

**RURAL SYSTEMIC INITIATIVES'
SURVEY 2002 REPORT**

**(Perceptions and Experiences of
Key Participant Personnel)**

**Prepared for the
NSF Rural Systemic Initiatives Evaluation Study**

**by
Jerry G. Horn and Gloria Tressler
The Evaluation Center
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5237**

October 2003

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grant REC-9819347. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	ii
Perceptions and Experiences of Key Participant Personnel	1
Table 1. States Included in RSIs of the Study	5
Table 2. Survey Distribution and Response	5
Table 3. Administrative Contacts' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences	13
Table 3A. Administrative Contacts' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences: Comparisons	14
Table 3B. Administrative Contacts' Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program	15
Table 4. Principals' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences	17
Table 4A. Principals' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences: Comparisons	18
Table 4B. Principals' Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program	19
Table 5. Local Facilitators' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences	21
Table 5A. Local Facilitators' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences: Comparisons	22
Table 5B. Local Facilitators' Contacts' Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program	23
Table 6. Summary of Open-End Responses to Critical Issues	25
Findings	27
APPENDIX A (Lists of Contact Persons)	32
APPENDIX B (Cover Letter to Contact Persons)	33

Foreword

On behalf of the evaluation study team from The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University, I want to thank the administrative leadership of the Delta, Texas, Appalachia, Coastal, and Michigan Rural Systemic Initiatives for their cooperation and support for this ongoing data collection process. Further, it is critical that participating school districts share their perceptions and experiences with the study team to help us and others understand how this large-scale school improvement effort has impacted the local science and mathematics curriculum and instruction for children and youth. To those people who responded to this survey (administrative contacts, school principals, and local facilitators), we extend our heartfelt gratitude.

We could not have completed the data analysis and development of the report without the able assistance and support of Sally Veeder, Mary Ramlow, Christine Hummel, and Barbara Miller at The Evaluation Center. Finally, I want to extend my appreciation to Ms. Gloria Tressler for work on this project as a Research Assistant. Her dedication to details and “getting it right” are attributes that help ensure that this study is meaningful and an accurate reflection of the data.

Jerry G. Horn

Perceptions and Experiences of Key Participant Personnel

Over the years, the National Science Foundation has created various programs to enhance and improve science and mathematics education for K-12 children and youth. One of the more recent and heavily funded education programs is under the general heading of systemic reform (state, urban, and rural). A description of the Rural Systemic Initiatives, as publicly described by NSF, is found below.

The Rural Systemic Initiatives in Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education Program was developed in FY 1994. RSI like the Urban Systemic Initiatives and the Statewide Systemic Initiatives stimulates system-wide educational reform of science, mathematics, and technology.

RSI is focused on improved education for students in rural, economically disadvantaged regions of the nation, particularly those that have been underserved by NSF programs; and on sustaining the improvements through encouraging community participation in instructional and policy reform. RSI is tailored to address policy, leadership, and workforce issues related to education, to provide a comprehensive and sustainable framework for science, mathematics, and technology education technology in elementary, secondary, and higher education.

RSI targets regions that are highly rural; characterized by significant levels of poverty among their school-age children; and that share common cultural, social, and economic characteristics. Interested individuals or identified leaders within eligible regions form consortia that include large NSF-funded Initiatives (e.g., SSI, EPSCoR, USP). RSI regions can be geographically vast, typically crossing state lines, or may be composed of areas that are geographically separated but linked by a unitary vision and other commonalities.

The RSI project scope is divided into two strategic elements. The initial element is a Development phase, to support planning for structuring Implementation (second) phase vision, strategies, and priorities. During the Development period, projects conduct regional self-studies to gather pertinent information regarding target populations, regional strengths and barriers, and policies that enhance or hinder instructional reform. Moreover, successful Development projects should result in a viable evaluation strategy to be utilized during the Implementation phase. The second strategic element, the Implementation phase, focuses on realizing the strategies for systemic improvement in RSI districts, schools, and classrooms. The strategies can include teaching workforce enhancements, curriculum innovation, leadership development among teachers and local district administrators, and innovative and pertinent assessment strategies; and must result in better classroom instruction and higher student achievement.

The goals of the RSI program are listed below:

- The improvement of science, mathematics, and technology education in rural, economically disadvantaged regions of the nation.
- The preparation of a technologically competent workforce to enhance the infrastructure of economic development activities within a community or region, by strengthening the science, mathematics, and technology instructional capacities of regional colleges and universities.
- The enhancement of scientific literacy and science understanding and appreciation among students and the general community in rural, economically disadvantaged regions of the nation.
- The development of community infrastructure to provide resources to sustain educational improvement.

Further, NSF recognizes “Six Drivers for Educational System Reform”:

1. Implementation of comprehensive, standards-based curricula as represented in instructional practice, including student assessment, in every classroom, laboratory, and other learning experience provided through the system and its partners.
2. Development of a coherent, consistent set of policies that supports: provision of high quality mathematics and science education for each student; excellent preparation, continuing education, and support for each mathematics and science teacher (including all elementary teachers); and administrative support for all persons who work to dramatically improve achievement among all students served by the system.
3. Convergence of the usage of all resources that are designed for or that reasonably could be used to support science and mathematics education—fiscal, intellectual, material, curricular, and extra-curricular—into a focused and unitary program to constantly upgrade, renew, and improve the educational program in mathematics and science for all students.
4. Broad-based support from parents, policymakers, institutions of higher education, business and industry, foundations, and other segments of the community for the goals and collective value of the program, based on rich presentations of the ideas behind the program, the evidence gathered about its successes and its failures, and critical discussions of its efforts.

5. Accumulation of a broad and deep array of evidence that the program is enhancing student achievement, through a set of indices that might include achievement test scores, higher level courses passed, college admission rates, college majors, Advanced Placement Tests taken, portfolio assessment, and ratings from summer employers, and that demonstrate that students are generally achieving at a significantly higher level in science and mathematics.
6. Improvement in the achievement of all students, including those historically underserved.

