

Summary of Existing School Climate Instruments for Middle School

This information memo provides an annotated list of extant surveys used to assess school climate, classroom climate, or teacher effectiveness that are designed for use in middle schools. The purpose is to assist educators to select or design surveys to assess school climate in middle schools, with a particular focus on assessing student engagement and teacher characteristics associated with higher student achievement.

Literature review

School climate is a global term that refers to the characteristics of a school's environment that influence students' academic and social development (Brand 2008). School- and classroom-climate dimensions include, for example, the quality of teacher-student relationships and peer relationships, the expectations and support for learning, the degree of connectedness and of safety that students experience in school, and the physical surroundings of the school (Brand, Felner, Shim, Seitsinger, Burns, and Bolton 2008; Bear, Gaskins, Blank, and Chen 2011; Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, and Pickeral 2009).

Climate surveys are widely used in districts across the nation to collect information about a school's or classroom's social and physical environment. Most assessments are based on structured inventories that ask respondents about their level of agreement with specific statements about the school or classroom (Brand et al. 2003), for example, "Students in this school are mean to one another." Other assessments are based on group-level aggregation of respondent reports of their own behaviors and attitudes (Lüdtke, Marsh, Robitzsch, Trautwein, Asparouhov, and Muthén 2008). Examples of concepts measured in this manner are student engagement and substance use, and examples of survey items include, "I try to do well in school" and "how many times in the last 30 days did you drink alcohol?"

One application of classroom-climate measures is the assessment of teacher effectiveness (Fraser 1998). There is evidence that indicators of classroom climate (e.g., teacher-student relationships, classroom order, and teacher expectations and support for learning) are associated with student test scores (Goe, Bell, and Little 2008). Thus states and local education agencies have begun using measures of classroom climate in conjunction with other criteria to determine the "value added" by a particular teacher to student achievement, guided by the assumption that teachers are accountable for the climate of their classroom (Goe, Bell, and Little 2008). For this reason, the present memorandum includes summaries of several school-climate instruments that are designed to measure indicators of classroom climate that are impacted by teachers, and associated with student test scores.

Method

The search process included a review of the U.S. Department of Education’s Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures¹, keyword searches (specifically, “school climate,” “classroom climate,” and “teacher effectiveness”) of major scientific journal databases,² and a “snowball” method of identifying measures via their reference in sources uncovered by the methods described earlier. REL West researchers pared down the initial list of over 50 measures by eliminating those not designed for middle-school students and those not directly related to climate, teacher effectiveness, or the school environment.

The final list comprises 20 school-climate measures, including several measures targeted toward classroom climate and teacher effectiveness. The oldest instruments were developed in the 1970s, while the most recent were developed in the past several years. Many of the surveys were created by university-based researchers and are available for public use; others are the products of private groups and are copyright protected. Partly for this reason, full information on all measures (e.g., subscale internal consistency) was not always available.

To summarize the 20 measures, a coding scheme was developed by REL West to classify the subscales of each instrument (using the developers’ original language) into general categories. The coding protocol is described in appendix A, and the results of this coding exercise are shown in table 1. Similar subscales were grouped together, ultimately resulting in 15 categories, including parental involvement and support, school connectedness. These categories are presented on the columns of tables 1a, 1b, and 1c, with each of the 20 instruments presented on its own row. A check mark signifies that the instrument includes items that measure the indicated category. Another set of columns indicates whether the measure is intended to capture school-level climate or classroom/teacher-level outcomes. Several of the instruments are designed for use with students only, one for staff only, and others include multiple versions for students, staff, and parents, as well. Table 1a includes the instruments designed for student respondents; table 1b includes those designed for staff; and table 1c includes those designed for parents. Readers may find these tables helpful in comprehending the full range of concepts variously included in operational definitions of school climate.

The remainder of this information memorandum provides detailed summaries of the 20 measures related to school climate. The measures are listed alphabetically and each measure’s proprietor is listed under the name. The summaries include a brief description of the measure, the total number of items (which may help gauge the completion time), and the item-response format. The subscales—or specific constructs—measured by each instrument are provided in a table format, complete with the number of items that load onto the subscale and, where available, its Cronbach’s alpha (an indicator of internal consistency; 0.70 or higher is generally considered adequate). Several of these instruments include items that measure constructs unrelated to school climate, which are not reported here. It should be noted that the number of items reported in the summary introduction may not correspond with the sum of the items for indicated subscales; this is due to the fact that some survey items are not used in subscale constructions. Also, where available, the size of the sample (N) of students, staff, or parents used to calculate the reported internal consistency is provided. The summaries conclude with contact information and a citation for the

¹ Available at <http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov>

² ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), Google Scholar, and PsycINFO.

main reference(s) consulted. Some of the instrument proprietors make their items publically available while others do not. Even in the case that instruments are available online, the material may be copyrighted and, unless otherwise noted, it is important to contact the instrument's proprietor to determine proper protocol for use.

If you have a survey for middle school students designed to measure student engagement or classroom environment that you would like to have included in this summary of instruments, please contact Adam Voight at avoight@WestEd.org.

Suggested citation: Voight, A. & Hanson, T. (2012). *Summary of existing school climate instruments for middle school*. San Francisco: REL West at WestEd.

This memo was prepared under Contract ED-IES-12-C-0002 from the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, by the Regional Educational Laboratory West, administered by WestEd. The content of the document does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Contact information: REL West at WestEd / 730 Harrison Street / San Francisco, CA 94107
866.853.1831 / relwest@WestEd.org

References

- Bear, G. C., Gaskins, C., Blank, J., and Chen, F. F. (2011). Delaware school climate survey—Student: Its factor structure, concurrent validity, and reliability. *Journal of School Psychology, 49*, 157–174.
- Brand, S. (2008). School climate. In E. M. Anderman (Ed.), *The psychology of classroom learning: An encyclopedia*. Farmington Hills, MI: Thomson-Gale.
- Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., and Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development of validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(3), 570–588.
- Cohen, J., McCabe, L., Michelli, N. M., and Pickeral, T. (2009, January). School climate: Research, policy, teacher education and practice. *Teachers College Record, 111*, 180–213.
- Fraser, B. J. (1998). Classroom environment instruments: Development, validity and applications. *Learning Environments Research, 1*, 7–33.
- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems, 12*(4), 436–445.
- Goe, L., Bell, C., and Little, O. (2008). *Approaches to evaluating teacher effectiveness: A research synthesis*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center on Teacher Quality.
- Lüdtke, O., Marsh, H. W., Robitzsch, A., Trautwein, U., Asparouhov, T., and Muthén, B. (2008). The multilevel latent covariate model: A new, more reliable approach to group-level effects in contextual studies. *Psychological Methods, 13*, 203–229.

