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A Framework of Essential Supports

Leadership as the Driver for Change

- Professional Capacity
- School Learning Climate
- Parent, School, Community Ties

The School Organization System
- Classroom Black Box
- Instructional Guidance

CCSR
Likelihood of Substantial Improvement, Given Weak or Strong Supports

Reading

Percentage of Schools that Substantially Improved in Reading

- School Leadership: Weak 11%, Strong 43%
- Parent Involvement: Weak 10%, Strong 40%
- Work Orientation: Weak 9%, Strong 47%
- Safety & Order: Weak 10%, Strong 36%
- Curriculum Alignment: Weak 10%, Strong 45%
Schools with strong teacher cooperative relationships focused on curricular alignment were very likely to show substantial academic improvements.
Schools did not improve attendance if their learning climate was unsafe/disorderly and instruction was weak.
## Relationships of Essential Supports with Improvements in Value-Added, 1997-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Support</th>
<th>Effect of strength in base year</th>
<th>Effect of improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program coherence</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent community ties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent involvement in the school</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective dialogue</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective responsibility</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation toward innovation</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School commitment</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-centered learning climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent CCSR Research

Attendance, grades and pass rates are higher in schools with stronger:

- Instruction
- Student-centered climates
  - Teacher-student relationships
  - Safety
- Teacher collaboration
  - Collective responsibility
  - Instructional program coherence
Recent CCSR Research

Teachers remain in schools with stronger:

- Student-centered climates
  - Safety
- Teacher collaboration
  - Collective responsibility
  - Innovation
- Parent involvement
  - Teacher-parent trust
- Leadership
  - Program coherence
  - Teacher influence
  - Instructional leadership
## Classification of School Communities by Students’ Racial/Ethnic and SES Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Percent African American</th>
<th>Percent Latino</th>
<th>Percent White</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truly Disadvantaged</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Low SES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$19,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American Moderate SES</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$33,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Minority</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$23,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Diverse</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$33,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Integrated</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$37,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stagnation or Substantial Improvement in Reading by Race/Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status of Students and Their Communities

- Truly Disadvantaged: 46 schools, 15 stagnated, 31 substantially improved (Expected: 25%)
- African-American, Low SES: 95 schools, 24 stagnated, 23 substantially improved
- African-American, Average to Moderate SES: 74 schools, 20 stagnated, 18 substantially improved
- Predominantly Minority: 45 schools, 31 stagnated, 18 substantially improved
- Predominantly Latino: 39 schools, 31 stagnated, 15 substantially improved
- Racially Diverse: 34 schools, 15 stagnated, 9 substantially improved
- Racially Integrated: 57 schools, 35 stagnated, 42 substantially improved

Legend: Blue = Stagnant, Purple = Substantially Improved
Data on Community Characteristics

Bonding Social Capital

- Collective Efficacy
- Religious Participation
- Crime statistics for school neighborhood and students’ neighborhoods

Bridging Social Capital

- Contacts with people in other neighborhoods

Percent of Students Who Were Abused or Neglected
Odds of Substantial Improvement in Reading Compared to Integrated Schools, Unadjusted and Adjusted

- Truly Disadvantaged
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital
  - Adjusted for social capital and density of abuse and neglect

- African-American Low SES
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital

- African-American Moderate SES
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital
  - Adjusted for social capital and density of abuse and neglect

- Predominantly Minority
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital

- Predominantly Latino
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital

- Racially Diverse
  - Unadjusted
  - Adjusted for bonding social capital
  - Adjusted for bonding and bridging social capital
  - Adjusted for social capital and density of abuse and neglect
Influence of Bonding and Bridging Social Capital on Essential Supports

Percentage of Schools with Strong Essential Supports in 1994

- Religious Participation: 39% (High)
- Collective Efficacy: 38% (High)
- Outside Connections: 33% (High)

Expected: 20%

Legend:
- Low
- High
Influence of Crime and Abuse and Neglect on Essential Supports

Crime Density of Abused or Neglected Students

Percentage of Schools with Strong Essential Supports in 1994

- Crime: Expected: 20%, Actual: 4%
- Density of Abused or Neglected Students: Expected: 20%, Actual: 40%

High Rate: □
Low Rate: ■
For more information....

About the book:
Email: organizingschools@ccsr.uchicago.edu
Website: ccsr.uchicago.edu/osfi
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