In late 1998, the National Science Foundation funded a project at The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan to conduct “The Rural Systemic Initiatives Evaluation Study.” The project, under the direction of Dr. Jerry G. Horn, had four objectives:

1. To develop a system of indicators around each of the identified six drivers of educational system reform
2. To determine the perceived relative importance and value of each of the drivers and indicators for reform in RSI schools in selected communities
3. To determine the status of innovation/reform within selected communities with respect to factors thought to support or serve as barriers to innovation and education reform
4. To determine the ways and the extent to which the perceived importance and value of the drivers and the characteristics of the community impact on systemic reform efforts and student achievement in mathematics, science, and technology

Initially, the WMU study was to focus on three RSI collaboratives: Appalachia, Delta, and UCAN. In Spring 2000, the NSF asked the project director to expand the study to include three newly funded collaboratives (Texas, Coastal, and Michigan). Based on early findings and questions, WMU also sought to investigate four additional questions as a part of the expanded study:

- ✓ What new or different forms of student assessment and teacher effectiveness have been developed and used as a result of curriculum transformation and alignment with state or national standards in science and mathematics, and how were these developed and used?
- ✓ What contextual factors (within and across collaboratives) serve to support reforms that result in or are associated with the development and implementation of standards-based curricula?
- ✓ What processes and conditions are essential for effective partnerships within large-scale collaboratives that are characterized by large geographic distances between entities and multiple/potentially contrasting governance arrangements?

- ✓ What considerations have been given to the use of technology for enhancing the accessibility and effectiveness of math and science instruction and communication within and among collaborative members?

By mid-2002, five of the collaboratives were functioning as a part of their original funding, with a mutually agreeable extension, or with additional funding for an expanded RSI or as a second cycle. The UCAN project was closed, but several elements of the original group resurfaced as leaders or participants in small, but related projects.

Through a series of 15 case studies, surveys, and other data collection procedures, a substantial amount of data regarding the new and additional questions have been accumulated and reported in various forms. However, the individual RSI projects kept evolving, and the participating schools were only then realizing the form and impact of the efforts designed to improve their science and mathematics curricula. However, since many of the projects were “in process” and others were at the earliest stages of development, additional information and evidence seemed warranted. Therefore, The Evaluation Center sought and was approved by NSF for a one-year, no-cost extension of the evaluative study (to May 31, 2004), which will provide local school personnel with the time to reflect on what has happened and where the impact (breadth and depth) of the effort has occurred.

We chose to include five RSI collaborative projects for this survey activity: Appalachia, Coastal, Delta, Michigan, and Texas. UCAN was not included because its organization and the types of schools it served were quite different from the other collaboratives. Additionally, its funds had been discontinued. The principal investigators of the five RSI collaborative projects were asked to supply the name and address of each project site contact person within their purviews (see Appendix A). Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter that accompanied the surveys to each contact person identified by the principal investigators. None of the collaboratives supplied the contact information for all of the projects under their domains. They selected the projects they deemed appropriate to partake in this survey, i.e., those that had participated with a reasonable level of involvement for the course of two or more years.

Each complete survey package contained three smaller packets and a cover letter to the administrative contact. Each smaller packet was labeled “Building Principal”; “School District RSI Contact Person”; or “Local Facilitator, Teacher Partner, or a Local Person who has substantial involvement in the RSI program” and included a survey for its anticipated respondent along with a postage-paid return envelope. To keep them informed of the process we were following, complete survey packages were sent to each principal investigator.

Table 1 shows details about the numbers of survey packages sent to and later returned by each collaborative. Michigan RSI had the highest response rate for each of the three types of surveys included in the complete survey package. In general, the school principals had the lowest rate of response, except for those from the Coastal RSI.

Table 1. States Included in RSIs of the Study*

States	Rural Systemic Initiatives (RSIs)				
	Appalachia	Coastal	Delta	Michigan	Texas
Arkansas			X		
Mississippi			X		
Louisiana			X		
Michigan				X	
Texas					X
South Carolina		X			
North Carolina	X	X			
Virginia	X	X			
Ohio	X				
Tennessee	X				
Kentucky	X				
West Virginia	X				

*Only selected school districts are included in specific RSIs, not all schools within that state.

Table 2. Survey Distribution and Response

RSI Collaborative	Number of Complete Survey Packages Mailed	Number of Individual Surveys Returned by Each Respondent Group					
		Administrative Contacts		School Principals		Local Facilitators	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Appalachian	45	20	44	9	20	17	38
Coastal	9	5	56	4	44	1	11
Delta	78	16	21	7	9	10	13
Michigan*	15	12	80	7	47	8	53
Texas	48	26	54	18	38	19	40

*Michigan included an extra letter written by the PI to the contact persons.

While the return rate is not what was hoped for or expected, there are some explanations. First, the packets of surveys were sent to the “administrative contact” in individual districts with instructions or a request for them to complete the one for them and forward one set to a building principal and one to the local facilitator” Without names and addresses, it was impossible to follow up. Secondly, the collaboratives had just been “hit” with a demand for a substantial amount of data from another NSF-funded research effort, which required some to find monies to hire persons to collect data and report it in specific ways. Lack of coordination by NSF likely resulted in confusion at the local level and lack of responsiveness to the substudy being reported here.

Below is a breakdown of the primary role of the administrative contacts for this study:

Teacher	8.9 percent
Principal	6.3 percent
Superintendent	16.5 percent
Curriculum Coordinator/Supervisor	53.2 percent
Other	15.2 percent

Over the course of a year, the administrative contact respondents reported that they distribute their time in the following ways:

RSI administration/coordination	14.8 percent
Teaching math and/or science	11.0 percent
Teaching courses other than science or math	2.3 percent
Other duties	72.1 percent

The principals represent schools at the following levels that have participated in RSI activities. (Note: A district might participate at more than one level; therefore, these do not sum to 100 percent.)

