY

#### BACKGROUND

Professional Learning Communities, or PLCs, refers to teachers actively collaborating for the purpose of improved student learning (rather than working in isolation). The term PLC is sometimes used to refer to the small collaborative groups and sometimes to a collection of these small groups at a school, region, or district level. The smaller groups are also called Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) in the literature (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2007). WCPSS started consistently using the term PLT for these smaller groups in 2008-09.

The implementation of PLTs as a key strategy for improving both learning and teaching began in 2003, spurred by the involvement of WCPSS in the High Five Regional Partnership for High School Excellence. High Five includes five area school districts and six area corporations with a common goal of increasing graduation rates. High Five and WCPSS have provided numerous training

#### Contents

Summary .....	p. 1-2
Summary of Results .....	p. 2-5
Participation .....	p. 6-11
Results by Theme .....	p. 11-23
Discussion/Recommendations .....	p. 24-26
References .....	p. 27
Appendix .....	p. 28

The author would like to acknowledge the support of Nancy Baenen and Amy Huebler of E&R within WCPSS, as well as Elliot Inman of the SAS Institute.

opportunities since that time, beginning with the high schools before spreading to the middle and elementary grade levels. In July 2009 the WCPSS School Board officially endorsed and formalized the PLT concept with Board Policy 3610, which specifies that “every school-based and certified staff member should have equal access to a minimum of one hour for participation in weekly professional learning teams and to the Board-approved early release days for collaboration and job-embedded professional development.” The policy defines a PLT:

A Professional Learning Team is made up of members who regularly collaborate toward continued improvement in meeting student needs. Using data, professional experience, and best practice, the team works toward realizing a shared vision for a better learning environment. The primary emphasis of this work is on the support of learning and meeting the needs of all students.

Initially, it was decided that the best way to implement this policy would be to dismiss students one hour early every Wednesday to allow teachers to meet in collaborative groups. The weekly early dismissal became known as “Wake Wednesdays,” and was intended to provide stronger support, more consistency, and more time for PLT work. “Wake Wednesdays” were discontinued for the 2011-12 school year, but the Board policy pertaining to PLT implementation has remained in place. Nevertheless, the removal of a district-wide, protected meeting schedule may have affected the most recent PLT survey results to some degree.

To help assess PLT status, the same survey has been given over the last four years to determine the extent to which those concepts were being actively practiced within the schools and to allow for direct comparisons over time at the district and school level. Reports by Reichstetter (2008), Jackl (2009), and Jackl (2010) provide district results and trends.

## RESULTS

WCPSS teachers have consistently expressed a high level of positive agreement with the High Five PLT Survey items (see Table 1). Over a four-year period, positive responses to each theme have increased between four and eight percentage points. However, the overall level of positive agreement has begun to stabilize; three of the survey themes have remained static from 2009-10 to 2010-11, and the *collaborative culture/team processes* theme declined by one percentage point.

What is more interesting is the remarkable consistency between the relative levels of positive agreement among the six themes over a four-year period. Table 1 presents those themes using this hierarchical structure.

- Historically, the highest levels of agreement have been for the themes pertaining to *collaborative culture/team processes* and the *focus on learning and teaching*. The *focus on learning and teaching* has increased more over time, with both themes having 91% of staff with positive views as of fall 2010.

- The *instructional strategies/intervention* theme and the *common formative assessment* theme have had the second highest levels of agreement over the years. The *instructional strategies/intervention* theme has shown the most improvement over time (+8 percentage points), yet still retains its third-place ranking.
- *Overall impact* and *support and resource allocation* have had the lowest levels of agreement each year. The *support and resource allocation* theme has shown more relative improvement than most themes (+7 percentage points), yet has always been the least positive theme within the survey. Curiously, this has remained the case regardless of the addition and/or removal of the district’s “Wake Wednesday” early dismissal policy establishing protected PLT meeting times. Finally, while we can acknowledge that the *overall impact* theme has risen four percentage points since 2007-08, it has only increased by one percentage point in the past three years. Our hypothesis was that this area would increase more over time as teachers experienced greater learning for their students.

What is not evident from this table is that there has been a noticeable improvement in the percentage of teachers marking “strongly agree” as opposed to “agree” on many survey items – signifying stronger levels of agreement regarding the core PLT concepts. However, in the past year, the reverse has been true for some items.

**Table 1**  
**Overall PLT Survey Results by Theme, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Theme	Percent Agree / Strongly Agree				
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Change from 07-08 to 10-11
Collaborative Culture/Team Processes	87%	89%	92%	91%	4%
Focus on Learning and Teaching	85%	87%	90%	91%	6%
Instructional Strategy/Intervention	80%	85%	87%	88%	8%
Common Formative Assessments	79%	81%	85%	85%	6%
Overall Impact	76%	79%	80%	80%	4%
Support and Resource Allocation	66%	71%	73%	73%	7%

2007-08 N = 6,858; 2008-09 N = 7,306; 2009-10 N = 7,660; 2010-11 N = 7507

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Data Source: WCPSS data analysis of 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 High Five PLT surveys.

Looking beyond the overall levels of positive agreement, the largest survey changes within each theme over four years and since 2009-10 follow.

**A Focus on Learning**

- The percentage of teachers reporting that their PLT has adopted SMART goals and are working to achieve them has increased by nine percentage points, moving from 84% in 2007-08 to 93% in 2010-11. It is also worth noting that the 2010-11 level of positive agreement improved by two percentage points from 2009-10.

- Similarly, the percentage of teachers affirming that their team’s SMART goals are aligned with the school’s SMART goals has increased by 12 percentage points since 2007-08, rising to 93% in 2010-11.

### **Collaborative Culture/Team Processes**

- The percentage of teachers indicating that their team has a process to effectively resolve conflict increased by five percentage points, moving from 79% in 2007-08 to 84% in 2010-11. This was the only collaboration-themed item that did not show a decrease in the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with the statement since 2009-10.
- Most teachers (88%) gather evidence concerning the effectiveness of their instructional strategies, and nearly all (92%) document and monitor their processes to facilitate improvement – an increase of four percentage points since 2007-08 for both items.

### **Instructional Strategies and Interventions**

- The vast majority of teachers (85%) now affirm that their team utilizes a school-wide pyramid of interventions. This percentage has climbed steadily since 2007-08, culminating in an increase of 15 percentage points over the past four years and a four percentage point increase since 2009-10.
- Similarly, the item asking if struggling students are required to participate in other learning opportunities has increased by 11 percentage points over the same period; currently 76% of the district’s teachers expressed positive agreement in 2010-11, an increase of three percentage points since 2009-10.

### **Common Formative Assessments**

- More than three-fourths of the teachers (85%) examine the results of common formative assessments to identify students who need additional support – an increase of six percentage points since 2007-08 and an increase of two percentage points since 2009-10.
- Most teachers (82%) use common formative assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness of their instructional practices – an increase of six percentage points since 2007-08, but an increase of only one percentage point since 2009-10.

### **Support/Resource Allocation**

- Most teachers (77%) indicated that they receive feedback and support from their leadership. This marks an increase of five percentage points since 2007-08, and a one percentage point increase since 2009-10.
- Slightly less than three-fourths of the teachers (72%) indicated that their school celebrated team progress towards SMART goals. This marks a steady increase amounting to nine percentage points since 2007-08, including a three percentage point increase since 2009-10.

## Impact

- Most teachers (82%) believed that their PLT work is making them more effective in the classroom, a gain of five percentage points since 2007-08, yet the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with this statement decreased by two percentage points since 2009-10.
- Most teachers (80%) indicated that their students were learning more because of their PLT work – an increase of five percentage points since 2007-08. However, the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with this survey item decreased by three percentage points since the previous 2009-10 school year.

## Meeting Frequency and Length

- The vast majority of teachers (86%) reported their primary PLT met weekly or daily; responses of weekly increased 31 percentage points from 2007-08. In another item, 90% of all teachers reported spending at least one hour per week on PLT-related activities and training per Board policy. Given the Board policy, 100% might be expected. However, 39% of teachers are members of multiple PLTs, and some teachers are part-time, which likely explains the difference.
- The percentage of teachers reporting that they typically met from “thirty minutes to one hour” increased by 21 percentage points from the previous school year (from 47% in 2009-10 to 68% in 2010-11) while those indicating their meetings typically lasted more than one hour decreased by 23 percentage points (52% in 2009-10 to 29% in 2010-11). These data suggest that teachers are now meeting in their PLTs for shorter periods of time than they have reported in previous years.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made to school staff and central staff.