Table 1a. List of school-climate measures designed for students, their target construct for assessment, and associated subscales

Instrument	Target	Subscales															
	School climate	Teacher effectiveness/Classroom climate	Classroom order & fairness of rules	Community relations & involvement	Expectations & support for learning	Administrative leadership	Parent involvement & support	Physical surroundings and resources	Positive peer relationships	Respect for diversity	Safety, bullying, & victimization	School connectedness	Student emotional & social competency	Student extracurricular activities	Student voice & involvement	Student substance use	Teacher-student relationships
1. Alaska School Climate and Connectedness Survey (SCCS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2. California School Climate, Health, and Learning Surveys (Cal-SCHLS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
3. Classroom Environment Scale (CES)	✓			✓	✓			✓			✓	✓				✓	
4. Classroom Life Instrument (CLI)	✓	✓		✓							✓	✓		✓		✓	
5. Communities That Care Survey (CTC)	✓					✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
6. Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	
7. Creating a Great Place to Learn Survey (CGPL)	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
8. Culture of Excellence and Ethics Assessment (CEEA)	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	
9. Delaware School Climate Survey (DSCS)	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	
10. Effective School Battery (ESB)	✓	✓			✓					✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
11. 5Essentials	✓			✓						✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
12. Inventory of School Climate (ISC)	✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
13. My Student Survey (MSS)	✓	✓		✓							✓	✓				✓	
14. Pride Learning/Teaching Environment Survey (PLES)	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
15. Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI)	✓	✓		✓								✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
16. School Climate Assessment Instrument (SCAI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
18. School Climate Survey, School Development Program (SCS-SDP)	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
19. Student Connection Survey (SCS)	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
20. Tripod Survey	✓			✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Table 1b. List of school-climate measures designed for staff, their target construct for assessment, and associated subscales

Instrument	Target	Subscales															
	School climate	Teacher effectiveness/Classroom climate	Classroom order and fairness of rules	Community relations and involvement	Expectations and support for learning	Administrative leadership	Parent involvement and support	Physical surroundings and resources	Positive peer relationships	Respect for diversity	Safety, bullying, and victimization	School connectedness	Student emotional & social competency	Student extracurricular activities	Student voice and involvement	Student substance use	Teacher-student relationships
1. Alaska School Climate and Connectedness Survey (SCCS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
2. California School Climate, Health, and Learning Surveys (Cal-SCHLS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
6. Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
7. Creating a Great Place to Learn Survey (CGPL)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
8. Culture of Excellence and Ethics Assessment (CEEA)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
9. Delaware School Climate Survey (DSCS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
10. Effective School Battery (ESB)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
11. 5Essentials	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
12. Inventory of School Climate (ISC)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
14. Pride Learning/Teaching Environment Survey (PLES)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
16. School Climate Assessment Instrument (SCAI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
17. School Climate Inventory (SCI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
18. School Climate Survey, School Development Program (SCS-SDP)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Table 1c. List of school-climate measures designed for parents, their target construct for assessment, and associated subscales

Instrument	Target	Subscales												
	School climate Teacher effectiveness/Classroom climate Classroom order and fairness of rules Community relations and involvement Expectations and support for learning Administrative leadership Parent involvement and support Physical surroundings and resources Positive peer relationships Respect for diversity Safety, bullying, and victimization School connectedness Student emotional & social competency Student extracurricular activities Student voice and involvement Student substance use Teacher-student relationships													
2. California School Climate, Health, and Learning Surveys (Cal-SCHLS)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
8. Culture of Excellence and Ethics Assessment (CEEA)	✓			✓		✓		✓	✓		✓			✓
9. Delaware School Climate Survey (DSCS)	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
16. School Climate Assessment Instrument (SCAI)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
18. School Climate Survey, School Development Program (SCS-SDP)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓

1. Alaska School Climate and Connectedness Survey

American Institutes for Research

Overview:

The School Climate and Connectedness Survey (SCCS) was developed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) in 2005 specifically to evaluate school climate and student connectedness in Alaskan middle and high schools. The SCCS includes ten subscales—or specific constructs—that measure several aspects of school climate and connectedness for students as well as eight subscales for school staff. The student survey comprises 69 items and the staff survey comprises 43 items. There are five Likert-scale response options for each item, either strength-of-agreement (i.e., “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) or a set of frequencies (e.g., “1-2 times,” “3-6 times”). The SCCS has demonstrably strong reliability and has been shown, using a large sample of both students and staff, to correlate significantly with student achievement and risk behavior (see citation below). It covers a broad range of domains related to school climate, including parent and community involvement and student substance use. It is intended as a school-level assessment. The SCCS is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The SCCS is intended for use with students and staff in grades 5 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 22,481 5th- through 12th-grade students in Alaska public schools)		
- High expectations	7	0.71
- School safety	5	0.74
- School leadership and student involvement	5	0.80
- Respectful climate	6	0.84
- Peer climate	5	0.73
- Caring adults	5	0.70
- Parent and community involvement	7	0.77
- Social and emotional learning	15	0.87
- Student delinquent behaviors	5	0.84
- Student drug and alcohol use	3	0.75
Staff survey (N = 4,982 school staff in 5th through 12th grades in Alaska public schools)		
- School leadership and involvement	8	0.92
- Staff attitudes	5	0.86
- Student involvement	3	0.84
- Respectful climate	5	0.86
- School safety	5	0.72
- Parent and community involvement	7	0.84
- Student delinquent behavior	5	0.81
- Student drug and alcohol use	3	0.70

Contact:

All SCCS items are available online in Alaska’s statewide report, cited below. Contact Kim Kendziora at kkendziora@air.org for permissions.

Citation:

American Institutes for Research. (2011). *2011 School Climate and Connectedness Survey: Statewide report*. Available online at <http://alaskaice.org/school-climate/survey>.