Elementary	66.7 percent
Middle/junior high	60.0 percent
High school	40.0 percent
Other	4.4 percent

Principals reported these estimates of the distribution of their duties:

Administration	51.2 percent
Curriculum leadership	21.7 percent
Professional development	10.5 percent
Public relations	12.6 percent
Other	3.9 percent

The primary roles of the local facilitators who responded to the survey are reported below:

Teacher	73.6 percent
Principal	3.8 percent
Superintendent	1.9 percent
Curriculum Coordinator/Supervisor	5.7 percent
Other	15.1 percent

Of the local facilitators who reported that they are teachers, the approximate amount of their time devoted to teaching the various subject areas is found below.

Science	41.1 percent
Math	35.3 percent
Computers and technology	9.8 percent
Other	13.7 percent

The local facilitators have an average of 18.9 years of experience in education, and they have been involved as facilitators for the RSI effort for an average of 2.8 years.

From the initial discussion with NSF about the purpose and procedures to be used in this study, we emphasized the intent to study the RSI collaboratives from the perspective of local schools and communities. In many cases, this involved on-site observations, face-to-face interviews, and review of actions and documents. This survey was sent to representatives of the three primary groups involved in choosing to participate in the project, carrying out the activities at the local level, and observing the impact of the program. Specifically, these key informants are the administrative contacts, the school principals, and the local facilitator or the person charged with day-to-day contact with teachers. While the response rates do not permit a reasonable statistical analysis between projects, which is not our intention, the responses overall provide us with information about three major areas: expectations, experiences, and impact. In other words, did the originators of the collaboratives pledge one thing and do something different? Did the project originators mislead local planners? Did they promise more than they delivered, etc.? The important question about impact regards whether the project had any influence on practice and results, i.e., increasing student test scores, reducing the number of dropouts, etc.

The data for the remaining portion of this report are grouped by respondent type; 3, 3A, and 3B represent responses from administrative contacts; 4, 4A, and 4B reflect the responses of school principals; and 5, 5A, and 5B come from local facilitators. These three groups are central to the RSI effort, and they should be in positions to know what is happening. Importantly, they are not the target audience for much of the RSI work; therefore, they can be more objective in their responses than if they were actually the focus of the professional development work or had direct responsibility for in-class instruction and student performance.

The narrative in the next section of this report highlights certain points and does not represent an

explanation of every data item. However, readers of this report may want to review all of the data summaries to gain a more comprehensive and inclusive perception.

The percentages of administrative contacts who perceived that 17 statements are “False,” “Partly True,” or “True” with regard to initial expectations and their current experience are found in Table 3. (Similar data for school principals are found in Table 4 and for local facilitators in Table 5.) With regard to expectations, the administrative contacts initially perceived these issues or factors to be true:

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (79.7 percent)
- Student achievement would improve. (74.7 percent)
- Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement. (70.9 percent)
- Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers. (68.4 percent)
- On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel. ((67.1)

School principals perceived these items as most true (see Table 4):

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (71.1 percent)
- Student achievement would improve. (71.1 percent)
- On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel. (71.1 percent)
- Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings. (68.9 percent)
- A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis. (64.4 percent)

A similar list for local facilitators follows (see Table 5):

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (71.4 percent)
- Student achievement would improve. (66.1 percent)
- On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel. (62.5 percent)
- Instruction would become laboratory/activity centered. (58.9 percent)
- Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers. (57.1 percent)

Clearly, there is strong agreement on three items: curriculum alignment, improved student achievement, and on-site assistance or some form of assistance for teachers.

After participating in the project, the highest rated items with regard to realization or experience (highest percentage that were marked True) for each of the groups are listed below:

Administrative Contacts

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (81.0 percent)
- Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement. (75.9 percent)
- On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel. (72.2 percent)
- Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers. (70.9 percent)
- Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data. (70.9 percent)

School Principals

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (86.7 percent)
- On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel. (80.0 percent)
- Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement. (73.3 percent)
- Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings. (71.1 percent)
- Leadership training would be a major intervention. (66.7 percent)

Local Facilitators

- The curriculum would be aligned with state standards. (80.4 percent)
- On-site assistance would be provided by RSI personnel. (75.0 percent)
- Leadership would be a major intervention. (66.1 percent)
- Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings. (64.3 percent)
- Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement. (62.5 percent)

Again, there is consistency in the items that appeared in the lists of respondents. An item that was identified as a high expectation and that has now dropped from the top 5 of all respondent groups is “Student achievement would improve.” Yet, the percentage of respondents who most currently marked “True” for that issue/factor ranged from 55.4 percent for local facilitators to 68.4 percent for administrative contacts.

Noticeably low expectations and realizations were recorded for the following items:

- Parents would become involved in substantive ways.
- The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.
- A new math/science program would be implemented.

Another way of looking at these same data is projected in Tables 3A, 4A, and 5A where the differences in the mean of the responses (1 = False, 2 = Partially True, and 3 = True) were

calculated (Difference = Mean of the current experience - the mean of the initial expectation). A negative value in the “Difference” column would indicate that the current experience for a particular issue or activity is less than what was initially expected. From the perception of administrative contacts, these items had the largest negative value:

- Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered. (-0.2)
- Parents would become involved in substantive ways. (-0.2)
- Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials. (-0.3)

School principals rated none of the negative items further from 0 than -0.1. All of the others were 0 or plus. The three with negative values pertained to student achievement, role of local facilitator, and parental involvement. For local facilitators, two with negative values are of note:

- Parents would become involved in substantive ways. (-0.2)
- Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials. (-0.4)

Indications that experience exceeded expectations are relatively few, but those of note are listed below under the three categories of respondents.

