



Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

University Honors Program Theses

2014

Teachers' Perceptions of Scripted Education

Alexa M. Lowery Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses
Part of the <u>Curriculum and Instruction Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

 $Lowery, Alexa\ M., "Teachers'\ Perceptions\ of\ Scripted\ Education"\ (2014).\ University\ Honors\ Program\ Theses.\ 13.$ https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/13

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Program Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Running head: TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF SCRIPTED EDUCATION

Teachers' Perceptions of Scripted Education

An Honors Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in the College of Education

By Alexa M. Lowery

Under the mentorship of Dr. Lina Soares

ABSTRACT

The purpose of my study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of scripted techniques using state mandated standards and the techniques' impact on student performance. I surveyed the teachers of elementary schools in Edwards County (pseudonym) and found that most teachers are not using the standards as they were originally intended, and they feel that students are falling behind because the standards are not developmentally appropriate.

Thesis Mentor:	
	Dr. Lina Soares
Honors Director:	
	Dr. Steven Engel

April 2014 College of Education University Honors Program Georgia Southern University

Introduction

Thirty years ago, reports claimed we were a 'nation at risk' due to our declining educational system (1983). We were at risk because the typical graduate from a school in the United States at that time was less educated than a typical graduate twenty-five to thirty-five years prior (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The National Commission on Excellence in Education wrote the aptly named report "A Nation at Risk" in April 1983 after eighteen months of study to change the way America educates its children and to improve the quality of schools across the country. Later in 1983, the state superintendent of California public schools Bill Honig began developing content standards and curriculum frameworks to revise the state public school system; a process which took ten years. However, the standards movement had begun and in 1987, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics also began going over curriculum documents and writing standards for curriculum and evaluation, which were published in 1989 under the title "Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics." At the same time, President George H. W. Bush and the fifty governors of the United States adopted the National Education Goals to be met by 2000. In his 1990 State of the Union address, President George H.W. Bush stated the National Education Goals. By advancing state and local reform efforts and promoting challenging academic standards, the National Education Goals have changed the landscape of education in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 1995). The New Standards Project was formed to create student performance standards. Soon after, the Secretary of Education Lamar Alexander created the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, and in 1992 the council released a report entitled "Raising Standards for American Education," which

proposed the creation of another board to certify content, performance standards, and criteria for assessments. In the following years, standards were developed and published for social studies, physical education, the arts, civics and government, geography, health, English Language Arts, foreign language, science, technology, English as a Second Language, and math (Kendall & Marzano, 2012).

There are many mixed feelings about standards-based education in the school community. An article in *The Reading Teacher* stated a "major criticism of standards-based school reform is that it misses the mark" (Valencia & Villarreal, 2003, p. 612). The authors argue the standards put students in a box, which causes them to fail, particularly minority students in reading education. Michael Apple, in the *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, says there is much he supports in the standards, and he talks about the broad-based manner of the standards so they would be accepted into classroom curriculum (1992). He also notes: "Whether it was actually taught in the manner in which its developers wanted is another issue, of course" (p. 414).

There is limited evidence on the results of standards-based reforms and whether the reform efforts help to improve student learning. However, the development of standards continue, and bring with them a list of specific mandates and requirements teachers must meet. The statement of purpose in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was:

to ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on all challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments by ensuring that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teachers

preparation and training, curriculum, and instructional materials are aligned with challenging State academic standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student academic achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 15).

Some states require teachers to post the standards in their classrooms and review state standards before each lesson. The technique was designed to introduce the topic with students and raise awareness of the intended goal of the activity. This practice raises questions as to whether teachers feel the standards are being used as they were intended. From that stance, the purpose of my study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of scripted techniques using state mandated standards and the techniques' impact on student performance.

Literature Review

The literature review begins by explaining how early childhood academic standards have been defined, who created them, and where they came from. The review then moves into how they have been implemented in schools and the ways in which standards are appropriate and effective. Finally, the review concludes with a summary of the research which has been done about early learning standards and standard implementation, and the research which is lacking, which my proposed study will cover.