2. California School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey System

WestEd

Overview:

The California Healthy Kids Survey for students, the California School Climate Survey for staff, and the California School Parent Survey collectively make up the California School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey (Cal-SCHLS) System developed by WestEd. The Cal-SCHLS System is intended to help schools and districts identify areas of student and school strengths and weaknesses. The student survey consists of 106 items, the staff survey consists of 73 items (with 34 additional items for specialized staff), and the parent survey consists of 33 items. All items have Likert-scale response options. There are a series of supplemental measures (not included in the below table) for the core Cal-SCHLS instrument; they include such topics as (a) resilience, (b) substance use, and (c) physical health. The Cal-SCHLS was mandated in California schools as a condition of Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools funding, and it has also been used by state departments of education in Louisiana, New Mexico, and West Virginia. Cal-SCHLS has been subject to reliability and validity testing with very large sample sizes. Its subscales were determined based on factor analyses³ with these large samples of middle- and high-school students. It has been used as a school- and district-level assessment and has a well-developed reporting system. The Cal-SCHLS is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The Cal-SCHLS is intended for use in grades 5 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 12,000 5th- through 12th-grade students in California public schools)		
- School support	6	0.89
- School meaningful participation	3	0.76
- Community support	6	0.94
- Community meaningful participation	2	0.73
- Home support	6	0.89
- Home meaningful participation	2	0.76
- Peer caring relationships	3	0.88
- Pro-social peers	2	0.73
- School connectedness	4	0.73
- Perceived safety	2	0.69
- Low substance use	4	0.79
- Low violence victimization	6	0.79
- Low violence perpetration	7	0.79
- Harassment	5	0.71
Staff survey (N = 8,468 school staff in 5th through 12th grades in California public schools)		
- Organizational supports	8	0.93
- Staff relational supports	5	0.86

³ Factor analysis is statistical procedure that uses information about the relationships between a set of observed variables (e.g., individual items on a survey) in order to identify underlying “factors.” The result is typically a smaller set of general factors (e.g., “School support”) around which more specific variables (e.g., “Teachers in this school want students to succeed” or “Students in this school help one another learn”) cohere.

- Resource provision	3	0.59
- Professional development needs	5	0.86
- Supports for students	5	0.74
- Learning facilitative behavior	7	0.83
- Risk behavior, conflict, and disruptive behavior	5	0.81

Parent survey (N = 102 parents of 5th- through 12th-grade students in California public schools)

- Facilitation of parental involvement	5	0.78
- Positive student learning environment	4	0.81
- Opportunities for meaningful participation	4	0.82
- Cultural sensitivity	2	0.75
- Clarity and equity of discipline policies	2	0.76
- Learning barriers	8	0.93

Contact:

Full versions of the student, staff, and parent surveys are available on the WestEd website (<http://cal-schls.wested.org>). Contact Gregory Austin at gaustin@wested.org for permissions.

Citations:

Hanson, T. L. (2011). *Internal consistency reliabilities for Healthy Kids School Climate Survey instruments*. Unpublished document.

Hanson, T. L. (2011). *Measurement analysis of California School Climate, Health, and Learning Survey (Cal-SCHLS) for staff*. Unpublished document.

3. Classroom Environment Scale

Mind Garden, Inc.

Overview:

The Classroom Environment Scale (CES) was developed by Edison Trickett and Rudolf Moos in the 1970s to assess the social climate of middle- and high-school classrooms. It focuses on teacher-student and student-student relationships and on the organizational structure of a classroom. The CES is intended for student respondents but has been adapted to tap teachers’ perceptions of their classes. It consists of 90 items in true-false response format. Example items are: “The teacher takes a personal interest in the students” and “There is a clear set of rules for students to follow.” Over the years, the CES has been subjected to psychometric testing, demonstrating strong internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity. The CES is specifically designed to measure classroom, rather than school, characteristics and has been used as a tool for classroom improvement and formative evaluation.

Target age group:

The CES is designed for use with middle- and high-school students.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 22 nationally representative junior and senior high classrooms)		
- Involvement	10	0.85
- Affiliation	10	0.74
- Teacher support	10	0.84
- Task orientation	10	0.84
- Competition	10	0.67
- Order and organization	10	0.85
- Rule clarity	10	0.74
- Teacher control	10	0.86
- Innovation	10	0.80

Contact:

The CES is available for purchase at <http://mindgarden.com>. Its items are not publically available.

Citation:

Moos, R. H., and Trickett, E. J. (1986). *Classroom Environment Scale manual* (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

4. Classroom Life Instrument

David Johnson and Roger Johnson

Overview:

The Classroom Life Instrument (CLI) was developed in 1983 by David Johnson and Roger Johnson through research and evaluation studies with dozens of school districts. It was designed to measure cooperative learning and social support in the classroom. It consists of 59 items to which students respond using 1–5 Likert scales to rate the truth of a statement. The “positive goal interdependence” subscale gauges student perceptions about whether the entire class is held to the same standard, using such items as “When we work together in small groups, our job is not done until everyone in our group has finished the assignment”; the “resource interdependence” subscale gauges student perceptions about the sharing of ideas and materials, using such items as “When we work together in small groups, we cannot complete an assignment unless everyone contributes”; and the “achieving for social approval” subscale gauges the degree to which students perceive their effort as being oriented to pleasing teacher, parents, and/or peers, using such items as “I do school work to make my parents happy.” The subscales of the CLI were determined both theoretically and through factor analysis. The scale is intended as a classroom-level measure. It continues to be used as an instrument in research studies, but we could not identify any recent applications for the purpose of assessment and evaluation.

Target age group:

The CLI has been used in research with students in grades 4 through 9.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 883 students in grades 4 through 9 in three public school districts)		
- Cooperative learning	7	0.83
- Positive goal interdependence	5	0.61
- Resource interdependence	5	0.74
- Teacher academic support	4	0.78
- Teacher personal support	4	0.80
- Student academic support	4	0.67
- Student personal support	5	0.78
- Class cohesion	5	0.51
- Academic self-esteem	5	0.61
- Fairness of grading	5	0.61
- Achieving for social approval	5	0.72
- Alienation	11	0.68

Contact:

The specific CLI survey items are listed in full in the article cited below. Contact David Johnson at johns010@umn.edu for permissions.

Citation:

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R., and Anderson, D. (1983). Social interdependence and classroom climate. *The Journal of Psychology*, 114(1), 135–142.

5. Communities That Care Youth Survey

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration

Overview:

The Communities That Care (CTC) Youth Survey was designed to assess a broad set of risk and protective factors across the domains of community, school, family, peer, and individual. The survey was developed as an evaluation and monitoring tool for the broader CTC initiative of the U.S. government’s Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration (SAMHSA). The full survey consists of 196 items with a variety of response options, including frequency and strength-of-agreement Likert scales and multiple-choice story problems. Its subscales are based on factors that had been found in previous longitudinal studies to predict drug use and/or delinquent behavior. The survey has been administered at the city- and statewide levels in multiple states and has a detailed reporting system. It has been used in a number of peer-reviewed research studies. The survey is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The CTC Youth Survey is intended for use with adolescents ranging in age from 11 to 18.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha*
Student survey (N = 94 6th- and 8th-grade public-school classrooms in Oregon)		
- Academic failure	2	0.75
- Low commitment to school	4	0.74
- Opportunities for pro-social school involvement	2	0.57
- Rewards for pro-social school involvement	3	0.62
- Rewards for pro-social community involvement	3	0.88
- Opportunities for pro-social family involvement	3	0.74

* Reported alphas are the averages of four subgroups, based on combinations of grade level (6th and 8th) and gender.