Administrative Contacts

- Leadership training would be a major intervention. (0.3)
- A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis. (0.2)

School Principals

(None greater than 0.1)

Local Facilitators

- Leadership training would be a major intervention (0.2)
- Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement. (0.2)
- External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur. (0.2)

In sum, the initial expectations were not far removed from what was experienced, i.e., the participating schools got what they expected. However, it does seem that the expectations were relatively low, which may be a result of their experiences with outside funded projects or simply a reflection of the culture in which they are located.

Of course, the impact of the program is the more important aspect to consider for the RSI projects. Did they make a difference? Will there be any residuals or evidence of the program after cessation of the interventions/activities and termination of the overall project? At the time of this writing, several RSI collaboratives are nearing the end of their funding period or have

terminated and, in some cases, have no organized NSF support to sustain this effort or begin a new set of initiatives.

On a four-point scale (1 = Not at All to 4 = Great Extent) with regard to the perceived extent of impact due to the RSI in which their school participated, the administrative contacts identified the following areas of greatest impact (greater than 3.0). (See Tables 3B, 4B, and 5B.)

- Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards (3.6)
- Curriculum more challenging for all students (3.3)
- Increased requirement and expectations of student in math/science (3.3)
- Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students (3.1)
- Policies that support high standards and good preparation of new teachers (3.1)
- Improved achievement test scores (3.1)
- Advocacy/support for math/science among all teachers (3.1)

School principals perceived the greatest impact on the following:

- Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards (3.6)
- Curriculum more challenging for all students (3.4)
- Increased ownership of the math/science curriculum by teachers (3.3)
- Content of statewide tests shape the curriculum (3.3)
- Increased requirement and expectations of students in math/science (3.3)
- Curriculum more challenging to the best students (3.2)
- Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students (3.2)
- Policies that support higher quality education (3.1)
- Policies that support high standards and good preparation of new teachers (3.1)
- Improved student achievement scores (3.1)
- Advocacy/support for math/science among all teachers (3.1)
- Expanded student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction (3.1)

Local facilitators perceived these issues as being impacted the most:

- Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards (3.4)
- Curriculum more challenging for all students (3.2)
- Expanded student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction (3.2)
- Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students (3.2)
- Increased requirement and expectations of students in math/science (3.2)

Two items rated highest on all three lists:

- Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards
- Curriculum more challenging for all students

Only two of the three groups perceived an issue or area was impacted so little that it produced a mean value of less than 2.0 (Slight Extent). The mean for school principals' responses was 1.9 for "Lowered dropout rate"; and local facilitators rated "Student engagement in community service projects, especially, those requiring some math/science knowledge and skills" as 1.9.

Other areas also warrant attention with regard to impact, but these will be discussed as a part of the "Findings" in this report when the six drivers are reintroduced in considering the overall reform and school improvement process.

The three groups of respondents were also asked to list the "three most significant changes," the "three greatest challenges," and the "three most important indicators of reform." The responses were reviewed, categorized, and are summarized in Table 6.

In examining these responses, there is a fairly consistent perception of the changes, challenges, and indicators of education reform among these key informants from participating RSI schools. There will be more discussion of these in relation to the case studies developed in the overall evaluative study, but the issues related to attitudes, opportunities, and skills appear time and time again. While student achievement is broadly recognized as an indicator of (positive) reform, there may be less agreement on how achievement is defined. Among the potential indicators of student achievement are course grades in K-12 schools, state or other standardized test scores, acceptance or admittance to higher education, success in various forms of scholastic competition, scholarship awards, acceptance into specialized programs, success in careers and employment, etc.

In sum, all of these may be valid evidence of achievement and, collectively, that may be the best use of the evidence. Time and teacher work habits are considerations primarily expressed by principals and local facilitators with regard to challenges. Because teachers in many of the small schools have multiple assignments, i.e., teaching, supervision, coaching, etc., and have up to 5 or 6 separate preparations, time to prepare for laboratory science is a challenge. While work habits are mentioned, it is not clear what that entails, but it appeared often enough to be recognized as an issue.

In looking at the duties of the administrative contacts with regard to RSI, they reported that their role/responsibilities in that capacity were as follows. (Note: Respondents were asked to indicated all that applied; therefore, the sum does not total to 100 percent.)

Administration and fiscal management	69.2 percent
Curriculum leader	70.5 percent
Overall change facilitator	47.4 percent
Consultant and resource person	46.2 percent
Public relations/spokesperson	38.5 percent
Other	3.8 percent

Table 3. Administrative Contacts' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Perceptions/Responses									
	Missing %		False %		Partly True %		True %		Don't Know %	
	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	6.3	7.6	3.8	1.3	43.0	29.1	38.0	62.0	8.9	--
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	7.6	5.1	2.5	3.8	20.3	20.3	68.4	70.9	1.3	--
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	6.3	6.3	6.3	13.9	45.6	39.2	36.7	40.5	5.1	--
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	5.1	5.1	--	1.3	21.5	16.5	70.9	75.9	2.5	1.3
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	5.1	5.1	--	--	13.9	12.7	79.7	81.0	1.3	1.3
6. Student achievement would improve.	5.1	5.1	--	1.3	16.5	22.8	74.7	68.4	3.8	2.5
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	5.1	5.1	7.6	10.1	32.9	43.0	40.5	39.2	13.9	2.5
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	5.1	5.1	2.5	6.3	26.6	39.2	53.2	45.6	12.7	3.8
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	5.1	5.1	15.2	25.3	43.0	53.2	21.5	15.2	15.2	1.3
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	5.1	5.1	16.5	15.2	41.8	50.6	26.6	25.3	10.1	3.8
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data.	5.1	5.1	3.8	3.8	27.8	20.3	58.2	70.9	5.1	--
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	5.1	5.1	13.9	26.6	25.3	32.9	43.0	30.4	12.7	5.1
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	5.1	5.1	3.8	8.9	20.3	22.8	64.6	63.3	6.3	--
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel	5.1	5.1	--	3.8	21.5	19.0	67.1	72.2	6.3	--
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	5.1	6.3	1.3	--	39.2	29.1	49.4	64.6	5.1	--
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	5.1	6.3	16.5	16.5	45.6	54.4	21.5	19.0	11.4	3.8
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	5.1	6.3	19.0	16.5	26.6	32.9	30.4	38.0	19.0	6.3

Notes: Missing responses were those that were either blank or not included because they were unusable, e.g., multiple instead of single responses, etc. N = 79. Therefore, rows may not total to 100 percent.