The Standards Movement

McClure (2005) wrote an article explaining how learning standards were developed. Before learning standards were developed, there were standards for time, textbooks, and teacher's working conditions, but standards were needed for what was actually being taught. There were many different beliefs and assumptions about public

education, but nothing substantial. She asserts the standards movement began originally during the struggle for equal educational opportunity. Students were being classified by everything from race to socioeconomic status, and the groups were being held to different standards depending on what was believed they could do. Variation among student abilities allowed administrators' and teachers' biases to surface in the classroom. The learning standards movement was meant to address the inequity of providing different types and quality of education for different groups of students. Establishing learning standards for all children in each grade level in all schools ensured all students would be taught to the same level, and would help close the achievement gap.

Kagan and Scott-Little (2004) define early learning standards as "what young children should know and be able to do" (p. 390). In their study of all fifty states, they found twenty seven of the states have documents to set standards for the learning and development of young children. Twelve states were in the process of developing early learning standards at the time of the study, and the remaining eleven states did not have them and were not working on creating them. Each respondent specified the early learning standards in his or her state related to the standards for kindergarten through twelfth grade, but in varying degrees. The study classified fifteen of the state's early learning standards as directly related to the kindergarten through twelfth grade standards. Eight states have made their early learning standards "voluntary," where resources were made available and teachers could choose whether or not to use them. Kagan and Scott-Little (2004) found the early learning standards were developed to improve instruction in all states, but the states vary as to how they are utilizing the early learning standards to develop instruction. Eight states have programs in place to train educators on using the

early learning standards, but the majority are simply handing out the documents with little to no training. The lack of training is why there is a misuse of standards.

Griffith's study (2008) suggested two ways to evaluate the quality of education. He defined quality as "the extent to which the delivery of school curriculum is realizing the learning outcomes established in the educational standards" (p. 102). However, in order to assess quality in education, Griffith states appropriate educational standards for students must be established. He lists six traits which make good educational standards, such as subject specificity and comprehensibility, but does not go into the way educational standards are implemented in the classroom, only stating they are guidelines for educators to create their curricula around. The two proposed types of evaluations were relative achievement assessments to measure how well the process of teaching and learning was working for students to achieve the outcomes listed in the educational standards and absolute achievement assessments to measure to what extent students were meeting the outcomes.

Several studies describe why learning standards are needed and define what they are, but the above authors are writing in a larger general sense. The next section discusses standards specifically in the early childhood setting. In my search for research on standards in elementary education I found limited work on the subject. Most of the research found was completed in the early childhood settings on pre-kindergarten and kindergarten levels. This study will build on the findings of early childhood research since little is documented on the middle or upper elementary grade levels. The following studies show the impact of learning standards on student performance and achieving mastery.

Standards and Early Childhood Education

Frelow, Kagan, and Scott-Little (2006) conducted a content analysis on forty six early learning standards documents to determine the content included in them and the extent to which they align with developmentally appropriate practices for preschool children. They found the early learning standards stress language and cognitive domains while they tend to leave out areas in learning and development. They also found the standards place more importance on different areas depending on who wrote them and their views, and the authors' views may not match up with the theory and research on children's early learning and development.

Gentile and Lalley (2009) examined what they call "the defining features of mastery" (p. 28) in their article *Classroom Assessment and Grading to Ensure Mastery*. They state for students to have mastered a subject they must meet the performance standard in a criterion-referenced, not norm-referenced, method. For mastery to be applied, there must be set mastery objectives in the standards for students to meet before moving on to more difficult subjects which build on prior knowledge and, as the first defining feature states, the objectives must be explicitly stated and published. The second defining feature declares standards need to be set high enough so all students have to work toward mastery. Initial mastery may be obtained on the first try with a score of one hundred percent on a test, but enrichment activities are still needed for a student who has obtained initial mastery so he or she will not forget the material after the test is over.