Contact:

A full version of the CTC Youth Survey is available online at <http://store.samhsa.gov>. Other private companies offer services to aid in the administration and analysis of the CTC Youth Survey, but its contents are available for public use. Contact Michael Arthur at marthur@washingtton.edu for more information about the survey.

Citation:

Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., Pollard, J. A., Catalano, R. F., and Baglioni, A. J. (2002). Measuring risk and protective factors for substance use, delinquency, and other adolescent problem behavior: The Communities That Care Youth Survey. *Evaluation Review*, 26(6), 575–601.

6. Comprehensive School Climate Inventory

National School Climate Center

Overview:

The Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI) provides feedback on how students, staff, and parents perceive their school’s climate for learning. It is intended for use as a needs assessment and as a pre-post measure of change over time. The third version of the CSCI student survey for middle school—reported on below—includes 63 total items with five-point strength-of-agreement Likert-scale response options. Information regarding the parent version of the CSCI was not readily available. The CSCI has been used as a diagnostic tool in schools across multiple states. The National School Climate Center offers a reporting system linked with technical assistance opportunities. The CSCI is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

There are different versions of the CSCI for elementary-school students, middle- and high-school students, and school personnel.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 5,182 students in a nationally representative sample of middle schools)		
- Support for learning	12	0.89
- Social support – adults	6	0.81
- Social and civic learning	6	0.84
- Adult respect	6	0.83
- Rules and norms	6	0.83
- Student-student relationships	7	0.78
- Physical and social bullying	8	0.74
- Physical surroundings	8	0.79
- Sense of security	5	0.75
- School connectedness	3	0.58
Staff survey		
- Support for learning	11	Not
- Social support – adults	8	available
- Respect and diversity	8	
- Administrator and teacher relationships	15	
- Outreach to family members	3	
- Social and civic learning	6	
- Rules and norms	5	
- Professional relationships	7	
- Physical and social bullying	6	
- Physical surroundings	4	

Contact:

Sample forms of the CSCI are available online at <http://schoolclimate.org>. The full version of the surveys is available for purchase. Contact Darlene FASTER at dfaster@schoolclimate.org for more information.

Citation:

Guo, P., Choe, J., and Higging-D’Alessandro, A. (2011). *Report of construct validity and internal consistency findings for the Comprehensive School Climate Inventory*. Available online at http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/documents/Fordham_ Univ_CSCI_development_review_2011.pdf

7. Creating a Great Place to Learn Survey

Search Institute

Overview:

The Creating a Great Place to Learn (CGPL) Survey was created by the Search Institute in order to more strongly emphasize the role that developmental assets play in shaping student learning. The CGPL includes school-climate measures as well as developmental outcome measures, including sense of belonging, achievement motivation, and academic self-efficacy. The student version comprises 55 items and the staff version comprises 76 items, all measured using 5-point Likert-scale response options (i.e., “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”). The CGPL has been tested nationally and demonstrates good reliability and validity. The survey’s emphasis on developmental assets as a key feature of school climate is unique among the school-climate measures included in this memo. It is intended as a school-level assessment. The CGPL is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The CGPL can be used with students and staff in grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 2,085 6th- through 12th-grade students in California)		
- Caring and fair staff	11	0.85
- Parental support and achievement values	5	0.75
- Student voice	4	0.64
- Safety	8	0.75
- Classroom order	3	0.71
- Peer and academic influence	3	0.51
- Academic expectations	4	0.60
- Active learning	3	0.61
- Sense of belonging	7	0.77
- Motivation	4	0.85
- Academic self-efficacy	3	0.70
Staff survey (N = 310 middle and high school staff in California)		
- Student-staff relationships	4	0.71
- Staff collective efficacy	5	0.76
- School-community relations	3	0.73
- Staff collegiality	4	0.80
- Parental involvement	2	0.78
- Administrative leadership	3	0.80
- Academic expectations	4	0.71
- Students’ commitment to learning	8	0.85
- Safety	8	0.77
- Classroom order	4	0.79
- Student voice	3	0.69
- Fairness and consistency of policies and practices	4	0.80
- Support for instructional improvement	6	0.80
- Resource adequacy	8	0.87
- Adaptive efficacy	5	0.69
- Commitment	5	0.87

Contact:

The CGPL is available for purchase on the Search Institute website at <http://www.search-institute.org>. The Survey Services Coordinator, Justin Roskopf, can be contacted at justinr@search-institute.org.

Citation:

Search Institute. (2006). *Search Institute's Creating a Great Place to Learn survey: A survey of school climate: Technical manual*. Minneapolis, MN: Author. Available online at <http://www.search-institute.org/system/files/School+Climate--Tech+Manual.pdf>

8. Culture of Excellence and Ethics Assessment

Institute for Excellence and Ethics

Overview:

The Culture of Excellence and Ethics Assessment (CEEA) is a comprehensive battery of survey tools for students, staff, and parents. It measures the extent to which the climate and culture of a school are conducive to the development of student competencies of excellence and ethics, or in other words, their academic performance and moral character. In addition, the CEEA measures whether the school is safe, supportive, and engaging for students. With background and demographic items, the student version includes 75 total items, the staff version 105 items, and parent version 54 items. All items use a 5-point Likert-scale response option (i.e., “completely disagree” to “completely agree”). The CEEA is intended for use as a diagnostic tool for schools. The CEEA differs from other school climate surveys in its emphasis on the cultural assets, or protective factors, provided by school and family culture. The Institute for Excellence and Ethics offers analytic and reporting assistance. The CEEA is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The CEEA has several versions, one of which is intended for grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 4,032 students in middle and high schools in the Eastern U.S.)		
- Student safety	5	0.86
- Faculty and staff support and engagement	10	0.91
- Staff practices supporting deeper learning	14	0.91
- Staff practices supporting positive behavior	12	0.90
- Peer behaviors supporting academic engagement	14	0.85
- Peer behaviors supporting pro-social engagement	14	0.85
Staff survey (N = 1,151 school staff in middle and high schools in the Eastern U.S.)		
- Student safety	5	0.84
- Faculty and staff support and engagement	10	0.91
- Staff practices supporting deeper learning	14	0.88
- Staff practices supporting positive behavior	12	0.86
- Peer behaviors supporting academic engagement	14	0.88
- Peer behaviors supporting pro-social engagement	14	0.85
- Leadership practices	6	0.92
- Staff beliefs and behaviors	13	0.93
- School-home communication	9	0.87
Parent survey (N = 627 parents of middle- and high-school students in the Eastern U.S.)		
- Parents' perceptions of school culture	20	0.92
- School engaging parents	13	0.87
- Parents engaging with school	5	0.64
- Learning at home/promoting excellence	13	0.85
- Parenting/promoting ethics	13	0.86

Contact:

The CEEA is available free of charge, subject to the conditions of a user agreement that can be accessed at <http://excellenceandethics.org>. Contact Vlad Khmelkov at vkhmelkov@excellenceandethics.org for more information.