Table 3A. Administrative Contacts' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Comparisons of the Means of the Initial Expectations and Current Experiences		
	Mean _I [Standard Deviation _I]	Mean _C [Standard Deviation _C]	Difference (Mean _C minus Mean _I)
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	2.4 [0.58]	2.7 [0.50]	0.3
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	2.7 [0.51]	2.7 [0.54]	0.0
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	2.4 [0.61]	2.3 [0.72]	-0.1
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	2.8 [0.43]	2.8 [0.44]	0.0
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	2.9 [0.36]	2.9 [0.36]	0.0
6. Student achievement would improve.	2.8 [0.39]	2.7 [0.48]	-0.1
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	2.4 [0.66]	2.3 [0.67]	-0.1
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	2.6 [0.55]	2.4 [0.62]	-0.2
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	2.1 [0.67]	1.9 [0.65]	-0.2
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	2.1 [0.71]	2.1 [0.67]	0.0
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretations of test data.	2.6 [0.57]	2.7 [0.54]	0.1
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	2.3 [0.76]	2.0 [0.80]	-0.3
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	2.7 [0.56]	2.6 [0.66]	-0.1
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel.	2.8 [0.43]	2.7 [0.54]	-0.1
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	2.5 [0.53]	2.7 [0.47]	0.2
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	2.1 [0.67]	2.0 [0.62]	-0.1
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	2.2 [0.81]	2.3 [0.76]	0.1

Notes: Means and standard deviations are calculated only from responses to options "False," "Partly True," and "True." Results from the initial expectations response category are designated by subscript "I"; results from the current

experiences response category are designated by subscript “C.”

Table 3B. Administrative Contacts’ Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don’t Know		
1. Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards	74	--	1.3	39.2	54.4	1.3	3.6	0.53
2. Curriculum more challenging to the best students	74	1.3	15.2	57.0	21.5	1.3	3.0	0.67
3. Curriculum more challenging for all students	73	--	7.6	46.8	39.2	--	3.3	0.63
4. Expanded student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction	73	1.3	21.5	43.0	27.8	2.5	3.0	0.76
5. Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students	73	1.3	17.7	46.8	27.8	2.5	3.1	0.74
6. Internet and other forms of technology integrated into instructional activities	73	2.5	25.3	38.0	27.8	2.5	3.0	0.82
7. Increased student interest and participation in science fairs and other forms of competitive activities	72	5.1	30.4	41.8	15.2	3.8	2.7	0.81
8. Increased awareness of math/science-related careers and educational requirements for entrance into these professions	68	2.5	22.8	48.1	13.9	8.9	2.8	0.73
9. Student engagement in community service projects, especially those requiring some math/science knowledge and skills	70	13.9	45.6	26.6	3.8	6.3	2.2	0.76
10. Lowered dropout rate	56	19.0	24.1	24.1	5.1	22.8	2.2	0.93
11. Higher daily attendance	60	10.1	26.6	32.9	7.6	19.0	2.5	0.85
12. Use of alternative student assessment approaches	75	3.8	36.7	36.7	19.0	--	2.7	0.83

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don't Know		
13. Increased parental/community participation in math/science-related school events	72	17.7	34.2	31.6	8.9	2.5	2.4	0.91
14. Policies that support higher quality education	70	5.1	13.9	46.8	24.1	6.3	3.0	0.82
15. Policies that support high standards and good preparation of new teachers	72	--	21.5	44.3	26.6	3.8	3.1	0.73
16. Increased requirement and expectations of students in math/science	73	--	12.7	38.0	43.0	2.5	3.3	0.71
17. Students take more math/science	68	1.3	21.5	36.7	27.8	7.6	3.0	0.80
18. Improved student achievement scores	72	2.5	8.9	55.7	25.3	3.8	3.1	0.68
19. Narrowing of achievement test scores within grade levels	65	2.5	16.5	46.8	17.7	12.7	2.9	0.73
20. Advocacy/support for math/science among all teachers	73	1.3	19.0	45.6	27.8	--	3.1	.074
21. Visible evidence of support for math/science in decor of school and school environment	73	3.8	20.3	43.0	26.6	--	3.0	0.82

Notes: Response options used for calculating the means and standard deviations were “Not at All” (1), “Slight Extent” (2), “Moderate Extent” (3), and “Great Extent” (4). Data not included in this table were missing and multiple responses or responses that were unusable for one reason or another. Therefore, rows may not total 100 percent.