Gentile and Lalley (2009) also state by giving formative assessment feedback, rather than just a grade, the standards can be continually raised as students continually improve. The third defining feature suggests teachers give a criterion-referenced test, reteach for

students who did not pass and allow students who did pass to work on enrichment activities or peer tutor their classmates, and then retake a parallel form of the test. The final defining feature of mastery includes using enrichment activities as a grading incentive to encourage students to achieve more than initial mastery. Using the four defining features of mastery will ensure all students achieve mastery learning in the classroom.

Standard Implementation in Early Childhood and Elementary Education

Feldman (2010) outlined an approach to use standards and assessments while still keeping the curriculum child-centered by conducting a study on 237 children aged ten months to kindergarten who participated in the Family Connections program at The Children's Museum in Seattle, Washington. Feldman says most forms of assessment at the early childhood level are informal observation, but informal observation can be used to see if students are meeting the standards. One method she suggests is called match measure. When using match measure the teacher predicts what standards will be met, and then observes the children in an activity. He or she makes notes about the children's activities, and then matches the activities to standards which either are or are not being met, and adjusts the curriculum accordingly. The second method is open-ended measure. In open-ended measure the teacher observes the activities of the students which go outside of the set standards. The open-ended measure gives children the opportunity to participate in more activities than just what is stated in the standard and allows them to think in their own ways.

Adams, Baldwin, and Kelly (2009) designed a play-based curriculum, while still including the content standards for pre-school age children. They implemented what is

called the ACCESS Curriculum Framework at the Bombeck Family Learning Center, specifically in the area of science. The ACCESS Curriculum Framework allowed the students to direct learning by teaching about their interests and linking their interests to the standards. Teachers were able to incorporate the framework in three very different ways: as part of the daily routine, as an extended investigation, or as a skill-based lesson. By teaching according to student interests and the standards, the ACCESS Curriculum Framework allowed the Bombeck Family Learning Center to stay a child-centered program while preparing children for kindergarten by utilizing standards.

Brookshire, Grisham-Brown, and Hallam (2006) implemented the LINK model in nine Head Start preschool classrooms to promote linkage of curriculum and assessment to the Head Start standards which had been previously implemented. The LINK model had three main features for teachers to use. First, they were to use recommended, developmentally appropriate practices during assessments. Second, they should be using authentic assessments which had a clear connection to their curriculum. And third, they should be sure their assessments align with the standards. The LINK model was created to improve early learning assessments and to keep teachers accountable to the standards.

Celio, Hill, Lake, and O'Toole (1999) studied forty elementary schools in the state of Washington to discover whether the standards-based reform strategy was effective. They collected data over two years from the Washington Assessment of Student Learning, which is taken in the fourth grade. First, their results showed in order to be effective, changes must be focused and school-wide. The teachers must be unified and work together as a team, not as independent bodies. Second, the results pointed to schools needing to focus on developing children's skills in a few core areas and get rid of

activities which were not useful in order to improve. Third, the improving schools strategically planned out their professional development so the programs focused on the needs the school had and could help teachers improve in areas where they were weak. They also intentionally planned out the funds and resources they had based on their priorities. Fourth, they found performance pressure will always exist, but the key is to use the pressure to encourage determination, not fear of tests. Fifth, principals who knew their schools needed help sought out assistance without waiting for help to fall in their laps. They found help from parents and other sources from their school districts. This study shows the need for a clear direction for standards-based reforms to work. Teachers need to understand the goals behind the standard and how to implement them in the classroom in order for the standards to be effective.

Mason, Mason, Mendez, Nelson, and Orwig (2005) conducted a study of second through fifth grade students in one hundred eighty nine schools in the Jurupa Unified School District to find a solution to the poor implementation of standards-based reform. The No Child Left Behind Act mandated schools operate under a system of standards and assessment to improve the quality of education. Their proposed solution was called a "top-down bottom-up" approach, in which top-down reforms were based on research and theory and bottom-up reforms allowed teachers to have a part in constructing the changes. The authors suggested the "top-down bottom-up" approach because previous reforms had done nothing to close the education gap between social classes because "educational reforms often go awry in implementation" (p. 354). Because reforms often go wrong when being implemented, part of their proposed plan was based on research and theory on how the approach should be implemented in a classroom setting. The study

implemented many different top-down bottom-up reforms in one school district and studied student's achievement and how teachers perceived the reform efforts. Teachers responded the standards were more likely to be well-implemented because they had a part in creating them. The reforms also brought about improved student achievement on criterion-referenced tests.