Citation:

Khmelkov, V. T., and Davidson, M. L. (2011). *Culture of Excellence & Ethics Assessment: Psychometric data*. Available online at http://excellenceandethics.org/assess/CEEA_v4.5_Psychometrics_HS.pdf

9. Delaware School Climate Surveys

Delaware Positive Behavior Support Project, University of Delaware

Overview:

The Delaware School Climate Surveys (DSCS) are designed by staff at the Delaware Positive Behavior Support Project (DE-PBS) at the University of Delaware to provide schools with a brief, useful measure of school climate. There are three separate surveys: student, staff, and parent. The DSCS assess aspects of school climate that are targeted in popular bullying-prevention programs. The surveys are intended to provide schools with useful information for needs assessment, program development, and program evaluation. The student version comprises 75 items, the teacher version 68 items, and the parent version 43 items, all using 4-point frequency and strength-of-agreement Likert-scale response options. To address concerns that administering the survey would cause teachers to lose an entire period of instruction, each of the DSCS was designed to be administered in less than 20 minutes. The surveys have undergone rigorous reliability and validity testing and the subscales have been refined through theory and factor analysis.

Target age group:

The DSCS includes a student, staff, and parent version for use in grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 10,748 students in 29 public middle schools in Delaware)		
- Teacher-student relations	3	0.92
- Student relations and safety	4	0.85
- Respect for diversity	3	0.84
- Fairness of rules	3	0.79
- Clarity of expectations	3	0.78
- School safety	3	0.86
- Positive behavior techniques	4	0.79
- Punitive techniques	4	0.71
- Social emotional learning techniques	5	0.84
Staff survey (N = 1,231 staff in 29 public middle schools in Delaware)		
- Teacher-student relations	3	0.86
- Student relations and safety	4	0.89
- Respect for diversity	3	0.87
- Fairness of rules	3	0.80
- Clarity of expectations	3	0.89
- School safety	3	0.90
- Teacher-home communication	5	0.90
- Positive behavior techniques	4	0.82
- Punitive techniques	4	0.74
- Social emotional learning techniques	5	0.89
Parent survey (N = 2,353 parents of public middle-school students in Delaware)		
- Teacher-student relations	3	0.85
- Student relations and safety	4	0.89
- Respect for diversity	3	0.84
- Fairness of rules	3	0.83
- Clarity of expectations	3	0.84
- School safety	3	0.87
- Teacher-home communication	5	0.89

Contact:

Full versions of the DSCS are available online at <http://wordpress.oet.udel.edu/pbs>. Contact Erin Konrad at ekonrad@udel.edu or Sarah Hearn at skhearn@udel.edu for permissions.

Citation:

Bear, G., and Yang, C. (2011). *Delaware School Climate Survey technical manual*. Available online at <http://wordpress.oet.udel.edu/pbs/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Final-Technical-Manual.pdf>

10. Effective School Battery

Gottfredson Associations, Inc.

Overview:

The Effective School Battery (ESB) was developed by Gary Gottfredson in the early 1980s for use in assessing the climates of secondary schools. It can be used to identify a school’s strengths and weaknesses, to develop improvement plans, and to evaluate improvement projects. The ESB includes a student and teacher survey, each broken out into two parts: (1) an assessment of individual (i.e., student or teacher) characteristics and (2) a measure of school climate. The ESB school climate student survey consists of 31 items and the teacher survey 61 items. Both surveys use a variety of response options including strength-of-agreement Likert scales, frequency Likert scales, and true-false. The “planning and action” subscale refers to the degree to which a school innovates versus resisting change (e.g., “This school hardly ever tries anything new”). The ESB has been used in many empirical studies over the course of the past three decades, demonstrating strong reliability and validity. It continues to be used in contemporary research. Its practical applications include schoolwide planning and assessment, evaluation of school programs, and monitoring organizational health indicators. It is intended as a school-level assessment. The ESB is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The ESB is designed to be used in grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha*
Student survey (N = 59 nationally representative middle and high schools)		
- Safety	13	0.90
- Respect for students	3	0.82
- Planning and action	3	0.83
- Fairness of rules	3	0.76
- Clarity of rules	4	0.71
- Student influence	5	0.70
Staff survey (N = 61 nationally representative middle and high schools)		
- Safety	10	0.94
- Morale	11	0.94
- Planning and action	9	0.89
- Smooth administration	12	0.93
- Resources for instruction	4	0.81
- Race relations	2	0.74
- Parent and community involvement	6	0.81
- Student influences	5	0.85
- Avoidance of grades as sanction	2	0.65

* Internal consistencies were calculated based on school-level aggregates of items

Contact:

The ESB is available for purchase at <http://www.gottfredson.com/esborder.pdf>. Contact Gary Gottfredson at ggottfre@umd.edu for more information.