School-based personnel:

- Identify areas for improvement and develop specific goals to address shortcomings; and
- Consider ways to increase administrative support for PLT work and celebrate team progress.

Central services personnel:

- Revisit the district’s plan for PLT implementation;
- Administer the High Five PLT survey, or at least a shortened version, in future years; and
- Conduct additional research on PLTs in WCPSS.

More details on these recommendations are included at the end of this report.

## **WCPSS 2010–11 HIGH FIVE PROFESSIONAL LEARNING TEAM (PLT) SURVEY RESULTS: IMPLEMENTATION OVER TIME**

### **BACKGROUND**

In 2003, a group of six corporations (SAS, BlueCross BlueShield of North Carolina, A.J. Fletcher Foundation, Capital Broadcasting, Progress Energy, and The News & Observer) formed a partnership with the five school districts of Chapel Hill-Carrboro, Durham, Johnston, Orange, and Wake counties. This consortium, the High Five Regional Partnership for High School Excellence, combined forces to improve graduation rates and to better prepare students for higher education and the careers of their choice. After reviewing the educational research, the foundation of the improvement effort focused on the implementation of PLTs across all schools and districts. Since the 2003-04 school year, the High Five partnership has funded numerous training opportunities for teachers and support staff members. High Five initially focused on training high school staff on PLTs, with other levels gradually added. WCPSS central staff has also offered training, guidance, and support to school PLT implementation over time.

### **EVALUATION METHODS**

To help assess PLT status, five district-wide PLT surveys of WCPSS teachers have been conducted. The first district-wide survey, a modified version of one developed by the Indiana-based Solution Tree group, was administered in the middle of the 2006-07 school year to collect baseline data about the educators' understanding of the PLT concepts, and to determine the extent to which those concepts were being actively practiced within the schools. In the four subsequent years, a modified version of this survey has been consistently deployed to allow for direct comparisons over time.

The electronic survey was made available to all 9,152 teachers working within the district's schools from November 17 through December 20, 2010. The long survey window ensured that all teachers, including those working on the year-round calendar, would be given ample time to participate. The Evaluation (E&R) department staff provided interim return rates to the schools at frequent intervals, although teachers' individual responses were kept confidential.

### **PLT SURVEY PARTICIPATION RATES**

The response rate for the 2010-11 High Five PLT Survey was high, albeit lower than previous years. Overall, approximately 82% of the district's teachers voluntarily participated (86% from the elementary schools, 76% from the middle schools, and 80% from the high schools). The exact figures, including the number of respondents from each school level, are listed in Table 2. It is important to note that these totals encompass all surveys submitted. Yet, in many cases, teachers declined to answer certain survey items. Therefore, the exact number of respondents tended to vary from question to question. A complete copy of the survey has been included as an appendix to this report.

**Table 2**  
**2010-11 PLT Survey Response Rates**

School Level	Total Teachers	Number of Respondents	Survey Response Rate
Elementary	4,751	4,069	86%
Middle	2,035	1,550	76%
High	2,366	1,888	80%
All	9,152	7,507	82%

Data Sources: WCPSS Human Resources and analysis of High Five 2010-11 PLT survey data

Note: The “number of respondents” included all teachers who submitted a completed PLT survey.

Non-teaching and/or non-professional support staff members responding to the survey were not included in these totals. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

**PLT PARTICIPATION RATES**

Of the educators responding to the survey, approximately 99% reported belonging to at least one PLT – up from 92% in 2007-08. More specifically, 95% claimed membership in a school-level PLT, and 4% claimed membership in a district-level PLT. The educators claiming membership in a district-level PLT tended to be more specialized, requiring them to network with similar professionals in other schools. These overall results, along with data disaggregated by school level, are detailed in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
**2010-11 PLT Participation Rates**

School Level	Number of Respondents	# in a School-Level PLT	% in a School-Level PLT	# in a District-Level PLT	% in a District-Level PLT	Total PLT Participation %
Elementary	4,069	3,893	96%	123	3%	99%
Middle	1,550	1,456	94%	66	4%	98%
High	1,888	1,792	95%	81	4%	99%
All	7,507	7,141	95%	270	4%	99%

Data Sources: WCPSS analysis of High Five 2010-11 PLT survey data.

Note: The “number of respondents” included all teachers who submitted a completed PLT survey.

Non-teaching and/or non-professional support staff members responding to the survey were not included in these totals. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number.

It is important to remember that the figures in Table 3 represent teachers who claimed membership in at least one PLT. However, a teacher could easily belong to more than one. For example, a 7<sup>th</sup>-grade Language Arts teacher may collaborate with his or her *Language Arts PLT* on the first and third Wednesdays of the month, whereas the same teacher might collaborate with his or her *Seventh Grade PLT* on the second and fourth Wednesdays of the month. In this case, the teacher was directed to answer the survey items as they pertained to his or her *primary* PLT.

In order to clarify, E&R staff added a question to the 2010-11 PLT survey asking teachers to identify the number of PLTs in which they claim membership; Table 4 reports those data.

District-wide, 60% of the teachers reported membership in only one PLT, while approximately 39% claimed membership in two or more. When the data are disaggregated by grade level, they suggest that middle school teachers are the most likely to participate in two or more PLTs (48%), followed by high (45%) and elementary teachers (33%).

**Table 4**  
**2010-11 Number of PLT Memberships by School Level**

School Level	Number of Reported PLT Memberships									
	Zero		One		Two		Three		More than Three	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>WCPSS</b>	61	1%	4,504	60%	2034	27%	513	7%	375	5%
<b>Elementary</b>	36	1%	2,692	66%	863	21%	245	6%	225	6%
<b>Middle</b>	14	1%	795	52%	460	30%	166	11%	105	7%
<b>High</b>	11	1%	1,017	54%	711	38%	102	5%	45	2%

Elementary n=4,061; Middle n=1,540; High n=1,866; Total N=7,487

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100 percent in all cases.

Data Source: WCPSS data analysis of 2010-11 High Five PLT survey data.

**PLT MEETING FREQUENCY AND LENGTH**

The percentage of teachers indicating they meet in their primary PLT on a weekly basis has increased by 31 percentage points since 2007-08, returning the largest increase for any item on the High Five PLT survey. Still, for the first time, the percentage of teachers reporting that their primary PLT meets on a weekly basis declined from the previous year, suggesting that meeting frequency may have been affected by the elimination of “Wake Wednesdays,” or other factors such as multiple PLT memberships. Table 5 reports those data.

**Table 5**  
**2007-08 to 2010-11 PLT Meeting Frequency**

Statement	School Year	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Quarterly	Twice a Month	None	No Response
<b>My PLC typically meets:</b>	2007-08	3%	53%	20%	4%	20%	1%	0%
	2008-09	2%	53%	20%	3%	20%	0%	2%
	2009-10	2%	87%	4%	0%	6%	0%	0%
	2010-11	2%	84%	6%	0%	7%	0%	0%
<b>Change from 07-08 to 10-11:</b>		-1%	31%	-14%	-4%	-13%	-1%	0%
Elementary	2010-11	1%	87%	6%	1%	5%	0%	0%
Middle	2010-11	2%	81%	7%	0%	9%	0%	0%
High	2010-11	3%	81%	5%	0%	11%	0%	0%

2007-08 N= 6,858; 2008-09 N=7,306; 2009-10 N=7,426

2010-11: Elementary n=4,029; Middle n=1,533; High n=1,841; Total N=7,403

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100 percent in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 High Five PLT surveys.

The precise wording of the High Five survey item asking the length of a typical PLT meeting was kept the same to allow comparisons over time. However, it was not ideal for measuring the extent to which PLTs met “at least one hour” per WCPSS Board policy because the High Five categories are “less than 30 minutes,” “30 minutes to one hour,” and “more than one hour.” Thus, a one hour meeting time (as expected in the Board policy) fits within the 30-60 minute category, as well as the category allowing for even longer meeting times.