Summary

While research is widely available about standards-based education, there are some gaps in the literature. Much of the research which has been done about standards in the early childhood setting includes early learning standards for preschools. Some research investigates what makes a good or effective standard and considerable research has been done on linking assessments to the standards and making assessments developmentally appropriate, but the research leaves out how teachers should apply standards in the classroom. Some of the research says the standards are being misused in the classroom because the teachers are not being trained on how to use them, and one study attempted to find a solution to the poor implementation of the standards.

For purposes of my study, I further investigated the misuse of the standards by studying how the original purpose for the standards gets lost among all the requirements specific school districts and state departments of education create and enforce based on research that focused on standards. Specifically, I further researched Gentile and Lalley's (2009) finding which said the objectives, or standards, must be explicitly stated and published for students to reach mastery. My research adds to the already available literature by expanding on the use and misuse of the standards. I investigated the implementation of learning standards by exploring the use of standards and teachers'

perceptions of using scripted standards. Pursuant to the purpose of this study and my own interest, the following research questions guided this study:

- 1. What are teachers' perceptions of using scripted techniques in state mandated standards?
- 2. What differences do teachers observe in student performance when implementing the scripted techniques in state mandated standards?

Methodology

In order to understand teachers' perceptions of the scripted techniques using state mandated standards and the impact on students' performance, a mixed methods research design was used for this study and supported by pragmatism. The pragmatic paradigm places "the research problem" as central and applies all approaches to understanding the problem (Creswell, 2003, p. 11). The pragmatic paradigm is informed by both quantitative and qualitative data. It includes both qualitative and quantitative research methods, allowing for one approach to inform the other. This mixed-method study was conducted in one phase. The quantitative data was collected through online surveys in Qualtrics Online Survey System, and through paper copies of the survey sent to one of the elementary schools.

Setting and Participants

There are 14 schools in Edwards County (pseudonym), eight of which are elementary schools where I conducted my research. These schools employ the 500 full time teachers who teach the 5575 students. Of these students, 4292 are white, 768 are black, 261 are Hispanic, 188 are biracial, and 66 are of another race ("Guyton Elementary Schools," n.d.). Sandra Nethels, Special Programs Coordinator for the Edwards Board of

Education, informed me via email that Edwards County requires teachers to use the language of the standards and create essential questions (personal communication, September 17, 2013). I surveyed Pre-Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers throughout the county and had 33 of these teachers return my survey.

Data Collection

The Edwards County School Board was approached about their interest in participating in a study on standards based curriculum in Edwards County. Upon receiving IRB approval, I requested written permission from local school principals to move forward with the surveys. After receiving permission from the local school principals, an electronic survey link was sent to the teachers at all elementary schools in Edwards County (see appendix A for the survey questions). Teachers had two weeks to complete the survey. The school principals were asked to remind their teachers about the survey and their submissions. After the surveys were submitted, paper copies were delivered to one elementary school to reach more participants. After receiving these surveys, an initial round of analysis commenced.

Results

Research Question 1.

The first research question asked: What are teachers' perceptions of using scripted techniques in sate mandated standards? Using descriptive statistics, such as frequency counts and percentages to detail the population and overall response to the survey items, data analysis showed varying opinions about the standards. The results for research question one are reported in different aggregates based on participants' survey responses: (1) by grade level, (2) the subject they taught, (3) their number of years of

experience, and (4) whether the participants use traditional or differentiated teaching techniques (see Appendixes B, C, D, and E). Overwhelmingly, teachers from every grade and subject did not expect the same level of performance from all students, and still would not expect this same level of performance if there were no standards. In addition, teachers from every category, including those who labeled their teaching style as "traditional," reported that they differentiate their instruction just as much as they did before the standards, so it seems that standardization is not hurting differentiated instruction.

