Research Outcomes:

The ISM Student Experience Study

2010–11

ism®

Research Outcomes: The ISM Student Experience Study 2010–11

The ISM International Model Schools Project ran for six years, from 1989 to 1995, and entailed ISM on-site data collection expeditions—usually three per year—to eight to nine private-independent schools annually. The project focused upon relevant factors in student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm, and, secondarily, on teacher performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm. That project's outcomes produced two books, numerous articles for ISM's periodicals, and ISM's Meaningful Faculty Evaluation system. Those building blocks served, in turn, as the foundation for later ISM studies of School Head leadership and Board President leadership. Finally, the original outcomes and subsequent research projects were layered systematically into the several iterations of the ISM Stability Markers and, more recently, the 20 ISM Success Predictors for the 21st Century.

In the school year 2010–11, ISM conducted a one-year partial replication of the original project, this time with eight private-independent schools. The mix of schools, as with the original project, included the full range of possible grade configurations, religiously affiliated and secular, single-sex and coed, and boarding and day. [Note 1]

Executive Summary

Eight private-independent schools, representing a range of "types" (single-sex/coed, religious/secular, boarding/day, with/without grades 9–12), agreed to participate in a year-long partial replication of the original ISM Model Schools Project, which had in the mid-1990s identified a critical variable associated with student performance, student satisfaction, and student enthusiasm. That variable, termed "predictability and support" by ISM, has provided a flexible pedagogical framework within which whole faculties and/or individual teachers, using any teaching method whatever, could by observing the predictability/support principles, enhance the likelihood that students would perform better and experience strengthened satisfaction from, and enthusiasm for, their school experiences. [Note 2]

"Predictability and support" has been, and continues to be, defined by ISM as a school environment in which students find that:

1. the rule/reward structure is strong, but intelligible and fair from the student perspective;
2. faculty/administration/coaching responses are consistent, fair, and accurate from the student perspective, in regard to what is positively or negatively reinforced (both academically and behaviorally); and
3. the faculty, administration, and coaching staffs appear to the students genuinely to desire their (the students') success and work to elicit that success, but nonetheless provide accurate—not inflated—reinforcement (as implied by Nos. 1 and 2).

Sixteen grade 5–11 students at each of the eight schools, representing a broad achievement range at each school, were interviewed by ISM Consultant/data collectors at the end of each grading period, and copies of their report cards were submitted to ISM (signed parental permission forms were collected at the start). Pearson Product-Moment correlation outcomes supported the original (1990s) findings: Predictability/support principles—whether used purposefully or "accidentally" *(i.e., as a byproduct of a particular teaching approach or as a teacher-specific idiosyncrasy)* in classrooms, in hallways, on playing fields, in administrative offices—correlated significantly with student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm.

ISM concludes afresh that those who lead faculties should:

a. seek to build faculty cultures in which predictability/support principles predominate, *regardless of the prevailing pedagogical style, if any, imbedded in the existing faculty culture*; and
b. evaluate individual teachers at least in part on the basis of their adherence to predictability/support principles.

ISM calls particular attention to the certainty that instructional delivery systems will emphasize technology at ever-increasing levels throughout the 21st century. Predictability and support principles can provide a conceptual framework that is flexible yet reliable, permitting faculties and their leaders to approach a technology-dominated future appropriately equipped to navigate difficult teaching/learning routes with confidence. (See the three ISM-developed instruments designed to facilitate both "a" and "b," above, elsewhere in this report.)

Two Recent Research Projects

While the only research project bearing in a direct fashion on the 2010–11 ISM Student Experience Study is ISM's own International Model Schools Project (cited in the introduction), two 2010 projects deserve special mention in this context. The first is titled "Is Traditional Teaching Really All That Bad? A Within-Student Between-Subject Approach" (Schwerdt, G.; and Wuppermann, A., Program on Education Policy and Governance Working Paper Series, Harvard Kennedy School, 2010). The second is titled "How the World's Most Improved School Systems Keep Getting Better" (Mourshed, M.; Chijioke, C.; and Barber, M. McKinsey & Co., 2010).

The Schwerdt and Wuppermann study focused specifically on the much-derided lecture method and its relationship to student achievement. The abstract is quoted here in its entirety:

> Recent studies conclude that teachers are important for student learning but it remains uncertain what actually determines effective teaching. This study directly peers into the black box of educational production by investigating the relationship between lecture style teaching and student achievement. Based on matched student-teacher data for the US, the estimation strategy exploits between-subject variation to control for unobserved student traits. Results indicate that traditional lecture style teaching is associated with significantly higher student achievement [than methods that focus on problem-solving and/or discussion-based approaches]. No support for detrimental effects of lecture style teaching can be found even when evaluating possible selection biases due to unobservable teacher characteristics.