E&R staff reduced confusion by adding additional survey items for clarification, reported later in Table 7. Nevertheless, results from 2010-11 still present a substantial shift in responses from 2009-10, suggesting that PLTs are meeting for shorter periods of time. More specifically, the data in Table 6 show that:

- The percentage of teachers reporting that they met from “thirty minutes to one hour” increased by 21 percentage points, moving from 47% in 2009-10 to 68% in 2010-11.
- The percentage of teachers indicating their meetings typically lasted more than one hour decreased by 23 percentage points, moving from 52% in 2009-10 to 29% in 2010-11.

**Table 6  
PLT Meeting Length 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Less than 30 Minutes	Thirty Minutes to One Hour	More than One Hour	No Response
<b>The length of a typical PLT meeting is:</b>	2007-08	10%	64%	26%	0%
	2008-09	8%	63%	28%	1%
	2009-10	1%	47%	52%	1%
	2010-11	2%	68%	29%	0%
Change from 07-08 to 10-11:		-8%	4%	3%	0%
Elementary	2010-11	1%	64%	35%	0%
Middle	2010-11	4%	72%	24%	0%
High	2010-11	5%	73%	22%	0%

2007-08 *N*=6,858; 2008-09 *N*=7,306; 2009-10 *N*=7,426

2010-11: Elementary *n*=4,029; Middle *n*=1,533; High *n*=1,841; Total *N*=7,403

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100 percent in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 High Five PLT surveys.

Since the “one hour” mark has traditionally been a dividing line among possible High Five survey responses to this item, E&R staff added two questions to clarify the extent to which the Board policy was being implemented in 2010-11. The responses to those additional questions, reported in Table 7, ask teachers if they spend at least one hour per week on PLT-related activities, and if they spend at least three hours on job-embedded professional development on the designated early release days. These supplemental survey items were designed to be as direct as possible, and were intended to eliminate any confusion caused by teachers participating in multiple PLTs and/or average meeting lengths that hover around the one-hour mark.

In short, approximately 90% of all teachers reported being in compliance with the Board policy pertaining to weekly PLT participation – and, curiously, 10% of the teachers did not. For comparison with earlier figures, it is helpful to remember that 86% of the teachers reported that their primary PLT met either daily or weekly – although, as previously discussed, approximately 39% of WCPSS teachers claimed membership in multiple PLTs. By extension, 97% of all teachers reported a meeting time that included either the one hour mark (30-60 minutes), or else an average meeting length of more than one hour.

Similarly, 94% of the teachers reported being in compliance with the Board policy pertaining to early release days. When disaggregated by grade level, the responses were relatively consistent; the level of positive agreement between elementary, middle, and high school teachers to these supplemental survey items varied between two and three percentage points.

**Table 7**  
**2010-11 Board Policy 3610 Compliance (Self-Report)**

I spend at least one hour per week on PLT-related activities and training.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
All	36%	54%	9%	1%	1%	90%	11%
Elementary	36%	54%	8%	1%	1%	90%	10%
Middle	33%	55%	10%	1%	1%	88%	12%
High	39%	51%	9%	1%	0%	90%	10%
On early release days, I spend at least three hours on job-embedded professional development.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
All	47%	47%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
Elementary	48%	46%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
Middle	46%	49%	4%	1%	0%	95%	5%
High	43%	49%	5%	2%	1%	92%	8%

2010-11: Elementary  $n=4,048$ ; Middle  $n=1,536$ ; High  $n=1,879$ ; Total  $N=7,463$

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100 percent in all cases.

Data Source: WCPSS data analysis of 2010-11 High Five PLT surveys.

## PLT TRAINING HOURS

Survey data indicates that the amount of PLT training provided to teachers since September of 2005 varies widely. As Table 8 shows, approximately 31% of all teachers who responded to this survey item reported that they had not received any PLT training through High Five, while 21% reported that they had not received any district-sponsored PLT training. Conversely, 67% reported that they had received some level of PLT training through the High Five initiative, and 76% reported that they had received some level of district-sponsored training. Of those teachers reporting that they had received training, 1-4 hours was the most common response.

**Table 8**  
**High Five and District Sponsored PLT Training Hours since September of 2005**

PLT Training Since 2005	None	1-4 Hours	5-8 Hours	9-12 Hours	13-16 Hours	Over 16 Hours	No Response
<b>High Five Sponsored</b>	31%	22%	16%	10%	6%	13%	4%
Elementary	34%	22%	14%	10%	6%	12%	3%
Middle	28%	22%	18%	10%	5%	13%	4%
High	26%	21%	17%	10%	6%	17%	4%
<b>District Sponsored</b>	21%	28%	18%	10%	5%	15%	3%
Elementary	24%	29%	18%	9%	4%	12%	3%
Middle	17%	29%	20%	11%	5%	15%	3%
High	16%	26%	18%	11%	5%	21%	3%

2010-11: Elementary  $n=4,029$ ; Middle  $n=1,533$ ; High  $n=1,841$ ; Total  $N=7,403$

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100 percent in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of 2010-11 High Five PLT surveys.

## RESULTS BY THEME

The High Five PLT survey was organized around six themes: a focus on learning and teaching, a collaborative team culture, instructional strategies and interventions, implementation of common formative assessments, the team's impact on learning, and support/resource allocation. For clarity, these survey results were organized and presented using these six categories.

The following tables explain the survey results in greater detail. Please note that in this analysis survey items were coded as a negative response if the teacher reported that he or she "did not understand" the question and/or chose to omit the survey item entirely. Thus, the most conservative estimate of results is reported.

### A Focus on Learning and Teaching

Some core elements of this theme, detailed in Table 9, pertain to the team's identification of essential learning outcomes, standards of assessment, and the teachers' expectations for success. The number of teachers expressing positive agreement to these three items has remained relatively unchanged since 2007-08, with none of the items fluctuating more than two percentage points over the four-year period. The number of teachers indicating that they "strongly agree" with the items on Table 9 has improved between one and four percentage points over the four-year span, yet the figures have actually declined between one and two percentage points since the 2009-10 school year.

The survey item asking teachers if they believe that their students can master the targeted educational outcomes returned the lowest positive response rate within this theme; 86% expressed some level of positive agreement, yet 14% did not – clearly a cause for concern. Viewed longitudinally, the level of positive agreement for this particular item has only risen by two percentage points over the past four years (from 84% in 2007-08 to 86% in 2010-11). When disaggregated by school level it becomes apparent that the elementary teachers are the most positive (89% expressing agreement) followed by the middle (87%) and high school teachers (81%).

**Table 9**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Focus-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have identified essential learning outcomes.</b>	2007-08	35%	58%	5%	1%	1%	93%	7%
	2008-09	41%	52%	4%	1%	1%	93%	6%
	2009-10	41%	52%	4%	2%	1%	93%	7%
	2010-11	39%	55%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	-3%	-1%	0%	0%	1%	-1%
Elementary	2010-11	39%	56%	3%	1%	1%	95%	5%
Middle	2010-11	37%	57%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
High	2010-11	42%	52%	4%	2%	1%	94%	7%
<b>We believe our students can master these outcomes.</b>	2007-08	24%	60%	14%	2%	1%	84%	17%
	2008-09	28%	58%	12%	2%	1%	86%	15%
	2009-10	26%	58%	13%	2%	1%	84%	16%
	2010-11	25%	61%	12%	1%	1%	86%	14%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		1%	1%	-2%	-1%	0%	2%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	27%	62%	10%	1%	1%	89%	12%
Middle	2010-11	24%	63%	12%	1%	1%	87%	14%
High	2010-11	22%	59%	17%	2%	1%	81%	20%
<b>We use team-adopted standards to assess learning.</b>	2007-08	32%	54%	12%	2%	1%	86%	15%
	2008-09	36%	50%	10%	2%	2%	86%	14%
	2009-10	35%	53%	9%	2%	2%	88%	13%
	2010-11	34%	54%	9%	1%	2%	88%	12%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		2%	0%	-3%	-1%	1%	2%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	35%	55%	8%	1%	1%	90%	10%
Middle	2010-11	31%	55%	11%	1%	1%	86%	13%
High	2010-11	37%	51%	9%	2%	1%	88%	12%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.