Table 4. Principals' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Perceptions/Responses									
	Missing %		False %		Partly True %		True %		Don't Know %	
	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	2.2	2.2	11.1	4.4	20.0	26.7	60.0	66.7	6.7	--
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	--	2.2	8.9	8.9	28.9	24.4	60.0	64.4	2.2	--
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	2.2	2.2	13.3	15.6	42.2	46.7	35.6	35.6	6.7	--
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	2.2	2.2	2.2	4.4	22.2	17.8	62.2	73.3	11.1	2.2
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	2.2	2.2	8.9	4.4	11.1	6.7	71.1	86.7	6.7	--
6. Student achievement would improve.	2.2	2.2	4.4	2.2	22.2	33.3	71.1	60.0	--	2.2
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	2.2	2.2	11.1	8.9	26.7	40.0	46.7	42.2	13.3	6.7
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	2.2	2.2	11.1	8.9	22.2	33.3	55.6	51.1	8.9	4.4
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	2.2	2.2	17.8	24.4	48.9	48.9	20.0	20.0	11.1	4.4
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	4.4	4.4	28.9	28.9	35.6	35.6	24.4	31.1	6.7	--
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data.	2.2	2.2	4.4	4.4	35.6	26.7	48.9	60.0	8.9	6.7
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	6.7	8.9	17.8	20.0	28.9	35.6	35.6	35.6	11.1	--
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	2.2	2.2	6.7	8.9	22.2	17.8	68.9	71.1	--	--
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel	2.2	2.2	6.7	2.2	17.8	13.3	71.1	80.0	2.2	2.2
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	2.2	2.2	6.7	4.4	17.8	24.4	64.4	64.4	8.9	4.4
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	2.2	2.2	17.8	24.4	51.1	55.6	17.8	11.1	11.1	6.7
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	2.2	4.4	17.8	13.3	26.7	35.6	35.6	33.3	17.8	13.3

Notes: Missing responses were those that were either blank or not included because they were unusable, e.g., multiple instead of single responses, etc. N = .45. Therefore, rows may not total to 100 percent.

Table 4A. Principals' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Comparisons of the Means of the Initial Expectations and Current Experiences		
	Mean _i [Standard Deviation _i]	Mean _c [Standard Deviation _c]	Difference (Mean _c minus Mean _i)
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	2.5 [0.71]	2.6 [0.57]	0.1
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	2.5 [0.66]	2.6 [0.66]	0.1
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	2.2 [0.70]	2.2 [0.70]	0.0
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	2.7 [0.52]	2.7 [0.55]	0.0
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	2.7 [0.65]	2.8 [0.48]	0.1
6. Student achievement would improve.	2.7 [0.56]	2.6 [0.54]	-0.1
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	2.4 [0.72]	2.4 [0.66]	0.0
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	2.5 [0.72]	2.5 [0.67]	0.0
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	2.0 [0.67]	2.0 [0.70]	0.0
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	2.0 [0.78]	2.0 [0.80]	0.0
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data.	2.5 [0.60]	2.6 [0.59]	0.1
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	2.2 [0.79]	2.2 [0.77]	0.0
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	2.6 [0.64]	2.6 [0.65]	0.0
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel.	2.7 [0.61]	2.8 [0.45]	0.1
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	2.7 [0.62]	2.6 [0.58]	-0.1
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	2.0 [0.65]	1.9 [0.61]	-0.1
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	2.2 [[0.80]	2.2 [0.72]	0.0

Notes: Means and standard deviations are calculated only from responses to options "False," "Partly True," and "True." Results from the initial expectations response category are designated by subscript "i"; results from the current

experiences response category are designated by subscript “C.”

Table 4B. Principals' Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don't Know		
1. Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards	45	4.4	2.2	26.7	66.7	--	3.6	0.76
2. Curriculum more challenging to the best students	42	4.4	8.9	46.7	33.3	4.4	3.2	0.79
3. Curriculum more challenging for all students	44	4.4	4.4	40.0	48.9	2.2	3.4	0.78
4. Expanded student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction	43	6.7	15.6	37.8	35.6	4.4	3.1	0.91
5. Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students	43	2.2	13.3	42.2	37.8	4.4	3.2	0.77
6. Internet and other forms of technology integrated into instructional activities	44	4.4	17.8	53.3	22.2	2.2	3.0	0.78
7. Increased student interest and participation in science fairs and other forms of competitive activities	44	20.0	24.4	37.8	15.6	2.2	2.5	1.00
8. Increased awareness of math/science-related careers and educational requirements for entrance into these professions	40	4.4	28.9	46.7	8.9	11.1	2.7	0.73
9. Student engagement in community service projects, especially those requiring some math/science knowledge and skills	38	24.4	28.9	26.7	4.4	15.6	2.1	0.91
10. Lowered dropout rate	42	17.8	17.8	11.1	--	46.7	1.9	0.79
11. Higher daily attendance	31	17.8	22.2	28.9	0.0	26.7	2.2	0.82
12. Use of alternative student assessment approaches	42	11.1	17.8	48.9	15.6	6.7	2.7	0.89
13. Increased parental/community participation in math/science-related school events	43	15.6	37.8	31.1	11.1	2.2	2.4	0.90
14. Policies that support higher quality education	40	6.7	6.7	46.7	28.9	8.9	3.1	0.84
15. Policies that support high standards and good preparation of new teachers	42	6.7	11.1	40.0	35.6	6.7	3.1	0.89
16. Increased requirement and expectations of students in math/science	44	4.4	8.9	33.3	51.1	2.2	3.3	0.83
17. Students take more math/science	34	15.6	8.9	31.1	20.0	17.8	2.7	1.08

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don't Know		
18. Improved student achievement scores	42	2.2	15.6	48.9	26.7	6.7	3.1	0.75
19. Narrowing of achievement test scores within grade levels	36	4.4	24.4	46.7	4.4	15.6	2.6	0.68
20. Advocacy/support for math/science among all teachers	45	4.4	24.4	31.1	40.0	--	3.1	0.91
21. Increased ownership of the math/science curriculum by teachers	44	6.7	11.1	31.1	48.9	--	3.3	0.92
22. Responsibility for learning/achievement shifted from teacher to student	45	6.7	28.9	53.3	11.1	--	2.7	0.76
23. Content of statewide tests shape the curriculum	44	4.4	13.3	33.3	46.7	--	3.3	0.87
24. Increased instructional time on science	45	15.6	17.8	46.7	20.0	--	2.7	0.97
25. Increased instructional time on math	45	15.6	15.6	46.7	22.2	--	2.8	0.98
26. Content unrelated to standards dropped from the curriculum	39	8.9	22.2	31.1	24.4	8.9	2.8	0.97
27. Use of different/alternative student assessments in science and math	42	8.9	13.3	51.1	20.0	4.4	2.9	0.86
28. Increased parent/community involvement in schools	41	17.8	37.8	33.3	2.2	6.7	2.2	0.79
29. Viable evidence of support for math/science in decor of school and school environment	43	8.9	35.6	40.0	11.1	--	2.6	0.83

Notes: Response options used for calculating the means and standard deviations were “Not at All” (1), “Slight Extent” (2), “Moderate Extent” (3), and “Great Extent” (4). Data not included in this table were missing responses and multiple or responses that were unusable for one reason or another. Therefore, rows may not total to 100 percent.