Note that ISM's student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm findings do not now, nor have they ever, found in favor of lecture-style teaching over problem-solving, discussion-based, and/or other approaches. ISM's findings, past and present, have indicated rather that the critical differentiators in eliciting stronger student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm lie elsewhere (than in traditional pedagogical schema), and that a concentration on lecture-versus-problem-solving and other competing methods simply points the spotlight in a consistently unhelpful direction.

The second project cited here, the Mourshed study, identified "sustained improvers" among school systems worldwide (the top five: Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea, Ontario/Canada, and Saxony/Germany). This brief passage is particularly relevant:

> In the early days (of any system-wide school-improvement effort), outcomes improvement is all about stabilizing the system, reducing variance between classrooms and schools, and ensuring basic standards are met. At this stage of the journey, the reforms are almost always driven from the center (of the system). Later, as the system improves, the engine for improvement shifts to instructional practices. This, by its very nature, has much less to do with the center and is primarily driven by the teachers and the [teacher-leaders] themselves: it is all about turning schools into learning organizations. (p. 123)

Note that ISM's student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm improvement recommendations have always, and continue to be, focused on enhancements in the *faculty culture* as the most promising approach to strengthening all-student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm. As the Mourshed study emphasized (see language above), "… it is all about turning schools into learning organizations."

Method

Eight schools were engaged in early fall of the 2010–11 school year. The schools collectively provided the study with single-sex and coed contexts: with PK–5, PK–8, PK–12, 7–12 and 9–12 grade configurations; with religiously affiliated and secular missions; and with day and boarding environments. At each school, 16 students were invited to participate (eight from each of two grade levels except in the PK–5 school, in which all 16 were fifth graders). Students were selected by school administrators to conform to ISM's requirements: four students from each academic quartile; eight boys and eight girls (except in the three single-sex schools); no students likely to be intimidated by interviewers from outside the school community (i.e., by ISM personnel). Students were interviewed in pairs, near the end of each grading period.

ISM developed an interview instrument designed to measure:

a. student perception of "predictability and support" in the environment;
b. student satisfaction; and,
c. student enthusiasm.

These were the three most critical findings—in their relationship to student performance and to each other—from the earlier six-year 1990s ISM project.

The instrument's 12 items are listed here strictly for the purpose of giving readers a sense of the instrument's content. The instrument should not be reproduced and used as shown here, since it was administered face-to-face by ISM personnel who provided examples and explanations throughout the student interviews. *A version of the instrument designed for widespread use by schools is displayed later in this report.*

Interview Items: The ISM Student Experience Study (not for general use in this form)

1. **Students here actually look forward to coming to school every day.**
2. **No one picks on anybody, or bullies anybody, at our school … ever.**
3. **Most of us feel quite proud of our school, and proud to be part of such a school.**
4. **It's obvious that our teachers really want us all to do well, in school and out.**
5. **Our teachers work every day at helping us become better people, i.e., more virtuous.**
6. **I'm quite excited about what I'm studying, and about what's coming up.**
7. **I'm so satisfied with my school, I'd certainly want to come here, if my family and I could choose again.**
8. **Our tests cover exactly what our teacher(s) said they would—no surprises.**
9. **The grades we receive are exactly what we have earned—no higher or lower.**
10. **I'm satisfied with our rules (what's okay, what's punished).**
11. **Our teachers enforce our rules justly, fairly, and consistently.**
12. **I know exactly what to expect from my teacher(s), every day—what's okay and what's not.**

(These items were administered orally in research-controlled conditions by ISM Consultants; a nine-point scale was employed; the Predictability/Support scale drew from items 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12; the Satisfaction scale from items 1, 7, 10; the Enthusiasm scale from items 1, 3, 6. Only item No. 1 was applied to more than one scale. Item No. 2 was reverse-scored.)

Findings and Comments on Findings

Pearson Product-Moment correlations were administered for each grading period, using the following five pairings:

1. Student-perceived "predictability and support" by student performance;
2. Student-perceived "predictability and support" by student-reported satisfaction;
3. Student-perceived "predictability and support" by student-reported enthusiasm;
4. Student performance by student-reported satisfaction; and,
5. Student performance by student-reported enthusiasm.

Pairings 1, 2, and 3 reached statistical significance in each of the three grading periods (fall, winter, and spring) utilized in the study. (See Table I for detail.)

Pairing 4 failed to reach statistical significance in the fall and winter grading periods, but did reach statistical significance in the spring. (See Table I for detail.)

Pairing 5 failed to reach statistical significance in any of the grading periods utilized in the study. (See Table I for detail.)

Additionally, means were calculated at the end of each grading period for each of the four scales: GPAs, predictability/support, satisfaction, and enthusiasm.