2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

The most dramatic improvement within the focus-area theme occurred on the survey items pertaining to the use of instructional goals that are strategic and specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound – commonly referred to as “SMART goals.” Over time, the percentage of teachers reporting that their PLT has adopted SMART goals and are working to achieve them has increased by nine percentage points, moving from 84% in 2007-08 to 93% in 2010-11. It is also worth noting that the 2010-11 level of positive agreement improved by two percentage points from 2009-10. Similarly, the percentage of teachers affirming that their team’s SMART goals are aligned with the school’s SMART goals has increased by 12 percentage points since 2007-08, rising to 93% in 2010-11. Finally, the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with these two items showed double-digit increases, improving by 10 and 11 percentage points, respectively. Table 10 reports these data in greater detail.

**Table 10**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Focus-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have adopted SMART goals that we are working to achieve.</b>	2007-08	29%	55%	12%	2%	2%	84%	16%
	2008-09	35%	51%	10%	1%	3%	86%	14%
	2009-10	39%	52%	6%	1%	1%	91%	8%
	2010-11	39%	54%	5%	1%	1%	93%	7%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		10%	-1%	-7%	-1%	-1%	9%	-9%
Elementary	2010-11	41%	53%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
Middle	2010-11	35%	57%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
High	2010-11	40%	53%	5%	1%	1%	93%	7%
<b>Our SMART goals are aligned to our school's SMART goals.</b>	2007-08	29%	52%	11%	2%	6%	81%	19%
	2008-09	35%	49%	9%	1%	7%	84%	17%
	2009-10	40%	51%	5%	1%	3%	91%	9%
	2010-11	40%	53%	4%	1%	2%	93%	7%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		11%	1%	-7%	-1%	-4%	12%	-12%
Elementary	2010-11	42%	52%	4%	1%	2%	94%	7%
Middle	2010-11	36%	56%	5%	1%	2%	92%	8%
High	2010-11	40%	53%	4%	1%	2%	93%	7%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.

2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

## Collaborative Culture and Team Processes

The survey items pertaining to the PLT team’s collaborative culture and team processes are shown in Tables 11 and 12. Viewed as a whole, these survey items have generally shown an increase in the positive responses ranging between one and five percentage points over a four-year period, albeit none of the items changed more than two percentage points from the previous school year. The most rigid survey responses originated from the item asking teachers if they are open and honest about each others’ strengths and weaknesses; the positive response rate for that item has remained unchanged (90% positive) over a four-year time span.

While the other collaboration-themed items have shown an overall improvement since 2007-08, the biggest changes have occurred in the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with the survey items. As documented on Tables 11 and 12, the number of teachers responding to these survey items with the strongest possible level of agreement has increased between three and six percentage points when 2010-11 results are compared with 2007-08. These figures, however, can be misleading. While the percentage of teachers indicating they “strongly agree” that they have established a process to resolve conflict increased by one percentage point between 2009-10 and 2010-11, all other collaboration-themed survey items showed a reduction in this category ranging from one to six percentage points. At this time, the reason for this decline remains unclear.

**Table 11**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Collaboration-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have established norms to clarify how we will work as a team.</b>	2007-08	42%	50%	7%	1%	0%	92%	8%
	2008-09	48%	46%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
	2009-10	54%	42%	3%	1%	1%	96%	5%
	2010-11	48%	47%	3%	1%	1%	95%	5%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		6%	-3%	-4%	0%	1%	3%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	50%	47%	2%	0%	0%	97%	2%
Middle	2010-11	46%	49%	4%	1%	1%	95%	6%
High	2010-11	48%	46%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
<b>We abide by the explicit team norms we developed.</b>	2007-08	32%	57%	9%	1%	1%	89%	11%
	2008-09	38%	53%	7%	1%	2%	91%	10%
	2009-10	43%	50%	5%	1%	1%	93%	7%
	2010-11	38%	54%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		6%	-3%	-3%	0%	0%	3%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	39%	55%	6%	1%	0%	94%	7%
Middle	2010-11	38%	55%	6%	0%	1%	93%	7%
High	2010-11	39%	53%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
<b>We use sound, structured decision-making processes.</b>	2007-08	40%	54%	5%	1%	0%	94%	6%
	2008-09	45%	48%	5%	1%	2%	93%	8%
	2009-10	47%	47%	3%	1%	1%	94%	5%
	2010-11	45%	50%	4%	1%	1%	95%	6%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		5%	-4%	-1%	0%	1%	1%	0%
Elementary	2010-11	44%	50%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
Middle	2010-11	45%	51%	4%	1%	1%	96%	6%
High	2010-11	48%	47%	3%	1%	1%	95%	5%
<b>We are open and honest about strengths and weaknesses.</b>	2007-08	40%	50%	8%	2%	0%	90%	10%
	2008-09	44%	46%	6%	2%	1%	90%	9%
	2009-10	45%	45%	7%	2%	1%	90%	10%
	2010-11	43%	47%	7%	1%	1%	90%	9%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		3%	-3%	-1%	-1%	1%	0%	-1%
Elementary	2010-11	42%	49%	7%	1%	1%	91%	9%
Middle	2010-11	42%	49%	5%	2%	2%	91%	9%
High	2010-11	48%	43%	7%	2%	2%	91%	11%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

Table 12 documents results of the last three collaboration-themed survey items. Note that the final item asks teachers if they systematically gather evidence concerning instructional strategies; important variance appeared when the data were disaggregated by school level. In the other collaboration-themed items, the percentage of elementary, middle, and high school teachers

expressing positive agreement varied between zero and three percentage points. For this item, however, the elementary teachers were the most positive (91%), followed by the middle (87%) and high school teachers (85%).

**Table 12**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Collaboration-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have a process to effectively resolve conflict.</b>	2007-08	26%	53%	17%	2%	1%	79%	20%
	2008-09	30%	51%	15%	2%	2%	81%	19%
	2009-10	28%	54%	14%	2%	2%	82%	18%
	2010-11	29%	55%	13%	1%	2%	84%	16%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		3%	2%	-4%	-1%	1%	5%	-4%
Elementary	2010-11	27%	56%	14%	1%	2%	83%	17%
Middle	2010-11	29%	54%	14%	1%	2%	83%	17%
High	2010-11	32%	52%	12%	2%	2%	84%	16%
<b>We document and monitor our processes so that we can improve.</b>	2007-08	30%	58%	10%	1%	0%	88%	11%
	2008-09	36%	52%	8%	1%	2%	88%	11%
	2009-10	38%	54%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
	2010-11	34%	58%	6%	1%	2%	92%	9%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	0%	-4%	0%	2%	4%	-2%
Elementary	2010-11	34%	59%	6%	1%	1%	93%	8%
Middle	2010-11	33%	58%	7%	1%	2%	91%	10%
High	2010-11	36%	55%	7%	1%	2%	91%	10%
<b>We systematically gather evidence concerning instructional strategies.</b>	2007-08	27%	57%	14%	2%	1%	84%	17%
	2008-09	32%	52%	12%	1%	2%	84%	15%
	2009-10	31%	56%	10%	1%	1%	87%	12%
	2010-11	30%	58%	9%	1%	1%	88%	11%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		3%	1%	-5%	-1%	0%	4%	-6%
Elementary	2010-11	32%	59%	7%	1%	1%	91%	9%
Middle	2010-11	28%	59%	11%	1%	1%	87%	13%
High	2010-11	28%	57%	11%	2%	1%	85%	14%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.

2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.

Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

### Instructional Strategies and Interventions

The third PLT survey theme, instructional strategies and interventions, is focused on the extent to which PLT team members are working together to identify and implement effective instructional strategies directly targeted at the team’s essential learning outcomes; the first three of these items are reported on Table 13. The number of teachers expressing positive agreement to these three items has increased between two and three percentage points over a four-year period, and the number of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” has risen by four percentage points since 2007-08. However, neither the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with these items, nor the percentage of teachers expressing any level of positive agreement, increased by more than one percentage point since 2009-10.