Research Question 2.

Research question 2 asked: What differences do teachers observe in student performance when implementing the scripted techniques in state mandated standards? Using inductive coding to prepare a thematic analysis, the following theme is that the majority of teachers perceive students' language skills have weakened and are falling further behind (Leininger, 1985).

Discussion

The survey data determined teachers' perceptions of using scripted techniques in state mandated standards. According to survey item five, the majority of teachers believe in the purpose of the standards, to make education fair and equal for all students, as was stated in McClure's 2005 article "Where the Standards Come From." However, most teachers disagreed with item six, meaning they do not expect the same level of performance from all students, even though they know this is what the standards were created to do. Frelow, Kagan, and Scott-Little (2006) found that the standards' appropriateness and areas of focus differed depending on who was creating them. For

item eight, the majority of third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers thought the standards were developmentally appropriate for their grade level. Kagan and Scott-Little's study (2004) found that only eight states had programs in place to train teachers on how to use early learning standards. Celio, Hill, Lake, and O'Toole (1999) found that teachers need to be trained on the goals behind the standards and how to implement them in the classroom, in order for the standards to be effective. The majority of first grade teachers were the only group to say they did not feel like they had adequate training on how to use the standards in their classroom in response to item nine. Gentile and Lalley (2009) said that objectives must be explicitly stated and published so that students will know what standard they must meet before moving on to more difficult subjects, and that standards must be set high enough that all students have to work to achieve mastery. To answer item thirteen, the majority of first grade teachers said they do not state their standard before they teach, so first grade students may not understand what goal they are working towards. Only third grade teachers felt that the standards allow all students to achieve mastery as indicated in item fifteen, but most teachers do believe the standards are set high enough that all students must work to reach them and they give assessments that align with the standards, according to items sixteen and seventeen. Griffith's study (2008) suggested that assessments must be given to monitor how the process of teaching and learning was working for students to achieve the standards, and teachers believe they are doing this. Feldman (2010) found that you can observe students in activities outside of the standards to see what students may be learning. For items nineteen and twenty, all the teachers agreed that they do activities related to the standards, and the majority of teachers of Kindergarten through fourth grade reported that their students also do

activities that go beyond the standards. Most second grade teachers agreed that they do not differentiate their instruction as much now as they did before the standards as stated in item twenty-one.

In the survey, teachers were asked one open ended question to address the issue of whether or not teachers have perceived changes in the students since using the standards. Three of the first grade teachers reported negative changes in their students. These teachers answered that there was a weakness in phonics and decoding skills because of the new emphasis on whole group close reads and writing. The teachers reported they must fight to include time in the day for reading and phonics instruction. They also feel that individual student needs are not as focused on as they once were so struggling students are having more difficulty than in the traditional setting. Second grade teachers answered that while there are some frustrations, they have noticed students' problem solving skills increase. Fourth grade teachers agreed with the first grade teachers that there is more of an emphasis on writing, but they say their students' writing is not improving. They also report the students feel dumber and stress more about testing. Celio, Hill, Lake, and O'Toole (1999) found that teachers must use performance pressure to encourage determination, rather than fear of tests. Finally, fifth grade teachers said that because the students do more writing, they have improved in this area and do not seem to fear writing as they did before.

Conclusion

I conducted this study to investigate teachers' perceptions of scripted techniques using state mandated standards and the techniques' impact on student performance. There was limited research on this topic on the elementary level, so my study would add to the

research that had already been conducted on the early-learning level. I found that teachers perceive the standards as not being developmentally appropriate and are therefore causing students to struggle. Teachers also responded to the survey that they are not expecting the same level of performance from all students when using the standards, even though they know this is why the standards were created.

Implications

It is now up to the teachers to take these standards and make them appropriate for the grade and subject they teach. Pre-service teachers need to have extensive training on the standards and how to use them in the classroom setting to their fullest potential.