Citation:

Gottfredson, G. D. (1999). *The Effective School Battery: User’s manual*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland. Available online at <http://www.education.umd.edu/EDCP/schoolassess/Tools/ESB/ESBManualA-UMD-all.pdf>

11. 5Essentials

University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research

Overview:

The 5Essentials surveys were developed by and used in a partnership between the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR) and Chicago Public Schools (CPS). CPS uses the surveys to gather information about school quality so that it can provide proper support to help schools continuously improve. In addition to asking students about school climate, classroom environment, academic rigor, and support from parents, the student survey asks students about their experiences and feelings, such as about the support they receive from teachers, how safe they feel at school, how they feel about their school work, and their plans for the future. Both the student and teacher surveys use 4-point Likert-scale response options, either frequency or strength of agreement. Psychometric information regarding the 5Essentials surveys was not readily available. The surveys address a broad range of concepts, including some subscales not found on other school-climate surveys (e.g., future orientation, math/English instruction). CCSR surveys, including 5Essentials, have been used as diagnostic tools in CPS for almost two decades. The 5Essentials surveys are included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The 5Essentials surveys are for students and staff in grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N > 146,000)		
- Safety	4	Not available
- Academic personalism*	5	
- Expectations for postsecondary education	5	
- School-wide future orientation	6	
- Student-teacher trust	5	
Staff survey (N > 12,000)		
- Principal instructional leadership	8	Not available
- Program coherence	5	
- Teacher influence	6	
- Teacher-principal trust	8	
- Collective responsibility	6	
- School commitment	4	
- Quality professional development	5	
- Teacher-teacher trust	5	
- Outreach to parents	8	
- Human and social resources in the community	5	
- Teacher-parent trust	6	
- Quality of student discussion	5	
- Math instruction	6	
- English instruction	6	
- Course clarity	5	

* Academic personalism refers to the degree to which “teachers connect with students in the classroom and support them in achieving their goals.”

Contact:

Full 5Essentials surveys are available online at <http://cps.5-essentials.org>. Contact Loretta Morris at ccsr-survey@uchicago.edu for permissions.

Citation:

Chicago Consortium on School Research. (2011). *5 Essentials school report: The 5 Essentials full report*. Chicago: The University of Chicago. Available online at <http://cps.5-essentials.org>.

12. Inventory of School Climate

Stephen Brand

Overview:

The Inventory of School Climate (ISC) includes separate student and teacher surveys and was designed by Stephen Brand, Robert Felner, and their colleagues at the University of Rhode Island to assess dimensions of school climate that have been found to be consistently related to students’ well-being. The student survey includes 50 items and the teacher version 29 items, all using frequency Likert-scale response options (i.e., “never” to “often”). The subscales of the ISC are based on a review of school climate literature, including previous measures of school climate, as well as factor analysis. The inventory underwent a scientifically rigorous development process with large samples to ensure that it is reliable, valid, and comprehensible to middle- and high-school students. The ISC has been administered in multiple states, mostly for research and planning purposes. It is frequently cited in peer-reviewed publications. Compared to most other school-climate measures, the ISC puts greater emphasis on respect for diversity.

Target age group:

The ISC is intended for students and staff in grades 6 through 8.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 66,375 students in middle and high schools in 16 U.S. states)		
- Teacher support	6	0.76
- Clarity of rules and expectations	5	0.74
- Student commitment	5	0.81
- Negative peer interactions	5	0.73
- Positive peer interactions	5	0.70
- Disciplinary harshness	5	0.67
- Participation in decision making	5	0.70
- Innovation	4	0.63
- Support for cultural pluralism	4	0.68
- Safety problems	6	0.71
Staff survey (N = 2,950 staff in middle and high schools in 16 U.S. states)		
- Peer sensitivity	5	0.84
- Disruptiveness	5	0.86
- Teacher-pupil interactions	5	0.76
- Achievement orientation	5	0.84
- Support for cultural pluralism	5	0.78
- Safety problems	4	0.57

Contact:

A full list of ISC items is available in the publication cited below. Contact Stephen Brand at sbrand@uri.edu for permissions.

Citations:

Brand, S., Felner, R. D., Seitsinger, A. B., and Bolton, N. (2008). A large scale study of the assessment of the social environment of middle and secondary schools: The validity and utility of teachers’ ratings of school climate, cultural pluralism, and safety problems for understanding school effects and school improvement. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*(5), 507–535.

Brand, S., Felner, R., Shim, M., Seitsinger, A., and Dumas, T. (2003). Middle school improvement and reform: Development and validation of a school-level assessment of climate, cultural pluralism, and school safety. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(3), 570–588.

13. My Student Survey

Ryan Balch

Overview:

The My Student Survey (MSS) was developed by Ryan Balch at Vanderbilt University as a means of bringing student perceptions to bear on measures of teacher effectiveness. The survey comprises 63 items, which are broken into six categories that represent various roles filled by a teacher. For instance, in assessing the teacher’s effectiveness as a “presenter,” students use a frequency Likert scale response to answer such items as “When explaining new skills or ideas in class, my teacher tells us about common mistakes that a student might make.” The MSS has been shown to be highly reliable, valid, and comprehensible to middle- and high-school students. The MSS asks students to rate the frequency of their teacher’s observable behaviors (e.g., “My teacher uses examples or illustrations to help explain ideas”) rather than asking them to infer whether the teacher is effective (e.g., “Does the teacher plan a good lesson?”). The MSS has been used in Georgia as a teacher effectiveness instrument.

Target age group:

The MSS is intended for grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 12,408 middle- and high-school students in Georgia)		
- Presenter	13	0.89
- Manager	9	0.70
- Counselor	10	0.82
- Coach	13	0.82
- Motivator	10	0.85
- Expert	8	0.82

Contact:

Sample MSS items are available online at <http://mystudentsurvey.com>. Contact Ryan Balch at ryan.balch@vanderbilt.edu for information on accessing the full version.

Citation:

Balch, R. T. (2012). *The validation of a student survey on teacher practice*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

14. Pride Learning/Teaching Environment Surveys

International Survey Associates

Overview:

Pride Learning and Teaching Surveys are designed to measure school-level factors that influence students’ learning experience. The surveys initially emphasized student substance use and violent behavior, and more recent versions have added indicators of school supportiveness and engagement. The intention of the surveys is for students, teachers, and administrators to use the surveys and their results to address weaknesses within their school and to build upon its strengths. The student survey consists of 133 items and the staff survey 95 items. Both surveys use a variety of response options, including frequency and agree-disagree Likert scales. Although researchers could not locate psychometric information for the instruments, Pride surveys are reported to have “undergone more than three years of psychometric testing of responses drawn from 72,000 teachers and 240,000 students” (McGrath, n.d., p. 1). The surveys have not been referenced in empirical studies. Pride surveys are included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

Pride surveys are designed for grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey		
- School climate	Not	Not
- Student-teacher relationships at school	available	Available
- Students and learning		
- Teacher involvement		
- Students at home and in the community		
- Student alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use		
- Other student behaviors		
- Student mental health		
Staff survey		
- Career and intentions	8	Not
- School leadership	17	available
- Shared decision making	16	
- School climate	23	
- Students and learning	11	
- The teaching experience	19	

Contact:

Full versions of the Pride surveys are available online at <http://www.pridesurveys.com>. Contact Jay Gleaton at jay.gleaton@pridesurveys.com for permissions.