**Table 13**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Strategies-and-Interventions-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have worked to align our instruction with learning outcomes.</b>	2007-08	38%	55%	5%	1%	0%	93%	6%
	2008-09	43%	50%	4%	1%	2%	93%	7%
	2009-10	43%	51%	4%	1%	1%	94%	6%
	2010-11	42%	53%	3%	1%	1%	95%	5%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	-2%	-2%	0%	1%	2%	-1%
Elementary	2010-11	43%	52%	3%	0%	1%	95%	4%
Middle	2010-11	40%	55%	4%	0%	1%	95%	5%
High	2010-11	43%	52%	3%	1%	1%	95%	5%
<b>We are identifying more effective instructional strategies.</b>	2007-08	33%	57%	8%	1%	0%	90%	9%
	2008-09	38%	53%	6%	1%	2%	91%	9%
	2009-10	38%	54%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
	2010-11	37%	55%	6%	1%	1%	92%	8%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	-2%	-2%	0%	1%	2%	-1%
Elementary	2010-11	39%	55%	5%	1%	1%	94%	7%
Middle	2010-11	36%	57%	6%	0%	1%	93%	7%
High	2010-11	38%	54%	7%	1%	1%	92%	9%
<b>We utilize increasingly more effective instructional strategies.</b>	2007-08	29%	59%	10%	1%	1%	88%	12%
	2008-09	34%	55%	7%	1%	3%	89%	11%
	2009-10	33%	57%	7%	1%	2%	90%	10%
	2010-11	33%	58%	6%	1%	2%	91%	9%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	-1%	-4%	0%	1%	3%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	35%	58%	5%	1%	1%	93%	7%
Middle	2010-11	30%	61%	7%	1%	2%	91%	10%
High	2010-11	32%	57%	8%	1%	1%	89%	10%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

The final two survey items for this theme produced more dramatic variation, as shown in Table 14. More specifically, the item asking teachers if they utilize a school-wide pyramid of interventions has climbed steadily since 2007-08, culminating in a collective increase of 15 percentage points over the four-year span – with a six percentage point increase in the number of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with the item. When disaggregated by grade level, the elementary teachers were the most positive at 88%, followed by the high (82%) and middle school teachers (79%).

Similarly, the item asking if struggling students are required to participate in other learning opportunities has increased by 11 percentage points over the same period – with an increase of four percentage points in the “strongly agree” category. The positive response rate for this item increased by three percentage points since 2009-10 alone – a noteworthy improvement when

most of the other survey items have begun to stabilize. It is also worth highlighting that the level of positive agreement for the elementary teachers was 10 percentage points higher (81%) than it was for the other grade levels (middle and high school teachers were both at 71%).

**Table 14**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Strategies-and-Interventions-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We utilize the schoolwide pyramid of interventions.</b>	2007-08	19%	51%	18%	3%	10%	70%	31%
	2008-09	26%	53%	12%	2%	7%	79%	21%
	2009-10	25%	56%	11%	2%	6%	81%	19%
	2010-11	25%	60%	10%	1%	5%	85%	16%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		6%	9%	-8%	-2%	-5%	15%	-15%
Elementary	2010-11	28%	60%	7%	1%	5%	88%	13%
Middle	2010-11	20%	59%	15%	1%	6%	79%	22%
High	2010-11	23%	59%	13%	2%	3%	82%	18%
<b>We require students in need to participate in other learning opportunities.</b>	2007-08	19%	46%	28%	4%	2%	65%	34%
	2008-09	25%	47%	21%	3%	4%	72%	28%
	2009-10	24%	49%	21%	3%	3%	73%	27%
	2010-11	23%	53%	19%	2%	3%	76%	24%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	7%	-9%	-2%	1%	11%	-10%
Elementary	2010-11	27%	54%	15%	1%	3%	81%	19%
Middle	2010-11	18%	53%	25%	2%	2%	71%	29%
High	2010-11	19%	52%	24%	3%	2%	71%	29%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

**Common Formative Assessments**

The fourth theme addresses common formative assessments, whose results should be consistently shared and analyzed by all PLT team members. This aspect of instruction is vital for successful PLT implementation (DuFour & Eaker, 1998), yet the question asking how often common formative assessments are administered has traditionally produced the most variable survey results. For example, the percentage of teachers reporting that they administer common formative assessments every three weeks was 38% in 2007-08. Subsequently, it rose to 45% in 2008-09, fell to 21% in 2009-10, and then rebounded to 48% in 2010-11.

While these year-to-year fluctuations are admittedly curious, the data are more stable when viewed over the four-year period. Viewed holistically, it is possible to infer that the number of common formative assessments being administered every three weeks has increased by 10 percentage points since 2007-08, whereas the portion of teachers claiming they do not administer such assessments at all has declined by eight percentage points over the same period. Table 15 reports these data.

**Table 15**  
**Frequency of Common Formative Assessments, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Once Every 3 Weeks	Once Every 6 Weeks	Once a Quarter	Once a Semester	Not at All	No Response
<b>As a PLT, we administered Common Formative Assessments:</b>	2007-08	38%	16%	20%	5%	17%	5%
	2008-09	45%	17%	22%	4%	10%	4%
	2009-10	21%	4%	49%	16%	9%	2%
	2010-11	48%	16%	22%	4%	9%	2%
Change from 07-08 to 10-11:		10%	0%	2%	-1%	-8%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	46%	16%	25%	3%	8%	2%
Middle	2010-11	49%	14%	22%	4%	9%	2%
High	2010-11	53%	15%	14%	6%	12%	1%

Note: All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

Table 16 presents the responses to the other PLT survey items pertaining to common formative assessments. Collectively, the items showed an increase in positive responses between two and six percentage points over a four-year period. Furthermore, the number of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with each survey item increased between two and four percentage points over the same period. Here again, the differences between 2009-10 and 2010-11 are less impressive and, for three of these items, the number of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” actually declined by one percentage point from the previous year.

Overall, the elementary teachers returned the highest level of positive agreement to all of the assessment-themed survey items. Two items within this theme showed noteworthy variance when disaggregated by school level. For example, when asked if common formative assessments were used to identify students who need additional support, the elementary teachers indicated the highest level of agreement (88%), followed by high school (81%) and middle (80%) school teachers. Similarly, when teachers were asked if they used the assessment results to evaluate their instructional practices, elementary teachers again returned the highest level of agreement (84%), followed by 80% from both the middle and high school teachers. Greater use of universal screening tools at the elementary level may contribute to these differences.

**Table 16**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Assessment-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We have developed common formative assessments using different approaches.</b>	2007-08	28%	53%	16%	2%	1%	81%	19%
	2008-09	32%	49%	14%	2%	3%	81%	19%
	2009-10	32%	52%	12%	2%	2%	84%	16%
	2010-11	32%	53%	12%	1%	2%	85%	15%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	0%	-4%	-1%	1%	4%	-4%
Elementary	2010-11	30%	56%	11%	1%	2%	86%	14%
Middle	2010-11	32%	53%	12%	1%	2%	85%	15%
High	2010-11	35%	48%	13%	2%	2%	83%	17%
<b>We aligned our common formative assessments to learning outcomes.</b>	2007-08	30%	55%	13%	1%	1%	85%	15%
	2008-09	34%	51%	11%	1%	4%	85%	16%
	2009-10	34%	54%	9%	1%	2%	88%	12%
	2010-11	33%	54%	9%	1%	2%	87%	12%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		3%	-1%	-4%	0%	1%	2%	-3%
Elementary	2010-11	32%	57%	8%	1%	2%	89%	11%
Middle	2010-11	33%	54%	9%	1%	2%	87%	12%
High	2010-11	37%	50%	10%	2%	2%	87%	14%
<b>We examine results to identify students who need additional support.</b>	2007-08	25%	54%	19%	2%	1%	79%	22%
	2008-09	30%	50%	15%	2%	4%	80%	21%
	2009-10	30%	53%	13%	2%	2%	83%	17%
	2010-11	29%	56%	12%	1%	2%	85%	15%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	2%	-7%	-1%	1%	6%	-7%
Elementary	2010-11	32%	56%	9%	1%	2%	88%	12%
Middle	2010-11	24%	56%	16%	1%	2%	80%	19%
High	2010-11	26%	55%	15%	2%	2%	81%	19%
<b>We examine results to evaluate our instructional practices.</b>	2007-08	23%	53%	21%	2%	1%	76%	24%
	2008-09	27%	50%	17%	2%	4%	77%	23%
	2009-10	26%	55%	15%	2%	2%	81%	19%
	2010-11	25%	57%	14%	1%	2%	82%	17%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		2%	4%	-7%	-1%	1%	6%	-7%
Elementary	2010-11	26%	58%	13%	1%	2%	84%	16%
Middle	2010-11	23%	57%	16%	2%	2%	80%	20%
High	2010-11	24%	56%	16%	2%	2%	80%	20%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

## Support and Resource Allocation

Another High Five survey theme captures the PLT teams' level of feedback and support from school leadership, as well as how often the school celebrates progress towards full PLT implementation and its SMART goals. Traditionally, these items have returned the lowest level of positive agreement within the survey. When viewed thematically, *support and resource allocation* has always lagged seven to ten percentage points behind any other survey theme (see Table 1). For the two items asking if the school celebrates progress towards PLT implementation and its SMART goals, the responses from middle school teachers in 2010-11 were at least five percentage points lower than those from other grade levels.