Classroom teachers need continual professional development on the standards because they are always changing.

Recommendations

If this study were to be done again, I would take more time to conduct the study with a wider range of teachers to receive more responses. This would aid in the accuracy of my results. I would also like to conduct interviews with some of the teachers for triangulation. This would give more depth to my study and allow me to find out more of what teachers think than simple ratings on a survey.

References

- Adams, S. M., Baldwin, J. L., & Kelly, M. K. (2009). Science at the center: An emergent, standards-based, child-centered framework for early learners. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *37*, 71-77.
- Apple, M. W. (1992). Do the standards go far enough? Power, policy, and practice in mathematics education. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 23(5), 412-431.
- Brookshire, R., Grisham-Brown, J., & Hallam, R. (2006). Using authentic assessment to evidence children's progress toward early learning standards. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *34* (1), 45-51.
- Celio, M. B., Hill, P. T., Lake, R. J., & O'Toole, L. (1999). Making standards work: A case study of Washington state. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/makingstandardswork.html
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* approaches (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Feldman, E. N. (2010). Benchmarks curricular planning and assessment framework:

 Utilizing standards without introducing standardization. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 1-10.
- Frelow, V. S., Kagan, S. L., & Scott-Little C. (2006). Conceptualization of readiness and the content of early learning standards: The intersection of policy and research?

 Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 21 (2), 153-173.
- Gentile, J. R., & Lalley, J. P. (2009). Classroom assessment and grading to assure mastery. *Theory Into Practice*, 48, 28-35.

- Griffith, S. A. (2008). A proposed model for assessing quality of education. *International Review of Education*, *54*, 99-112.
- Guyton Elementary Schools. In Public Schools K12. Retrieved from http://publicschoolsk12.com/elementary-schools/ga/effingham-county/
- Kagan S. L., & Scott-Little, C. (2004). Early learning standards: Changing the parlance and practice of early childhood education?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 388-395.
- Kendall, J. S., & Marzano, R. J. (2012). Content knowledge. Retrieved from http://www2.mcrel.org/compendium/docs/purpose.asp
- Leininger, M. M. (1985). Ethnography and ethnonursing: Models and modes of qualitative data analysis. In M. M. Leininger (Ed.). *Qualitative research methods in nursing* (pp. 33-72). Orlando, FL: Grune & Stratton.
- Mason, B., Mason, D. A., Mendez, M., Nelsen, G, & Orwig, R. (2005). Effects of top-down and bottom-up elementary school standards reform in an underperforming California district. *The Elementary School Journal*, *105* (4), 353-376.
- McClure, P. (2005). Where standards come from. Theory into Practice, 44 (1), 4-10.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1995, May). Goals 2000: A progress report. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/goals/progrpt/index.html#toc
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002, January). No child left behind act of 2001.

 Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf

Valencia, R. R., & Villarreal, B. J. (2003, April). Improving students' reading performance via standards-based school reform: A critique. *The Reading Teacher*, 56 (7), 612-621.

Appendix A

(to be converted into Qualtrics)

Teacher's Perception of Scripted Standards Based Curriculum

For the purpose of this survey, "standards" refers to the Common Core and Georgia

Performance Standards for your grade level. "Mastery" means the students meet the

performance standard in a criterion-referenced method.

Demographic

1.	What	grade	do	you	teach?	(Click	all	that	apply	y)
----	------	-------	----	-----	--------	--------	-----	------	-------	----

Pre-K K 1^{st} 2^{nd} 3^{rd} 4^{th} 5^{th}

2. What subjects do you teach? (Click all that apply)

Reading Language Arts Math Science Social Studies PE Computer Science

3. How long have you taught at the elementary level?

1-3 years 3-5 years 6-8 years 8-10 years 10 years or more

4. What teaching techniques do you use most often?

Traditional Differentiated

Read each of the following statements. Using the scale to the left, click the response that best describes how true each statement is for you.