Table 5. Local Facilitators’ Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Perceptions/Responses									
	Missing%		False %		Partly True %		True %		Don't Know %	
	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current	Initial	Current
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	3.6	5.4	5.4	3.6	32.1	25.0	48.2	66.1	10.7	--
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	1.8	7.1	5.4	5.4	23.2	32.1	57.1	55.4	12.5	--
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	1.8	3.6	8.9	12.5	44.6	41.1	32.1	39.3	12.5	3.6
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	1.8	3.6	12.5	8.9	25.0	25.0	51.8	62.5	8.9	–
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	1.8	3.6	8.9	1.8	16.1	14.3	71.4	80.4	1.8	--
6. Student achievement would improve.	1.8	5.4	5.4	–	21.4	33.9	66.1	55.4	5.4	5.4
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	1.8	3.6	12.5	5.4	25.0	46.4	44.6	41.1	16.1	3.6
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	1.8	3.6	3.6	5.4	25.0	32.1	58.9	57.1	10.7	1.8
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	3.6	3.6	21.4	25.0	30.4	48.2	30.4	19.6	14.3	3.6
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	1.8	3.6	25.0	19.6	33.9	44.6	23.2	28.6	16.1	3.6
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data.	1.8	3.6	8.9	8.9	28.6	26.8	44.6	58.9	16.1	1.8
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	1.8	3.6	12.5	32.1	23.2	25.0	41.1	33.9	21.4	5.4
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	1.8	3.6	3.6	8.9	28.6	21.4	53.6	64.3	12.5	1.8
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel.	1.8	3.6	5.4	12.5	21.4	8.9	62.5	75.0	8.9	--
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	1.8	3.6	8.9	14.3	32.1	26.8	44.6	53.6	12.5	1.8
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	1.8	3.6	23.2	25.0	26.8	46.4	25.0	17.9	23.2	7.1
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	1.8	3.6	28.6	23.2	25.0	33.9	12.5	23.2	32.1	16.1

Note: Missing responses were those that were either blank or not included because they were unusable, e.g., multiple instead of single responses, etc. N = 56

Table 5A. Local Facilitators' Perceptions of Initial Expectations and Current Experiences

Issues or Activities	Comparisons of the Means of the Initial Expectations and Current Experiences		
	Mean _i [Standard Deviation _i]	Mean _c [Standard Deviation _c]	Difference (Mean _c minus Mean _i)
1. Leadership training would be a major intervention.	2.5 [0.62]	2.7 [0.55]	0.2
2. Teacher training/in-service would be available to help all teachers.	2.6 [0.61]	2.5 [0.61]	-0.1
3. Training in technology would be widely available.	2.3 [0.64]	2.3 [0.70]	0.0
4. Curriculum development would be a major focus and result of the reform movement.	2.4 [0.73]	2.6 [0.66]	0.2
5. The curriculum would be aligned with state standards.	2.7 [0.65]	2.8 [0.44]	0.1
6. Student achievement would improve.	2.7 [0.59]	2.6 [0.49]	-0.1
7. Alternative forms of student assessment would be identified and used.	2.4 [0.74]	2.4 [0.60]	0.0.
8. Instruction would become laboratory/activity-centered.	2.6 [0.57]	2.6 [0.61]	0.0
9. Parents would become involved in substantive ways.	2.1 [0.80]	1.9 [0.70]	-0.2
10. A new math/science program would be implemented.	2.0 [0.77]	2.1 [0.72]	0.1
11. Planned improvements would be tied to valid interpretation of test data.	2.4 [0.69]	2.5 [0.67]	0.1
12. Monies would be available for purchasing classroom materials.	2.4 [0.76]	2.0 [0.86]	-0.4
13. Monies would be available for teachers to attend professional conferences and meetings.	2.6 [0.58]	2.6 [0.66]	0.0
14. On-site assistance for teachers would be provided by RSI personnel	2.6 [0.60]	2.7 [0.70]	0.1
15. A local facilitator would provide support and leadership on a regular basis.	2.4 [0.68]	2.4 [0.75]	0.0

Issues or Activities	Comparisons of the Means of the Initial Expectations and Current Experiences		
	Mean _i [Standard Deviation _i]	Mean _c [Standard Deviation _c]	Difference (Mean _c minus Mean _i)
16. The community (not just parents) would become involved in the school.	2.0 [0.81]	1.9 [0.70]	-0.1
17. External audits or reviews of our curriculum would occur.	1.8 [0.76]	2.0 [0.77]	0.2

Notes: Means and standard deviations are calculated only from responses to options “False,” “Partly True,” and “True.” Results from the initial expectations response category are designated by subscript “I”; results from the current experiences response category are designated by subscript “C.”

In the survey forms, a number of questions called for open-end responses. These responses are summarized in Table 6.