Nevertheless, progress has been made. As Table 17 shows, the percentage of positive responses to these survey items has increased between three and nine percentage points per item since 2007-08. Overall, the level of positive agreement for the survey item asking if the team celebrates progress towards implementing its PLT goals has remained unchanged for the past three years at 71%. However, the item asking if the school celebrates team progress towards SMART goals has increased steadily, showing an increase of nine percentage points since 2007-08 and a three percentage point increase since 2009-10.

**Table 17**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Support-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>We receive feedback and support from our leadership.</b>	2007-08	18%	54%	21%	5%	1%	72%	27%
	2008-09	23%	53%	18%	3%	3%	76%	24%
	2009-10	21%	55%	17%	4%	2%	76%	23%
	2010-11	18%	59%	17%	3%	2%	77%	22%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		0%	5%	-4%	-2%	1%	5%	-5%
Elementary	2010-11	19%	60%	16%	3%	2%	79%	21%
Middle	2010-11	16%	60%	18%	4%	2%	76%	24%
High	2010-11	17%	59%	18%	5%	1%	76%	24%
<b>My school celebrates team progress toward implementing our PLTs.</b>	2007-08	17%	51%	24%	5%	2%	68%	31%
	2008-09	21%	50%	22%	4%	4%	71%	30%
	2009-10	19%	52%	21%	4%	4%	71%	29%
	2010-11	16%	55%	23%	4%	3%	71%	30%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		-1%	4%	-1%	-1%	1%	3%	-1%
Elementary	2010-11	16%	56%	23%	3%	2%	72%	28%
Middle	2010-11	13%	53%	25%	4%	4%	66%	33%
High	2010-11	17%	56%	20%	4%	3%	73%	27%
<b>My school celebrates team progress toward SMART goals.</b>	2007-08	15%	48%	26%	5%	6%	63%	37%
	2008-09	19%	48%	22%	3%	7%	67%	32%
	2009-10	17%	52%	22%	4%	5%	69%	31%
	2010-11	16%	56%	22%	3%	4%	72%	29%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		1%	8%	-4%	-2%	-2%	9%	-8%
Elementary	2010-11	17%	56%	21%	3%	3%	73%	27%
Middle	2010-11	12%	56%	24%	4%	4%	68%	32%
High	2010-11	17%	57%	19%	4%	4%	74%	27%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

**Overall Impact**

The final survey theme addresses the overall impact of the PLT initiative on instructional practice and student learning. While most items on the survey address the fundamental aspects of PLT implementation, such as the strength of the team’s core processes and strategies, this theme is more evaluative in nature. More specifically, it focuses on teachers’ summative perceptions of their PLT work, including the effect professional collaboration is having on their classroom effectiveness and their students’ academic achievement.

This is, of course, the ultimate goal of PLTs and the primary rationale for their implementation. E&R has recently released a comprehensive policy study (Jackl & Baenen, 2010) that sheds light on these issues. Nevertheless, the impact-themed items have consistently returned the second-lowest level of positive agreement within the survey over the past four years (see Table 1). Furthermore, *overall impact* has tied *collaborative culture/team processes* for the slowest

growth; the percentage of positive responses to these items has only improved by four percentage points since 2007-08.

As shown in Table 18, the item asking teachers if time spent with their PLT was saving them time overall has historically returned the lowest percentage of positive responses for the impact-themed items; 67% of the teachers expressed some level of positive agreement with the statement in 2010-11, a figure that has fallen by one percentage point since 2007-08. This item also showed a five percentage point variance when disaggregated by grade level; the middle school teachers showed the highest level of agreement (71%), followed by the high (68%) and elementary school teachers (66%).

The highest percentage of positive responses within this theme have always come from the item asking if PLTs can provide a more supportive environment for teachers; 92% of the teachers expressed agreement – a percentage that has remained unchanged for four consecutive years.

Arguably, the two most revealing questions on the entire survey directly ask if PLT work is making the teacher better, and if the students are learning more. The level of positive agreement for these two items in 2010-11 was 82% and 80%, respectively – documenting a four-year gain of five percentage points in both cases. It is also important to highlight that the number of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with the statements increased by five and four percentage points, respectively, since 2007-08. Still, one in five disagrees.

A comparison of the 2010-11 data with the previous year reveals a cause for concern. While it is true that the overall level of positive agreement to these statements did not decrease for any item since 2009-10 except, as noted earlier, the item asking if PLT work will save the teacher time overall did drop by one percentage point in 2010-11; that particular item remains one percentage point lower than its 2007-08 baseline. But it is important to highlight that the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with the impact-themed statements fell between two and six percentage points for every item. These data suggest that teachers are still willing to express agreement with these statements, but are not willing to endorse them as enthusiastically as they had in 2009-10. Table 18 presents these data in greater detail.

**Table 18**  
**PLT Survey Responses to Impact-Area Questions, 2007-08 to 2010-11**

Statement	School Year	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/No Response	% Positive	% Negative
<b>I am a better teacher because of my work with my PLT.</b>	2007-08	22%	55%	17%	5%	1%	77%	23%
	2008-09	27%	52%	14%	4%	2%	79%	20%
	2009-10	29%	51%	15%	4%	2%	80%	21%
	2010-11	27%	55%	13%	3%	1%	82%	17%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		5%	0%	-4%	-2%	0%	5%	-6%
Elementary	2010-11	25%	59%	13%	3%	1%	84%	17%
Middle	2010-11	28%	54%	14%	3%	1%	82%	18%
High	2010-11	31%	51%	13%	5%	1%	82%	19%
<b>My students are learning more because of my work with my PLT.</b>	2007-08	20%	55%	20%	4%	1%	75%	25%
	2008-09	25%	51%	18%	3%	3%	76%	24%
	2009-10	27%	51%	17%	4%	2%	78%	23%
	2010-11	24%	56%	16%	3%	1%	80%	20%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		4%	1%	-4%	-1%	0%	5%	-5%
Elementary	2010-11	24%	59%	15%	2%	1%	83%	18%
Middle	2010-11	25%	54%	17%	3%	1%	79%	21%
High	2010-11	26%	51%	16%	5%	1%	77%	22%
<b>PLTs can provide a more supportive environment for teachers.</b>	2007-08	34%	58%	6%	2%	0%	92%	8%
	2008-09	39%	53%	5%	2%	2%	92%	9%
	2009-10	40%	52%	5%	2%	1%	92%	8%
	2010-11	35%	57%	5%	2%	1%	92%	8%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		1%	-1%	-1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
Elementary	2010-11	33%	59%	5%	2%	1%	92%	8%
Middle	2010-11	34%	60%	5%	1%	1%	94%	7%
High	2010-11	40%	52%	4%	2%	1%	92%	7%
<b>Time spent with my PLT will save me time overall.</b>	2007-08	21%	47%	24%	8%	1%	68%	33%
	2008-09	25%	44%	22%	7%	3%	69%	32%
	2009-10	27%	41%	22%	8%	2%	68%	32%
	2010-11	21%	46%	24%	8%	1%	67%	33%
Change from 2007-08 to 2010-11:		0%	-1%	0%	0%	0%	-1%	0%
Elementary	2010-11	18%	48%	25%	8%	1%	66%	34%
Middle	2010-11	24%	47%	21%	7%	1%	71%	29%
High	2010-11	26%	42%	22%	9%	1%	68%	32%

Note: 1. The “% Negative” includes all respondents who omitted the question and/or failed to indicate a positive response.  
 2. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number; consequently, totals may not equal 100% in all cases.  
 Data Source: SAS Institute data analysis of High Five 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11 PLT surveys.