Table I: Pearson Product-Moment Correlations/Significance Levels by Grading Period; Means for Each Scale by Grading Period (GPA, P/S, Satisfaction, Enthusiasm)

	Fall	Winter	Spring
Total Students	N=121	N=108	N=116
Pairing 1	r = .119/.1	r = .225/.01	r = .254/.01
Pairing 2	r = .523/.001	r = .699/.001	r = .748/.001
Pairing 3	r = .513/.001	r = .670/.001	r = .681/.001
Pairing 4	r = - .044/NS	r = .075/NS	r = .210/.1
Pairing 5	r = - .096/NS	r = .052/NS	r = .045/NS
Cumulative GPAs	3.326	3.243	3.267
Predictability/support	52.30	48.56	47.91
Satisfaction	20.52	18.60	18.28
Enthusiasm	19.96	18.44	18.17

Note 1: All correlation significance tests were directional.
Note 2: GPAs on 4.0 scale; predictability/support on 63-point scale; both satisfaction and enthusiasm on 27-point scales; GPAs calculated by ISM based only upon grades in English, math, science, social studies/history, theology or other faith-specific components of religious-mission-focused curricula, and world languages.

Comments on Findings

- Student totals (N) differed from one grading period to another due to absences and to the fact that one academic division of one school was on a semester grade-report system and did not have a "winter" grade report.
- "Student performance" was measured by grade reports issued to participating students at the end of each grading period. ISM computed GPAs only in the "core" subjects: English, math, science, social studies/history, world language (including Latin and/or Hebrew), and theology/Bible/Judaic studies (when offered). Students selected represented the full range of academic performance, school-by-school. ISM converted grades to a standard 4.0 scale, regardless of the approach a given school might have used as its actual reporting structure.
- "Predictability/support," "student satisfaction," and "student enthusiasm" were measured by student responses in face-to-face interviews conducted at the end of each grading period by ISM Consultant/data collectors. The instrument, developed by ISM for the project, is shown in the "Method" section preceding. (See, as well, the Executive Summary section for ISM's definition of "predictability/support.")
- Hypothesized correlation outcomes held true except for pairing No. 4 (see above). That is, based upon the seminal ISM Model Schools project, ISM expected pairings 1, 2, and 3 to reach accepted social-sciences statistical significance levels in each of the three grading periods. For the same reason, ISM expected pairings 4 and 5 *not* to reach accepted social-sciences statistical significance levels in any of the three grading periods. **This means that ISM expected administration-, faculty-, and coaching-induced "predictability and support" in the student-perceived environment to correlate positively and significantly with student performance, student satisfaction, and student enthusiasm. ISM expected student satisfaction and student enthusiasm not to correlate positively and significantly with student performance. That is, ISM expected *characteristics of the faculty culture (teachers' collective ability and willingness to create a predictable and supportive environment)* to determine the student experience. In contrast, ISM expected the student experience not to be a function of the grades earned by the students.**
- In fact, these expectations held true in four of the five dimensions, but not in all five. The exception was pairing No. 4 (student performance by student-reported satisfaction). As may be observed in Table I, the strength of the correlation between these two variables rose steadily throughout the school year, starting as a nonsignificant negative correlation, rising to a nonsignificant positive correlation, and finishing as a significant positive correlation. (See discussion following for ISM's inferences regarding this unexpected finding.)
- Based upon its findings in the original 1990s study, ISM expected grade point averages to fall slightly from fall to winter, and then to recover somewhat in the spring. This did, in fact, occur.
- For the same reasons, ISM expected measured levels of student-perceived predictability/support, student-reported satisfaction, and student-reported enthusiasm to fluctuate in the same pattern—highest in fall, lowest in winter, and recovering in spring. This did *not* occur: While scores on all three scales were indeed highest in fall (and by a considerable margin), scores on these scales declined steadily, hitting their lowest points at the end of the school year.

An Exemplary Set of Numbers

One school (of the eight) in particular displayed a set of numbers as close to ISM's view of "ideal" as real-world students, teachers, and school conditions are likely to allow. That school's array is displayed in Table II. The numbers to the left of each slash mark are the whole-study numbers shown in Table I (above). The numbers to the right of each slash mark—all underlined—show the numbers from this particular school. (No significance tests were run on the individual school correlations due to the small N—16 or fewer—at each school.)