1=Strongly disagree

2=Disagree

3=Neither agree nor disagree

4=Agree

5=Strongly agree

- 5. I believe the original purpose behind the standards as stated in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001to ensure "that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on all challenging State academic achievement standards and state academic assessments."
- 6. Because of the scripts and standards, I expect the same level of performance from all students.
- 7. If there were no standards, I would still expect the same level of performance from all students.
- 8. The standards are developmentally appropriate for the grade I teach.
- 9. I had adequate training on how to use the standards in my classroom.
- 10. My school provides me with professional development in areas I feel weak.
- 11. I work with a group of teachers to plan lessons on the standards.
- 12. I have the standards posted in my classroom.
- 13. I state the standard I am covering before each lesson.
- 14. I give students feedback, rather than just numerical/letter grades.
- 15. The standards allow all students to achieve mastery.
- 16. The standards are set high enough that all students must work to reach them.
- 17. The assessments I give are in line with the standards.
- 18. My students do activities that relate to their interests and meet the standards.
- 19. My students do activities that go beyond the standards.
- 20. My students do activities related to the standards.

- 21. Because of standardization, I do not differentiate my instruction as much as I did before the standards.
- 22. Were there any changes you noticed in your students since the use of standards based curriculum?

Appendix B

Statement Agreement (%) by Grade

Statement	Kinder	1 st	2 nd grade	3 rd	4 th	5 th
		grade		grade	grade	grade
I believe the original purpose behind the standards as stated in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001to ensure "that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on all challenging State academic achievement standards and state	100%	100%	67%	50%	83%	100%
academic assessments." Because of the scripts and standards, I expect the same level of performance from all students.	0%	17%	0%	0%	33%	60%
If there were no standards, I would still expect the same level of performance from all students.	0%	17%	33%	50%	33%	40%
The standards are developmentally appropriate for the grade I teach.	33%	17%	33%	75%	50%	60%
I had adequate training on how to use the standards in my classroom.	100%	33%	100%	50%	67%	100%
My school provides me with professional development in areas I feel weak.	100%	67%	100%	75%	83%	100%
I work with a group of teachers to plan lessons on the standards.	100%	83%	100%	75%	83%	100%
I have the standards	67%	67%	75%	50%	40%	100%

posted in my classroom.						
I state the standard I am covering before each lesson.	100%	17%	100%	75%	50%	60%
I give students feedback, rather than just numerical/letter grades.	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	60%
The standards allow all students to achieve mastery.	33%	0%	33%	75%	17%	0%
The standards are set high enough that all students must work to reach them.	100%	100%	100%	50%	83%	100%
The assessments I give are in line with the standards.	100%	83%	100%	100%	83%	75%
My students do activities that relate to their interests and meet the standards.	100%	33%	100%	100%	50%	40%
My students do activities that go beyond the standards.	100%	50%	100%	100%	67%	40%
My students do activities related to the standards.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Because of standardization, I do not differentiate my instruction as much as I did before the standards.	0%	33%	67%	25%	33%	20%

Statement Agreement (%) by Subject Taught

Statement	Read	LA	Math	Sci	SS
I believe the original purpose behind	92%	91%	89%	85%	86%
the standards as stated in the No					
Child Left Behind Act of 2001to					
ensure "that all children have a fair,					
equal, and significant opportunity to					
obtain a high-quality education and					
reach, at a minimum, proficiency on					
all challenging State academic					
achievement standards and state					
academic assessments."					
Because of the scripts and standards,	29%	18%	17%	20%	19%
I expect the same level of					
performance from all students.					
If there were no standards, I would	25%	27%	33%	35%	33%
still expect the same level of					
performance from all students.					
The standards are developmentally	33%	36%	39%	45%	43%
appropriate for the grade I teach.					
I had adequate training on how to use	63%	68%	72%	75%	76%
the standards in my classroom.					
My school provides me with	83%	86%	94%	95%	90%
professional development in areas I					
feel weak.					
I work with a group of teachers to	92%	95%	94%	90%	90%
plan lessons on the standards.					
I have the standards posted in my	63%	68%	83%	80%	81%
classroom.					
I state the standard I am covering	58%	64%	72%	70%	71%
before each lesson.					
I give students feedback, rather than	92%	91%	89%	85%	86%
just numerical/letter grades.					
The standards allow all students to	21%	23%	22%	25%	24%
achieve mastery.					
The standards are set high enough	88%	86%	94%	90%	90%
that all students must work to reach					
them.					
The assessments I give are in line	83%	86%	94%	95%	95%
with the standards.					
My students do activities that relate	58%	59%	78%	80%	76%
to their interests and meet the					
standards.					
My students do activities that go	63%	64%	78%	85%	86%