## DISCUSSION

It should be stressed that this document is a survey report – not a policy study. As such, its primary objective is to report the results of the 2010-11 High Five PLT Survey and compare those data to the 2007-08 baseline, as well as with data collected during the previous school year. The consistency of the High Five PLT Survey items (which have remained unchanged since 2007-08) allows for direct and accurate comparisons that can be used to assess PLT implementation progress. Therefore, this report should be particularly useful to central services leadership for determining where the district is strongest – and weakest – in terms of PLT implementation, and how those trends have changed over time.

This report has collateral virtues as well. For example, the information contained herein will serve as one of many data sources to be incorporated into the second phase of a comprehensive PLT policy study that E&R will be releasing in the coming months. This subsequent report will use correlational statistics to examine the relationship between WCPSS student achievement and PLT effectiveness – as measured by these survey data.

Finally, it is important to remember that this report is intended to supplement the individual school reports provided to schools. The school reports, combined with this larger analysis, give school-based personnel the information they need to examine their individual school's trends, as well as the ability to make year-by-year comparisons to ascertain their school's status relative to the district overall and by grade span over time. Thus, a principal at an elementary school can compare his or her school's survey data from the past four years to the district averages, as well as to the averages for the elementary schools in isolation.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In some ways, PLTs seem to be institutionalized in WCPSS. Yet, some areas are still considerably lower than others, and variation exists in the level of implementation at schools. The following recommendations are made to school staff and central staff.

### SCHOOL-BASED PERSONNEL

#### **Identify Areas for Improvement and Develop Specific Goals to Address Shortcomings**

School staff are encouraged to review their results compared to other schools at their grade span and set goals for improvement for areas that are low through the School Improvement Plan (SIP) or less formal methods. Since the principals were also provided with PLT reports disaggregated by subject area and PLT numbers, it should also be relatively easy to use this information to identify the PLTs that are struggling or dissatisfied in a particular area. Providing this type of direct, targeted assistance to individual PLTs may have other benefits, such as increasing the teachers' perceived level of administrative support for their PLT work (see next recommendation).

## **Increase Administrative Support for PLT Work and Celebration of Team Progress**

While the percentage of staff with positive views on most PLT themes is very high and stable, two survey themes have remained resiliently lower than others. The *support and resource allocation* theme, for example, has never risen above a 73% level of positive agreement. This phenomenon has persisted despite unprecedented district-wide initiatives broadcasting strong administrative support for the PLT concept, such as the adoption of Board policy 3610 in July 2009 and the subsequent “Wake Wednesday” early dismissal scheduling adjustment.

Two of the three support-themed items pertain exclusively to “celebrating progress” towards PLT implementation and/or the team’s SMART goals (Table 17). For those two items, the middle school teachers lag behind other grade levels by at least five percentage points. They were, however, more positive than other grade spans when asked about the level of feedback and support the teachers receive from their leadership. Nevertheless, the fact that 22% of the district’s teachers indicated that they are not receiving appropriate feedback and support from the administration cannot be ignored.

School administrators are encouraged to explore problems or areas of dissatisfaction among their staff and the relative importance of the support area to staff. This might be accomplished through group discussions or individual interviews, or a committee might be formed to determine key issues. One important issue is how PLT members define terms such as “celebration” and “support.” The survey items may be interpreted in different ways by different people, and improvement efforts should focus on what school staff really see as an issue. Once the root issues are identified, appropriate adjustments could be launched to make their faculty feel more supported and to celebrate their progress.

## **CENTRAL SERVICES PERSONNEL**

### **Revisit the District’s Plan for PLT Implementation**

As noted throughout the report, the responses to the annual PLT surveys have been overwhelmingly positive, especially when we compare 2010-11 data with the 2007-08 baseline. However, responses to most items have stabilized at a high rate of agreement (85% or greater). In some cases, the percentage of teachers indicating that they “strongly agree” with core PLT concepts has dropped noticeably from the previous year, indicating a weakening level of strong support... or at least a dimming of enthusiasm.

The changes in the PLT survey results may, admittedly, result from the elimination of the Wake Wednesday early dismissal policy. However, Board policy 3610 continues to support consistent weekly implementation of PLTs. The district’s PLT Steering Committee will be meeting in April to review these results, reassess the district’s current implementation status, and revisit the long-term goals pertaining to this initiative. While implementation based on self-report remains strong, some areas may need extra support, and the tie to student achievement outcomes has not yet shown up in district-level student outcomes.

The data in this survey report, along with the information disseminated throughout the larger policy study (Jackl & Baenen, 2010), identified areas for growth. This report, for example, noted that the frequency teachers report administering common formative assessments has varied

widely from year-to-year (Table 15). The recently-released policy study noted that a number of teachers remain unclear about what constitutes a common formative assessment, how to write common formative assessment items, and how to use the resulting data to improve classroom instruction. Other issues, such as the absence of a standardized/formalized PLT training program for new teachers entering the district, were discussed in the policy study. District leadership should discuss the recommendations and decide which ones warrant continued investigation, analysis, and/or action. It may be time to focus specifically on the outcomes expected from PLT work rather than implementation for most staff. Student outcome survey results remain relatively low compared to other items, and anticipated outcomes have not been emphasized with school staff to any great extent.

### **Continue to Monitor PLT Implementation**

The district's (generally) upward four-year trend has been well-documented in this report. It is apparent that, in many cases, the positive response rate has stabilized at a high rate of agreement (above 85%). This may be the ceiling for agreement. Even so, there are notable shifts in certain survey items, especially when the data are disaggregated by school level and/or by the strength of the agreement (e.g., "strongly agree" versus "agree"). Those differences should be noted by the professional staff charged with advancing the PLT concept within the district, as these are likely important factors to identify and acknowledge in order to improve student achievement. It seems essential, therefore, to continue to administer and report PLT surveys for the foreseeable future, although administration every other year or an annual shorter version might be considered.

### **Conduct Additional Research on PLTs in WCPSS**

It is time to shift our focus from PLT implementation to student outcomes. The high percentage of positive responses to the High Five survey detailed in this report, along with the relative consistency of the results, suggest that PLTs have become institutionalized within the district. But although the primary goal of the High Five initiative is to increase high school graduation rates, those benefits have yet to materialize. This issue, along with many others, will have to be addressed as E&R follows up on last year's policy study (Jackl & Baenen, 2010).

Board Policy requires regular reports on PLTs. Outcomes expected this year include a reduction in the percentage of failing grades, a reduction in student retention rates, and an improvement in End-of-Course (EOC) and End-of-Grade (EOG) proficiency and growth scores. The survey data collected for this report will also serve as a key element of a larger correlational analysis of impact. When complete, the second phase of the expanded PLT policy study will help to quantify the benefits of PLT work, and will also provide additional guidance to the district's policy makers as they seek ways to increase academic achievement for all students.

## REFERENCES

- DuFour, R.P., DuFour, R.B., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2007). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Jackl, A. (2009). *Professional learning community (PLC) implementation: WCPSS 2008-09 High Five PLC survey results*. Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System, Evaluation and Research Department.  
[http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2009/0912hi5plc\\_survey.pdf](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2009/0912hi5plc_survey.pdf)
- Jackl, A. (2010). *WCPSS 2009-10 High Five PLT survey results: Professional learning team (PLT) implementation over time*. Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System, Evaluation and Research Department.  
[http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2010/1008high5survey2009\\_10%20.pdf](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2010/1008high5survey2009_10%20.pdf)
- Jackl, A. & Baenen, N. (2010). *Wake County Public School System (WCPSS) professional learning teams (PLTs): 2009-10 school-based policy implementation study*. Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System, Evaluation & Research Department.  
[http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2010/1018plt\\_2009\\_10.pdf](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2010/1018plt_2009_10.pdf)
- Reichstetter, R. (2008). *Wake county public school system professional learning communities: 2007-08 implementation status*. Raleigh, NC: Wake County Public School System, Evaluation and Research Department.  
[http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2008/0806\\_plc\\_2007\\_08implement.pdf](http://www.wcpss.net/evaluation-research/reports/2008/0806_plc_2007_08implement.pdf)

APPENDIX



2010-11 High Five PLT Survey

2010-11 High Five PLT Survey

Page 1 - Heading

Description:  
 Our district, along with the other High Five districts, has determined that research indicates the development of Professional Learning Teams (PLTs) is likely to lead to higher student achievement and enhanced teacher satisfaction. This survey is designed to measure the depth of implementation of PLTs. The summarized results of the survey, along with team-level data, will be shared with individual teams, schools, districts and High Five. The majority of the items are multiple-choice; the survey should take about 15-20 minutes of your time.