Table II: Whole-Study Numbers (as in Table I) With a Single-School Exemplary Set (underlined)			
	Fall	**Winter**	**Spring**
Total Students	N=121/16	N=108/14	N=116/13
Pairing 1	r = .11/.30	r = .22/.08	r = .25/.15
Pairing 2	r = .52/.77	r = .70/.51	r = .74/.49
Pairing 3	r = .51/.37	r = .67/.44	r = .68/.24
Pairing 4	r = -.04/.12	r = .07/.10	r = .21/-.01
Pairing 5	r = -.09/-.05	r = .05/-.05	r = .04/.01
Cumulative GPAs	3.32/3.22	3.24/3.23	3.26/3.21
Predictability/support	52.30/56.00	48.56/53.86	47.91/53.77
Satisfaction	20.52/22.88	18.60/22.00	18.28/22.69
Enthusiasm	19.96/23.25	18.44/22.29	18.17/22.00

Pairing 1: Predictability/support with student performance
Pairing 2: Predictability/support with student satisfaction
Pairing 3: Predictability/support with student enthusiasm
Pairing 4: Student performance with student satisfaction
Pairing 5: Student performance with student enthusiasm

Comments on Table II

- Note that in the last three lines of the table all nine scores are substantially above the means for the whole study. These reflect extraordinary levels of student-perceived predictability/support, student-reported satisfaction, and student-reported enthusiasm.
- Note as well the remarkable stability in GPAs—fall, winter, spring. Winter and spring GPA means depart a mere one-hundredth of a grade point in each direction as compared with fall.
- The nine numbers shown in pairings 1, 2, and 3 are positive and relatively strong with the exception of pairing 1's winter number (r = .08). The other eight correlations are as hypothesized, showing positive correlations between predictability/support and performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm, respectively.
- The six numbers shown in parings 4 and 5 are weak and/or negative, as hypothesized, showing weak and/or negative correlations between performance and satisfaction, and between performance and enthusiasm. Note that the strength of pairing 4—performance with satisfaction—actually declines throughout the year in this exemplary set of numbers, the opposite of the whole-study tendency (but consistent with ISM's hypothesis, based upon the original six-year ISM project).

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn by ISM.

- **Data pertaining to the specific ingredients associated with student-perceived predictability and support, student-reported satisfaction, and student-reported enthusiasm in the school environment should be collected and analyzed by those in faculty leadership positions** (via use of ISM's Student Culture Profile II instrument shown on page 6–7).
- **Data pertaining to the specific ingredients associated with faculty, administrative, and coaching impact upon student performance, satisfaction, and enthusiasm should be collected and analyzed by those in faculty leadership positions** (via use of ISM's Faculty Culture Profile *II* instrument on pages 8–10 and, as well, ISM's Characteristics of Professional Excellence II, Parts A & B on pages 11–14) for the purposes of:
  (a) faculty-culture monitoring,
  (b) faculty-culture enhancement,
  (c) individual-teacher self- evaluation,
  (d) individual-teacher administrative evaluation,
  (e) individual-teacher pay-for-performance decisions,
  (f) individual-teacher hiring/dismissal decisions,
  (g) career-long teacher professional-development planning and execution, and
  (h) less directly but with equal potential importance and institutional impact, student retention.
- Regarding letter "h" in the item immediately preceding, **analysis of predictability and support in the student-perceived environment (exhibiting in this study year-long, extremely powerful correlations with student satisfaction and student enthusiasm) should become a core ingredient in any and all faculty, administrative, and coaching plans to strengthen student retention**. While a family's decision to re-enroll is not simply the student's decision, any student's high-level of satisfaction and enthusiasm for her/his school experience will play an integral role in that decision, as, obviously, will low-level satisfaction and enthusiasm.
- ISM appears to have been wrong regarding its long-held, research-derived stance that there is no relationship between a student's grades and that student's satisfaction with her/his school experience. As the school year progresses, it would appear from these findings that borderline-to-average students may tend to "lose hope"—to experience reduced levels of satisfaction with their school experience—while strong students experience enhanced satisfaction *even if they do not particularly like or respect their teachers, coaches, and administrators, are not appropriately challenged by their subject*

matter, and/or take little pride in being a part of the school, thereby evidencing little "enthusiasm" for their school experience. Thus, faculty, administrators, and coaches should analyze the "satisfaction" and "enthusiasm" components in their Student Culture Profile outcomes with care as the school year progresses, given the "satisfaction" component's tendency to be influenced by student performance outcomes, especially in the final months of the school year. (See "Interview items: the ISM Student Experience Study" in the "Method" section, above, for a breakdown of the items as they were applied to each of the three scales. This same breakdown is applicable to the Student Culture Profile II instrument, since the latter has been developed from the former, and uses the same order of items.)

- ISM appears to have been wrong, as well, regarding its long-held, research-derived inference that student-perceived predictability and support in the school environment can be expected to recover from its winter low at the end of the school year. While the large change was, as expected, from fall to winter (52.30 to 48.56 on a 63-point scale), scores on this variable continued to decline to school-year end (47.91). **Faculty leaders should not regard this year-long decline as inevitable; the fact that one school in this study did reverse the decline by year-end indicates that this is not a necessary condition, but, rather, one that can be fought against successfully.** Similarly, the ISM-expected (and confirmed in this study) GPA progression from high in fall to low in winter to "recovering" in spring is not inevitable, either. Worst-case scenarios do occur, i.e., year-long declines in GPA, in student-perceived predictability/support, in student-reported satisfaction, and in student-reported enthusiasm.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered by ISM.