beyond the standards.					
My students do activities related to	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
the standards.					
Because of standardization, I do not	25%	27%	28%	30%	29%
differentiate my instruction as much					
as I did before the standards.					

Appendix D

Statement Agreement (%) by Teaching Experience

Statement	1-3 years	3-5 years	6-8 years	8-10 years	10+ years
I believe the original purpose	100%	100%	100%	67%	87%
behind the standards as stated in					
the No Child Left Behind Act of					
2001to ensure "that all children					
have a fair, equal, and significant					
opportunity to obtain a high-					
quality education and reach, at a					
minimum, proficiency on all					
challenging State academic					
achievement standards and state					
academic assessments."					
Because of the scripts and	0%	0%	67%	0%	22%
standards, I expect the same					
level of performance from all					
students.					
If there were no standards, I	0%	100%	67%	33%	30%
would still expect the same level					
of performance from all					
students.					
The standards are	67%	100%	33%	0%	43%
developmentally appropriate for					
the grade I teach.					
I had adequate training on how	100%	100%	33%	33%	74%
to use the standards in my					
classroom.					
My school provides me with	100%	100%	67%	100%	87%
professional development in					
areas I feel weak.					
I work with a group of teachers	100%	100%	33%	67%	100%
to plan lessons on the standards.					
I have the standards posted in	33%	100%	33%	100%	65%
my classroom.					
I state the standard I am covering	33%	100%	33%	100%	61%
before each lesson.					
I give students feedback, rather	100%	100%	67%	100%	87%
than just numerical/letter grades.					
The standards allow all students	0%	100%	33%	33%	22%
to achieve mastery.					
The standards are set high	67%	100%	67%	100%	91%
enough that all students must					
work to reach them.					
The assessments I give are in	100%	0%	67%	100%	83%
line with the standards.					
My students do activities that	100%	100%	33%	100%	65%

relate to their interests and meet					
the standards.					
My students do activities that go	100%	100%	33%	67%	74%
beyond the standards.					
My students do activities related	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
to the standards.					
Because of standardization, I do	33%	0%	33%	33%	22%
not differentiate my instruction					
as much as I did before the					
standards.					

Statement Agreement (%) by Teaching Technique

Statement	Traditional	Differentiated
I believe the original purpose behind the standards as stated in	92%	83%
the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001to ensure "that all children		
have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-		
quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on all		
challenging State academic achievement standards and state		
academic assessments."		
Because of the scripts and standards, I expect the same level of	31%	17%
performance from all students.		
If there were no standards, I would still expect the same level of	31%	33%
performance from all students.		
The standards are developmentally appropriate for the grade I	46%	39%
teach.		
I had adequate training on how to use the standards in my	85%	56%
classroom.		
My school provides me with professional development in areas I	85%	89%
feel weak.		
I work with a group of teachers to plan lessons on the standards.	100%	83%
I have the standards posted in my classroom.	54%	72%
I state the standard I am covering before each lesson.	54%	67%
I give students feedback, rather than just numerical/letter grades.	77%	94%
The standards allow all students to achieve mastery.	8%	33%
The standards are set high enough that all students must work to	92%	89%
reach them.		
The assessments I give are in line with the standards.	85%	78%
My students do activities that relate to their interests and meet	54%	78%
the standards.		
My students do activities that go beyond the standards.	62%	78%
My students do activities related to the standards.	100%	100%
Because of standardization, I do not differentiate my instruction	31%	22%
as much as I did before the standards.		