Instructions:  
 If you are a participant in one or more PLTs, please complete the full survey according to your experience in your main PLT. If you are not a participant in any PLT, respond to item 1, and the survey will skip to the Demographics section. Be sure to click on the SUBMIT button at the bottom of each page to save your responses.

Page 2 - Question 1 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

During this school year, I have been part of a professional learning team (PLT) focused on achieving essential learning outcomes for all students.

- Yes, a School-level PLT [\[Skip to 3\]](#)
- Yes, a District-level PLT [\[Skip to 3\]](#)
- No [\[Skip to 12\]](#)

Page 3 - Question 2 - Open Ended - One Line

The number of my main PLT is:  
(This is the 3-digit number assigned to your PLT by your school's principal.)

Page 4 - Heading

A Focus on Learning

Page 4 - Question 3 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have identified essential learning outcomes for our students. (Essential learning outcomes, also called power standards, are the course and grade level critical knowledge, skills, and dispositions that students are expected to retain long after the assessment is completed, that are applicable to multiple academic disciplines, and that prepare the student for success in the next grade/course.)

Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.

Page 4 - Question 4 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we believe that all of our students will master the essential learning outcomes.

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 4 - Question 5 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we use team-adopted common standards of success to evaluate student learning. (Common standards of success would include team-developed grading policies and practices, such as standards of mastery for common formative assessments and similar criteria for grading and assigning value to homework, classwork, and tests, as well as consistently applying team-developed rubrics so that a sample would likely receive the same grade regardless of who graded it.)

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 4 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have adopted strategic and specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and timebound (SMART) goals that we are working to achieve.

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 4 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, our SMART goals are aligned to our school's SMART goals.

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Heading

Collaborative Culture: Team Processes

Page 5 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have established norms (e.g., ground rules for team meetings including holding each other accountable for student learning) to clarify how we will work together as a team.

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we abide by the explicit team norms we developed.

**Strongly Agree**   **A g r e e**   **D i s a g r e e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

Page 5 - Question 10 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we use decision-making processes such as brain-storming, problem identification, consensus, and prioritization.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Question 11 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we are able to be open and honest with each other about what we do well and not so well (e.g., in instruction, in teacher-student relationships, in teamsmanship).

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Question 12 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have a process to effectively resolve conflict.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Question 13 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we document and monitor our PLC processes so that we can continue to improve.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 5 - Question 14 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we systematically gather evidence about the impact of various instructional strategies on student learning.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 6 - Heading

Instructional Strategies and Interventions

Page 6 - Question 15 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have made a conscious effort to align our instruction to achieve our essential learning outcomes.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 6 - Question 16 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we are identifying increasingly more effective instructional strategies.

**Strongly Agree**   **A**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **D**   **i**   **s**   **a**   **g**   **r**   **e**   **e**   **Strongly Disagree**   **I do not understand.**

Page 6 - Question 17 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we utilize those increasingly more effective instructional strategies that our team identifies.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 6 - Question 18 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we utilize the school-wide intervention pyramid (sequence of required interventions).

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 6 - Question 19 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we require every student who has not yet mastered the essential learning outcomes to participate in additional learning opportunities every few weeks.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 7 - Heading

Common Formative Assessments, Part I

Page 7 - Question 20 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have developed a variety of common formative assessments using different approaches (e.g., performance assessment, essays, tests, quizzes).

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 7 - Question 21 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we have aligned our common formative assessments to the essential learning outcomes.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 7 - Question 22 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we examine the results of our common formative assessments to identify students who need additional learning opportunities (enrichment or re-teaching).

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 7 - Question 23 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we examine the results of our common formative assessments to determine which instructional practices are most effective in achieving student mastery.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

Page 8 - Heading

Common Formative Assessments, Part II

Page 8 - Question 24 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

As a PLT, we usually administer common formative assessments with the following frequency:

- About once every 3 weeks
- About once every 6 weeks
- About once a quarter
- About once a semester
- Not at all

Page 9 - Heading

Impact

Page 9 - Question 25 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I am a better teacher because of my work with my PLT.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 9 - Question 26 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

My students are learning more because of my work with my PLT.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 9 - Question 27 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

The PLT process has the potential to provide a more supportive environment for teachers.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 9 - Question 28 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

Time spent with my PLT will save me time overall.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

                                                                                      

Page 10 - Heading

Support/Resource Allocation

Page 10 - Question 29 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

As a PLT, we receive feedback and support from leadership on our implementation of PLT concepts and practices.

Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.

                                                                                      

Page 10 - Question 30 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

My school celebrates team progress toward the implementation of PLT concepts and practices.

Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.

                                                                                      

Page 10 - Question 31 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

My school celebrates team progress toward SMART goals for student achievement.

Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.

                                                                                      

Page 11 - Heading

Support/Resource Allocation

Page 11 - Question 32 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

My PLT typically meets with the following frequency:

- None
- Daily
- Weekly
- Two times a month
- Monthly
- Quarterly

Page 11 - Question 33 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

The length of my typical PLT meeting is:

- Less than 30 minutes
- Between 30 minutes and an hour
- More than an hour

Page 11 - Question 34 - Choice - Multiple Answers (Bullets)

My PLT typically meets at the following time:  
(Mark all that apply.)

- Before school
- After school
- During the lunch period
- During a common planning period
- On workdays
- Other, please specify:

Page 12 - Heading

Demographics

Page 12 - Question 35 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Years of teaching experience (including current year):

- 1-2 years
- 3-4 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-20 years
- More than 20 years

Page 12 - Question 36 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

My main grade level assignment this year:

- K
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 4
  - 5
  - 6
  - 7
  - 8
  - 9-12
  - Elementary specialist
  - Middle grade specialist
  - Other, please specify:
- 

Page 12 - Question 37 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Which of the following best fits your primary job responsibility?

- Regular Elementary Classroom Subjects
- Math
- Math and Science
- Science
- Language Arts / Reading / Writing / Literacy
- Language Arts and Social Studies
- Social Studies / History
- Career Technical Education
- Technology Education
- World Language / Foreign Language
- PE / Health
- Arts / Arts Education / Fine Arts
- Media / Library
- Special Education / Exceptional Education

- AIG (gifted) Teacher / Gifted Ed. Specialist
- Guidance / Counselor / Psychologist / Social Worker
- ESL / English as a Second Language
- Pre-K
- Other

Page 12 - Question 38 - Choice - One Answer (Drop Down)

Base school assignment for this year:

- SELECT WCPSS SCHOOL

Page 12 - Question 39 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

My hours of formal High Five sponsored professional development that focused on PLT implementation (since September 2005):

- None
- 1-4 hours
- 5-8 hours
- 9-12 hours
- 13-16 hours
- Over 16 hours

Page 12 - Question 40 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

My hours of formal school district sponsored professional development that focused on PLT implementation (since September 2005):

- None
- 1-4 hours
- 5-8 hours
- 9-12 hours
- 13-16 hours
- Over 16 hours

Page 12 - Heading

Page 13 - Heading

PLT Work and Early Release Days

Page 13 - Question 41 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

I spend at least one hour per week on PLT-related activities and training.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

Page 13 - Question 42 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

To how many PLTs do you belong this year?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- more than 3

Page 13 - Question 43 - Rating Scale - One Answer (Horizontal)

On the designated early release days, I consistently spent at least three hours on job-embedded professional development.

**Strongly Agree   A   g   r   e   e   D   i   s   a   g   r   e   e   Strongly Disagree   I do not understand.**

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

Page 13 - Question 44 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Do you work full-time or part-time?

- Full-time
- Part-time

Thank You Page

Thank you for your participation in the High Five PLT Survey!

Screen Out Page

Standard

Over Quota Page

Standard

Survey Closed Page

Thank you for your willingness to participate; however, this survey is now closed.

Please contact Andy Jackl (ajackl@wcpss.net or 850-1742) for further assistance.