1. **Faculty leaders—School Heads, Division Heads, Deans of Faculties, Evaluation Design Teams of teachers—should take action on the ramifications of this study's confirmation of ISM's original (1990s) findings: the apparent likelihood that *any pedagogical approach whatsoever can prove efficacious, provided it is delivered with conviction and enthusiasm, and in a manner likely to promote student-perceived predictability and supportiveness in the learning environment*. Those ramifications plausibly extend to at least the following areas: student academic distinction; student-culture esprit de corps; student retention; student recruitment (via positive word of mouth); parent satisfaction (via their children's positive word of mouth); faculty satisfaction; faculty-culture esprit de corps; and faculty retention.** (See No. 3 below, for specific recommended action. See Table III, as well.)
2. **Faculty leaders should focus equally on career-long, student performance-, satisfaction-, and enthusiasm-based interaction with *individual teachers*, on the one hand, and on student performance-, satisfaction-, and enthusiasm-based *faculty-culture development*, on the other. The former includes high-performance expectations of individual teachers (with real consequences both for success and failure); the latter includes regular monitoring of the faculty culture and a "homegrown" approach to career-long faculty professional development for all teachers, both of these coupled with a consistent focus on "cross-pollination" between and among individual teachers.** (See No. 3 following for specific recommended action. See Table III, as well.)
3. **Faculty leaders should consider using the following ISM instruments as the basis for student-culture monitoring, analysis, and strengthening; for individual-teacher career-long evaluation and support; *and* for whole-faculty-culture monitoring, analysis, and strengthening (a) the Student Culture Profile II; (b) the Faculty Culture Profile II; and (c) the Characteristics of Professional Excellence II, Parts A & B. These three instruments are shown elsewhere in this report.** (Note: Readers are encouraged to make use of Table III as a concise, comprehensive guide to the appropriate use of these ISM instruments.)

The ISM Student Culture Profile II

Your school's results from the ISM Student Culture Profile II should, ISM suggests, serve as one basis for ongoing professional-development-focused conversations with individual teachers and, as well, with whole-faculty groups and sub-groups. (Note: the youngest students interviewed in the recent study were fifth graders; in the original study, third graders. ISM grants blanket permission to alter the language of the items to make them more intelligible to very young students, while noting that such changes may render ISM's to-be-established norms unusable under such conditions.)

Circle only one number for each item. Consider only the most recent grading period in your responses.

1. I have very much looked forward to coming to school every day of this grading period.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

2. I have not seen or heard of bullying—of anybody being "picked on" in any way at all—anywhere in our school during this grading period.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Absolutely no bullying — Bullying every day

3. I find that I am proud of my school, and proud to be part of such a school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

4. It has been obvious to me that my teachers *really* want me to do well—in school and out of school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not accurate at all — Fully accurate

5. My teachers have worked every day at helping me become a better, more virtuous person, regardless of the subject they are teaching (math, science, English, history, etc.).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not accurate at all — Fully accurate

6. I have been very excited about what I've been studying this grading period (the course material itself, not the teaching of the material).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

No; zero excitement — Yes; tremendous excitement

7. I'm so satisfied with my school, I'd certainly want to come here, if my family and I could choose again.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

No; absolutely not — Yes; certainly

8. Our tests this grading period have covered exactly what my teachers said they would cover.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

No; our teachers always tried to trick us — Yes; our tests covered exactly what we were told to study

9. All the grades I received during this grading period—big tests, quizzes, papers, etc.—were exactly the grades I think I actually earned—no higher or lower.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Never the correct grade — Always the correct grade

10. I have been completely satisfied with our rules (including the dress code).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Terrible, stupid rules — Perfectly appropriate rules

11. Our teachers have enforced our rules (including the dress code) justly, fairly, consistently.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Unfair or no enforcement — Fair, just enforcement

12. I have known exactly what to expect from my teachers, every day; I have known just how they will react to anything we say or do.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Teachers moody and unpredictable — Teachers perfectly consistent every day

To score the Student Culture Profile II so as to make outcomes comparable to this study's outcomes (Table I), break each student's scores into the three scales: Predictability and Support scale: items 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12 (item 2 reverse scored); Satisfaction scale: items 1, 7, 10; Enthusiasm scale: items 1, 3, 6. (Item 1 is double-scored.) Thus, for a given student, the P/S scale's maximum score is 63 (9 x 7 items); the Satisfaction and Enthusiasm scales' maximum scores are 27 each (9 x 3 items). *Hand-scoring can be expected to take roughly one person-hour for each 20 students. Thus, under hand-scoring conditions, student samples of 60 or fewer are suggested. (This assumes that the hand-scoring would result in each student's scale-score totals being entered on an Excel spreadsheet, at which point means and/or correlations could be computed nearly instantaneously by the software.)*