Citation:

McGrath, W. (n.d.). *Pride Surveys: Two powerful tools to improve teaching and learning*. Bowling Green, KY: International Survey Associates. Available online at http://www.pridesurveys.com/supportfiles/ts-ls-package2011_Long.pdf

15. Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction

Theo Wubbels

Overview:

The Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI) was developed by Dutch researcher Theo Wubbels and colleagues at the University of Utrecht in the 1990s as a means of measuring teachers' interpersonal behavior in the classroom. The QTI has since been adapted and employed in classroom-based research and teacher professional development in many countries around the world. There are two versions of the QTI: a full version with 77 items and an abbreviated version with 48 items. Both versions use 5-point frequency Likert-scale response options (i.e., "never" to "always"). The QTI has been cited frequently in empirical research around the world as a measure of classroom climate and teacher practice. It is robust psychometrically, evincing strong reliability and validity, as well as cross-cultural applicability. The QTI has been used primarily as a tool for research, although it has been used in some countries as a formative evaluation mechanism for teachers.

Target age group:

The QTI is designed for middle- and high-school students.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha (math, language)
Student survey (N = 1,973 6th-grade students in Greece) *		
- Quantity and pacing of instruction	6	0.83, 0.82
- Classroom management	6	0.82, 0.79
- Giving information	6	0.79, 0.82
- Asking questions	6	0.82, 0.79
- Providing feedback	6	0.85, 0.77
- Providing practice and application opportunities	6	0.86, 0.80
- Creating a businesslike and supportive environment	6	0.81, 0.85
- Establishing positive relationships with pupils	6	0.77, 0.80
- Having positive expectations for students	6	0.78, 0.80

* The items counts and alphas reported above are for the abbreviated 48-item version of the QTI.

Contact:

A full list of QTI items is available in the Fisher, Fraser, and Cresswell (1995) article cited below.

Contact Theo Wubbels at t.wubbels@uu.nl for permissions and more information.

Citations:

Fisher, D., Fraser, B., and Cresswell, J. (1995). Using the "Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction" in the professional development of teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 20(1), 8–18.

Kyriakides, L. (2005). Drawing from teacher effectiveness research and research into teacher interpersonal behavior to establish a teacher evaluation system: A study on the use of student ratings to evaluate teacher behaviour. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 40(2), 44–66.

16. School Climate Assessment Instrument

Alliance for the Study of School Climate

Overview:

The School Climate Assessment Instrument (SCAI) was developed by the Alliance for the Study of School Climate at California State University–Los Angeles. It is designed to help schools identify school-climate-related needs and conceptualize and evaluate interventions. The SCAI secondary student survey is made up of 57 items, the staff survey 79 items, and the parent survey 62 items. Item responses use “analytic scales,” which are 5-point Likert-type scales (“High” to “Low”), but instead of providing a statement to which the respondent indicates the strength of his or her agreement, there are specific rating anchors that define what “High,” “Middle,” or “Low” mean in the context of the item. For instance, for an item that assesses Attitude and Culture, the response “High” is labeled “Teachers share commonly high expectations for all students,” the response labeled “Middle” is labeled “Most teachers have high expectations for students who show promise,” and the response labeled “Low” is labeled “Often teachers openly express doubts about the ability of some students.” There are also “High-middle” and “Middle-low” response options without labels. The reliability and validity of the SCAI are well established and robust. The instrument has been shown to correlate strongly with student achievement scores at the school and district levels. The analytic-scale response options help clarify for the respondent exactly what the specific meaning of a scale response implies. The SCAI is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The SCAI for secondary students, staff, and parents is intended for use in grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey (N = 327 students*)		
- Physical appearance of the school	8	0.83
- Student interactions	10	0.88
- Discipline environment	10	0.91
- Learning/assessment	12	0.93
- Attitude and culture	10	0.92
- Community relations	7	0.88
Staff survey (N = 26 teachers)		
- Physical appearance of the school	8	0.80
- Faculty relations	11	0.89
- Student interactions	10	0.83
- Leadership decisions	11	0.96
- Discipline environment	10	0.80
- Learning/assessment	12	0.88
- Attitude and culture	10	0.88
- Community relations	7	0.73
Parent survey (N = 89 parents)		
- Physical appearance of the school	8	0.89
- Student interactions	10	0.90
- Leadership and decisions	11	0.90
- Discipline and management	10	0.94
- Learning/assessment	12	0.96
- Attitude and culture	10	0.94
- Community relations	7	0.87

* Specific sample information was unavailable.

Contact:

A full list of SCAI items is available online at http://www.calstatela.edu/centers/schoolclimate/assessment/school_survey.html. Contact John Shindler at jshindl@calstatela.edu for permissions and more information.

Citation:

Alliance for the Study of School Climate. (2011). *Examining the reliability and validity of the ASSC/WASSC School Climate Assessment Instrument (SCAI)*. Available online at http://www.calstatela.edu/centers/schoolclimate/research/reliability_validity.html

17. School Climate Inventory

Center for Research in Educational Policy, University of Memphis

Overview:

The School Climate Inventory (SCI), formerly the Tennessee School Climate Inventory, was developed in the 1990s by the Center for Research in Educational Policy at the University of Memphis to assess the impacts of education reform initiatives in Tennessee. The inventory helps school leaders gauge school personnel perceptions and address climate-related factors that hinder a school’s effectiveness. The SCI includes seven dimensions that are both theoretically and empirically linked with effective school organization climates. For example, “environment” refers to a positive learning environment and “involvement” to parent and community engagement with the school. The survey is intended for school staff and consists of 49 items with 5-point Likert-scale response options (i.e., “strong disagreement” to “strong agreement”). The SCI has been used for several decades as a research and evaluation tool in public school districts and has been cited in numerous empirical studies. It is the only school climate instrument reviewed here that is designed exclusively for staff. The SCI is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures.

Target age group:

The SCI is intended for school staff at all levels.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Staff survey*		
- Order	7	0.84
- Leadership	7	0.83
- Environment	7	0.81
- Involvement	7	0.76
- Instruction	7	0.75
- Expectations	7	0.73
- Collaboration	7	0.74

* Information regarding the sample was unavailable.

Contact:

The SCI is not publically available. Contact the Center for Research in Educational Policy at crep@memphis.edu for information on obtaining the SCI.

Citation:

Ross, S. M., and Lowther, D. L. (2003). Impacts of the Co-nect School Reform Design on classroom instruction, school climate, and student achievement in inner-city schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 8(2), 215–246.