The ISM Faculty Culture Profile II

The ISM Faculty Culture Profile II differs from ISM's earlier faculty-culture-profile iterations in that the revised version's Part A ties explicitly to the ISM Student Culture Profile II. This faculty culture instrument links strongly, then, to the ISM findings in the Student Experience Study regarding student performance, student satisfaction, and student enthusiasm. Your own school's outcomes from the two instruments may profitably be considered companion pieces in your ongoing efforts to monitor the extent to which "predictability and support" conditions are present, and how strongly so, within your teaching/learning environment. (ISM continues to recommend that the Faculty Culture Profile II be given in fall, winter and spring, with an Evaluation Design Team of exemplary teachers administering the instrument and assisting faculty leaders/administrators in the interpretation of the outcomes, item-by-item.)

Part A: Faculty culture items related to the Student Culture Profile II
Circle only one number for each item. Consider only the most recent grading period in your responses.

1. I and my colleagues find ways to make it obvious to all students that we wish them success every day, both in school and outside of school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

2. I and my colleagues find ways to make it obvious to all students that we want them to become better, more virtuous people (in ways consistent with our school's stated purposes and projected outcomes for our graduates).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

3. I and my colleagues set clearly articulated standards for student academic performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

4. I and my colleagues set reasonable, defensible standards for student behavior.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

5. I and my colleagues are continually alert to the threat of bullying between and among our students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

6. In confrontations with students, I and my colleagues conduct ourselves in ways that leave students' dignity intact regardless of the nature of the issue or infraction.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

7. I and my colleagues individually and collectively demonstrate believably high levels of enthusiasm for teaching/learning and for the content of our studies.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

8. I and my colleagues demonstrate through words and actions a genuine, believable commitment to the school, its purposes, its leadership, and each other.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

9. I and my colleagues are glad to arrive at school and to see our students each day.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

10. I and my colleagues create predictable tests (not to be confused either with "simple" tests or with "easy" tests); our students can rely on the test preparation we offer them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

11. I and my colleagues provide fair, reliable, understandable grade/reward structures for our students; our students are led to understand why they receive the grades they receive—good or bad—and thereby to see how improvement, if they will seek it, might be possible.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

12. I and my colleagues enforce our rules, including the dress code, justly, fairly, consistently.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

13. I and my colleagues are able to present ourselves each day in ways that will be seen by our students as consistent and reliable (i.e., unaffected by outside-of-school problems).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

Part B: Faculty culture items related to the original ISM study of students and teachers, and found in the Faculty Culture Profile I

14. I and my colleagues individually and collectively pursue career-long professional development as a foremost priority.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

15. I and my colleagues have mastered at least one pedagogical approach—not necessarily the same one for all of us—that is supported by reliable, contemporary research outcomes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

16. When I and my colleagues are in casual conversations with each other, those conversations tend to be constructive, upbeat and professional.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

17. I and my colleagues have great respect for our division and/or school administrators.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

18. I and my colleagues find that our division and/or school administrators are highly supportive of our division's and/or school's faculty.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

19. I and my colleagues find that our division and/or school administrators are highly supportive of our division's and/or school's students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

20. I and my colleagues find that our division and/or school administrators are highly supportive of our division's and/or school's parents.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of us at all — Exactly true of us

To score the Faculty Culture Profile II using the method that will conform to appropriate self-scoring on the ISM Stability Marker pertaining to the quality of the faculty culture, use the following method. [Note 3] On any item on which 75% of the faculty members score at the top third of the response scale (i.e., 75% of the faculty circling the 7, 8, or 9), award one point. After determining the total (a number between 0 and 20), multiply that number by 0.3, thus converting the outcome to the six-point scale required by that item in the Stability Markers.

(See cross-referenced list showing specific relationships between items in the Faculty Culture Profile II Part A to the instrument used in the Student Experience Study.)

The following 12 items represent the cross-referenced list from the ISM Student Experience Study (SES) interview instrument (an instrument which is similar, but not identical, to the ISM Student Culture Profile II also shown on these pages) as ISM has applied the study's outcomes to the ISM Faculty Culture Profile II Part A shown above:

1. I look forward to coming to school every day. (See 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13 Faculty Culture Profile II: A.)
2. No one picks on anybody, or bullies anybody, at our school… ever. [reverse scored] (See 2, 4, 5, 12.)
3. I am proud of my school, and proud to be part of such a school. (See 2, 7, 8.)
4. It's obvious to me that my teachers really want me to do well: in school and out. (See 1, 2, 9.)
5. My teachers work every day at helping me become a better, more virtuous person. (See 2, 4, 5, 12.)
6. I'm excited about what I'm studying (the course material itself). (See 7, 8, 10, 11.)
7. I'm so satisfied with my school, I'd certainly want to come here, if my family and I could choose again. (See 2, 8, 9, 11, 12.)
8. Our tests cover exactly what my teachers said they would; no surprises. (See 3, 10, 11.)
9. The grades I receive are exactly what I have earned: no higher or lower. (See 3, 10, 11.)
10. I'm satisfied with our rules (including the dress code). (See 4, 6, 12.)
11. My teachers enforce our rules (including the dress code) justly, fairly, and consistently. (See 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13.)
12. I know exactly what to expect from my teachers, every day—what's okay and not okay. (See 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.)

The ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II: Parts A and B; and Individual Teacher (Self-)Rating Scales

The ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II (CPE) is divided into two parts: Part A, items derived from the ISM Student Experience Study (these items identical to those in the Faculty Culture Profile II Part A except for details of the items' wording); and Part B, items designed for broad administrative use in faculty hiring/dismissal, faculty evaluation, and the development of more general criteria for overall faculty excellence.

The ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II: Part A

The instrument shown below, the ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II: Part A, ties explicitly to the ISM Student Experience Study and, thus, to the ISM Student Culture Profile II and the ISM Faculty Culture Profile II: Part A.

Part B adheres to more general criteria developed since the seminal 1990s ISM study.

All three instruments—the Student Culture Profile II (SCP); the Faculty Culture Profile II (FCP); and the Characteristics of Professional Excellence II (CPE)—are designed to serve as a basis for ongoing professional-development-focused conversations with individual teachers and, as well, with whole-faculty groups and subgroups.

The SCP II; FCP II: Part A; and CPE II: Part A connect explicitly to the ISM Student Experience Study, and, thus, to student performance, student satisfaction, and student enthusiasm. The FCP II: Part B and the CPE II: Part B comprise more comprehensive lists of faculty and faculty-culture characteristics designed for use in faculty-culture enhancement systems, career-long faculty professional development systems, faculty evaluation systems, faculty pay-for-performance systems, and faculty hiring/dismissal procedures.

Circle only one number for each item.

1. I find ways to make it obvious to all students that I wish them success every day, both in school and outside of school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

2. I find ways to make it obvious to all students that I want them to become better, more virtuous people (in ways consistent with our school's stated purposes and projected outcomes for our graduates).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

3. I set clearly articulated standards for student academic performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

4. I set reasonable, defensible standards for student behavior.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

5. I am continually alert to the threat of bullying between and among my students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

6. In confrontations with students, I conduct myself in ways that leave students' dignity intact regardless of the nature of the issue or infraction.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

7. I demonstrate believably high levels of enthusiasm for teaching/learning and for the content of my studies.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

8. I demonstrate through words and actions a genuine, believable commitment to the school, its purposes, its leadership, and my peers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

9. I am glad to arrive at school and to see my students each day.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

10. I create predictable tests (not to be confused either with "simple" tests or with "easy" tests); my students can rely on the test preparation that I offer them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

11. I provide fair, reliable, understandable grade/reward structures for my students; my students are led to understand why they receive the grades they receive—good or bad—and thereby to see how improvement, if they will seek it, might be possible.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

12. I enforce our rules, including the dress code, justly, fairly, consistently.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

13. I am able to present myself each day in ways that will be seen by my students as consistent and reliable (i.e., unaffected by outside-of-school problems).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

The ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II: Part B

The following continuation of CPE II comprises a more comprehensive list of faculty and faculty-culture characteristics designed for use in faculty-culture enhancement systems, career-long faculty professional development systems, faculty evaluation systems, faculty pay-for-performance systems, and faculty hiring/dismissal procedures.

This list has been developed by ISM in conjunction with its personnel-management approach known since the 1990s as "MFE: Faculty Professional Development and Renewal." While the items following do not tie explicitly to the findings of the ISM Student Experience Study project, and, thus, not explicitly to the current findings related to student performance, student satisfaction, and student enthusiasm, these items do connect to the seminal six-year 1990s project in which ISM developed the basic foundation on top of which the SES was constructed.

Circle only one number for each item.