18. School Climate Survey

Comer School Development Program

Overview:

The School Climate Survey (SCS), designed by the Comer School Development Program at the Yale School of Medicine in the 1990s, measures “the general tone of a school and the quality of relationships that exist among students and adults in the school building.” The SCS is part of a larger “Comer Process” initiative intended to improve the climate of participating schools to facilitate student learning and development. The student version of the survey consists of 37 items (using 3-point strength-of-agreement Likert-scale responses), the staff version 54 items, and the parent version 41 items (the latter two using 5-point Likert-scale responses). “Fairness” refers to the equal treatment of students regardless of background and “sharing of resources” refers to equal student opportunity to participate in school activities and materials. Since its inception, the SCS has been cited in a variety of empirical studies. It has also been used as a diagnostic and evaluation tool by the Comer School Development program with public school districts in multiple states. It has good psychometric properties.

Target age group:

The SCS includes a combined elementary- and middle-school version, a staff version, and a parent version.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey*		
- Fairness	5	0.83
- Order and discipline	7	0.75
- Parent involvement	5	0.68
- Sharing of resources	4	0.75
- Student interpersonal relations	7	0.84
- Student-teacher relations	9	0.87
Staff survey		
- Achievement motivation	5	0.78
- Collaborative decision-making	5	0.84
- Equity and fairness	5	0.86
- Leadership	7	0.90
- Order and discipline	9	0.93
- School building	5	0.87
- School-parent-community relations	7	0.89
- Staff dedication to student learning	5	0.85
- Staff expectations	6	0.87
Parent survey		
- Academic focus	4	0.80
- Achievement motivation	5	0.79
- Principal caring and sensitivity	7	0.94
- Collaborative decision-making	4	0.75
- Parent involvement	4	0.68
- School building	5	0.84
- School-community relations	5	0.86
- Student-teacher relations	7	0.94

* Information regarding the sample was unavailable.

Contact:

The SCS is not publically available. Contact the Comer School Development Program at schooldevelopmentprogram@yale.edu for information on obtaining the SCS.

Citation:

Comer School Development Program. (2009). *School Climate Survey*. Available online at <http://childstudycenter.yale.edu/comer/evaluation/surveys/scs/index.aspx>

19. Student Connection Survey

American Institutes for Research

Overview:

The Student Connection Survey (SCS) was developed by American Institutes for Resources (AIR) in collaboration with Chicago Public Schools in 2005 to measure the social and emotional conditions for learning. The SCS was designed to target the most important factors that schools should address if they want to improve student attendance, achievement, graduation, and postsecondary success. The SCS has been refined over several years of collaboration between AIR and partner organizations interested in students’ social and emotional learning. The items and subscales are the products of testing and vetting with stakeholders. There is empirical evidence linking the SCS’s subscales with student academic success. The SCS is included in the U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Supportive Schools compendium of school-climate measures. Information on subscale reliability, response items, and number of items could not be located.

Target age group:

The SCS is intended for grades 6 through 12.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey		
- School safety	13	Not available
o Physical safety		
o Emotional and social safety		
o Fairness and equity		
o Avoidance of risky behaviors		
- Academic rigor	17	
o High expectations		
o Strong personal motivation		
o School connection to life goals		
o Rigor of academic opportunities		
- Student support	14	
o Meaningful connection to adults		
o Strong bonds to school		
o Positive peer relationships		
o Effective and available supports		
- Social and emotional skills	11	
o Emotional intelligence and cultural competence		
o Responsibility and persistence		
o Cooperativeness		
o Contribution to school and community		

Contact:

A full list of SCS items is available online in a sample score report at http://www.air.org/focus-area/education/index.cfm?fa=viewContent&contend_id=386. Contact David Osher at dosher@air.org for permissions and more information.

Citation:

Osher, D., Kendziora, K., and Chinen, M. (2008). *Student connection research: Final narrative report to the Spencer Foundation*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

20. Tripod Survey

Cambridge Education

Overview:

The Tripod Survey instrument was developed by Ron Ferguson at Harvard University and is administered by Cambridge Education as a means of assessing students’ classroom experience. The survey focuses on the extent to which students find their classroom environment to be engaging, demanding, and supportive of their intellectual growth. It has been used as one of several measures of teacher effectiveness in the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project sponsored by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The Tripod questions are gathered into seven subscales called the Seven C’s. The Tripod includes 36 items that use a 5-point Likert-scale response option. The survey asks students if they agree or disagree with a variety of statements, including, “My teacher knows when the class understands, and when we do not” and “My teacher has several good ways to explain each topic that we cover in this class.” The Tripod is a classroom-level measure used most commonly as an indicator of teacher effectiveness and less as a measure of climate *per se*. It has been validated through association with measures of teacher “value-added,” or the degree to which teachers are thought to be responsible for changes in students’ test scores. Compared with other measures of classroom climate, Tripod is intended as more of a summative assessment.

Target age group:

The Tripod survey has been administered with students in grades 4 through 8.

Subscales and technical properties:

	# Items	Alpha
Student survey		
- Caring about students	3	*
- Captivating students	4	
- Conferring with students	5	
- Controlling behavior	7	
- Clarifying lessons	5	
- Challenging students	8	
- Consolidating knowledge	4	

* Specific internal consistencies are unavailable but according to Kane and Cantrell (2010), they are “in the range of 0.80 and above” (p. 14).

Contact:

The Tripod Survey is not available publically. Contact Joe McEvoy at joe@tripodproject.org for information on obtaining the Tripod Survey.

Citation:

Kane, T. J., and Cantrell, S. (2010). *Learning about teaching: Initial findings from the Measures of Effective Teaching project*. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Appendix A: Coding process for instrument subscales

Table 1 in the memorandum was the product of a qualitative coding procedure. The first step in this process involved populating a list of all of the subscales of instruments included in this memorandum. This resulted in a list of approximately 180 student-survey subscales, 110 staff-survey subscales, and 50 parent-survey subscales. The second step was to group the subscales into themes. In some cases this was straightforward, such as when multiple subscales had the same name and similar items. The third step used a constant comparative procedure to finalize thematic categories. Constant comparative analysis is an inductive, theory-building tool (Glaser 1965), but here it was employed to distill themes among the climate instruments. It requires taking one piece of data (in this case, one subscale name) at a time and comparing it to all other pieces of data in that thematic category and related thematic categories with the goal of integrating categories where there is sufficient overlap or creating new categories where there is sufficient difference. For example, the decision was made to combine “bullying” and “safety” into the same thematic category, as there was overlap in the types of items that loaded onto the subscales included in each of these categories. The results of this process are the 15 subscale themes listed in tables 1a, 1b, and 1c.