14. I pursue career-long professional development as a foremost priority.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

15. I am knowledgeable of cutting-edge content and developmental theory.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

16. I have mastered at least one pedagogical approach that is supported by reliable, contemporary research outcomes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

17. I am practiced in establishing meaningful emotional/psychological engagement with all my students.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

18. I am practiced in finding creative and appropriate ways to be involved with my students outside the classroom.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

19. I am practiced in displaying an overt, conspicuous interest in students' outside-the-class lives—apart from the previous item—without crossing privacy barriers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

20. I am practiced in applying any subject matter to real-life conditions beyond the classroom, including applications that may be global or universal in their potential.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

21. I am practiced in providing private and public positive reinforcement for individual or group (student) successes.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

22. I am practiced in giving active support for, and establishing active engagement with, colleagues.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

23. I am practiced in making positive contributions to a professional, mission-focused sense of community with all constituent groups.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

24. I am practiced in establishing proactive communication with, and service to, each student's parents.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

25. I am practiced in making an overt commitment to the personal and professional well-being of colleagues, administrators, and (other) nonteaching staff.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

26. I am practiced in giving public support for students, colleagues, and employers (administration and Board).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

27. I am practiced in communicating in-class experimentation-and-testing outcomes and findings to colleagues, within and beyond the school.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

28. I am practiced in routine (yet enthusiastic) participation in outside-the-school academic organizations whose work is supportive of, and pertinent to, my field(s).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

29. I am practiced in making an overt commitment to the life of my own congregation (church, synagogue, etc.) and its core traditions.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

30. I am practiced in serving as a mature role model for a biblically focused lifestyle.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

31. I am skilled in articulating the personal/ethical implications of a lifelong faith commitment.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

32. I am practiced in displaying appropriate levels of public tolerance of, and respect for, other religious points of view.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

33. I am knowledgeable of the developmental history of my school's religious heritage.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

34. I am practiced in participating in (and when appropriate, leading) the explicitly religious components of the school's student and community programs.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

35. I am committed to growing professionally and personally within the framework of my religious traditions.*

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Not true of me at all — Exactly true of me

Scoring: Unlike the Student Culture Profile II and the Faculty Culture Profile II, the Characteristics of Professional Excellence II, Parts A & B, are not designed to be tabulated. The purpose of the scoring scale under each item is for individual-teacher self-evaluation in preparation for conversations with administrators and/or peers regarding a given teacher's evaluation-related and/or professional-development-specific goals. Administrators seeking a faculty evaluation system that ties teacher performance to ISM's findings regarding the student culture—that is, to the importance of predictability and support in the student-perceived environment, of student-reported satisfaction, and of student-reported enthusiasm—will use the CPE II: Parts A & B both in an evaluative context (not to imply its use as the only component in evaluation), and in a professional-development context. (Note: CPE II: Part A ties explicitly to the SES findings; CPE II: Part B ties more generally to ISM's research and conclusions in working with student and faculty cultures over a two-decade period.)

*Note: Items 29–35 pertain to schools that are religiously affiliated.

Table III: Appropriate Uses of Instruments			
	SCP II	**FCP II**	**CPE II**
Analysis of P/S	x	x	
Analysis of SP	x	x	
Analysis of SS	x	x	
Analysis of SE	x	x	
Analysis of student retention	x	x	
Faculty culture monitoring		x	
Faculty culture enhancement		x	x
Teacher self-evaluation			x
Teacher evaluation			x
Teacher pay-for-performance			x
Teacher hiring/dismissal			x
Career-long teacher PD			x

Key

SCP II: Student Culture Profile II
FCP II: Faculty Culture Profile II
CPE II: Characteristics of Professional Excellence II
P/S: Predictability and Support
SP: Student Performance
SS: Student Satisfaction
SE: Student Enthusiasm
PD: Professional Development

Note 1:

ISM wishes to express its gratitude to the School Heads, Boards and support staff at the following participating schools:

- CFS: The School at Church Farm (PA);
- Collegiate School (VA);
- The Covenant School (VA);
- First Baptist Academy (TX);
- Independence School (DE);
- Padua Academy (DE);
- The Regis School (TX); and,
- The Shlenker School (TX).

While there were no out-of-pocket costs to the schools, there were substantial "costs" in staff time and attention: securing the ISM Parental Permission Forms from each participating family; dealing with the schedule interruptions connected with each ISM on-site visit to the school; sending the participating students' report cards electronically to ISM at the end of each grading period, and much more. ISM is grateful to these schools' leaders, to the parents involved, and, of course, to each participating student.

Note 2:

The phrase "predictability and support principles," originally defined operationally by ISM's 1992 book titled *20 Principles for Teaching Excellence,* is now defined operationally by the ISM Faculty Culture Profile II: Part A and, equally, by the ISM Characteristics of Professional Excellence II: Part A. These two 13-item lists mirror each other. The former is designed for whole-faculty-culture monitoring and enhancement; the latter, for individual-teacher evaluation and career-long professional development.

Note 3:

The ISM Stability Markers represent ISM's findings regarding those variables most strongly associated with a private-independent school's likelihood of sustaining programmatic, mission-specific excellence into the long-term future. The Stability Markers are published in ISM's periodical titled *Ideas & Perspectives*.

ism® Independent School Management, 1316 North Union Street, Wilmington, DE 19806
PHONE 302-656-4944 • FAX 302-656-0647 • E-MAIL ism@isminc.com • WEB isminc.com