Table 5B. Local Facilitators’ Contacts’ Perceptions of Impact on Selected Elements of the Instructional Program

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don’t Know		
1. Math/science curriculum aligned with recognized set of standards	54	--	17.9	21.4	57.1	--	3.4	0.79
2. Curriculum more challenging to the best students	53	8.9	33.9	33.9	17.9	--	2.6	0.90
3. Curriculum more challenging for all students	53	3.6	12.5	42.9	35.7	--	3.2	0.80
4. Expanded student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction	54	5.4	10.7	44.6	35.7	--	3.2	0.83
5. Increased use of group and/or cooperative learning experiences for students	54	7.1	8.9	39.3	41.1	--	3.2	0.89
6. Internet and other forms of technology integrated into instructional activities	54	3.6	26.8	39.3	26.8	--	2.9	0.84
7. Increased student interest and participation in science fairs and other forms of competitive activities	50	23.2	32.1	23.2	10.7	5.4	2.2	0.98

Issues or Activities	N	Responses (%)					Mean	S.D.
		1 Not at All	2 Slight Extent	3 Moder- ate Extent	4 Great Extent	Don't Know		
8. Increased awareness of math/science-related careers and educational requirements for entrance into these professions	52	14.3	33.9	35.7	8.9	3.6	2.4	0.87
9. Student engagement in community service projects, especially those requiring some math/science knowledge and skills	48	26.8	37.5	21.4	--	7.1	1.9	0.76
10. Lowered dropout rate	24	8.9	17.9	16.1	--	50.0	2.2	0.76
11. Higher daily attendance	30	8.9	17.9	19.6	7.1	41.1	2.5	0.94
12. Use of alternative student assessment approaches	51	8.9	28.6	33.9	19.6	3.6	2.7	0.92
13. Increased parental/community participation in math/science-related school events	50	17.9	48.2	17.9	5.4	7.1	2.1	0.80
14. Policies that support higher quality education	50	8.9	12.5	37.5	30.4	5.4	3.0	0.95
15. Policies that support high standards and good preparation of new teachers	44	10.7	16.1	23.2	28.6	17.9	2.9	1.06
16. Increased requirement and expectations of students in math/science	51	8.9	8.9	30.4	42.9	3.6	3.2	0.97
17. Students take more math/science	37	8.9	16.1	23.2	17.9	28.6	2.8	1.01
18. Improved student achievement scores	50	1.8	26.8	39.3	21.4	7.1	2.9	0.79
19. Narrowing of achievement test scores within grade levels	32	3.6	23.2	25.0	5.4	33.9	2.6	0.76
20. Advocacy/support for math/science among all teachers	49	7.1	21.4	28.6	30.4	8.9	2.9	0.97
21. Viable evidence of support for math/science in decor of school and school environment	49	12.5	26.8	33.9	14.3	7.1	2.6	0.94

Notes: Response options used for calculating the means and standard deviations were “Not at All” (1), “Slight Extent” (2), “Moderate Extent” (3), and “Great Extent” (4). Data not included in this table were missing responses and multiple or responses that were unusable for one reason or another. Therefore, rows may not total to 100 percent.

Table 6. Summary of Open-End Responses to Critical Issues

Issues/Questions		
Three Most Significant Changes		
Administrative Contacts (N = 79)	School Principals (N = 45)	Local Facilitators (N = 56)
Instructional techniques	Alignment and improvement of the curriculum	Use of different and varied instructional strategies and assessment techniques
Science and math emphases	Professional development opportunities and results, i.e., increased participation, awareness, attitudes, and competence	Alignment and changing curricula
Teachers' attitudes, perspectives, and awareness	Instructional techniques	Increasing course requirements
Teachers' abilities and involvement in process		Improving course offerings
Alignment of curricula		Teachers' attitudes, confidence, teamwork, and involvement
Three Greatest Challenges		
Teacher attitudes, work habits, and involvement	Teacher and union attitudes	Teacher attitudes and abilities
Teacher qualifications and turnover	Time	Poor teacher qualifications
Attitudes of parents and community	Parent and community attitudes	Time
Poverty mind-set in the community	Lack of awareness, support, and involvement of the community	Inadequate teacher recruitment and retention of qualified personnel
Lack of highly skilled and qualified teaching force		Work required to obtain training in technology, align curricula, and design new lessons
Lack of opportunity for higher education		
Lack of science, math, or technology-related jobs in the community		
Getting higher education involved		

Issues/Questions		
Three Most Important Indicators of Reform		
Alignment of curricula to standards	Inquiry-based lessons with more hands-on and laboratory work	Improved student achievement
More and more challenging course offerings	New and varied instructional practices	Greater participation of students in science and math fairs and challenge activities
Use of the laboratory	Improved student achievement	Increased enrollment in more challenging STEM courses
Use of technology	Improved teacher attitudes	Student interest and pursuit of studies and careers in science, math, and technology areas
Improved teacher attitudes and work habits	More teacher involvement in planning and improved work habits	Percentage of students taking qualification exams and enrolling in higher education
Student achievement scores	Students acceptance of challenges	Improved student attitudes and attendance in school
Student participation in science fairs and other forms of competition		Greater use of technology
Student enthusiasm and requests to enroll in upper level or more challenging courses		Appearance of the classrooms
		Types of courses offered
		Teacher attitudes and awareness

The school principals estimated that they spent an average of 3.3 hours per week on RSI-related work and that they communicated with an RSI representative an average of 3.4 times per month. Regarding their involvement with RSI, they estimated the time they devote to RSI is of the following types and percentage.

Administration and fiscal management	25.7 percent
Curriculum leader	22.9 percent
Overall change facilitator	25.7 percent
Consultant and resource person	17.1 percent
Public relations/spokesperson	5.7 percent
Other	2.9 percent

Findings

A number of questions and issues emerged from the evaluative study of selected NSF-supported Rural Systemic Initiative collaboratives. This study, under the direction of Dr. Jerry G. Horn with The Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University, is directed more toward what is happening in the RSIs than as an assessment of individual RSIs or participating schools. The study was designed and is being conducted on the principle that rural communities and the schools that serve them are unique and that there is value in how these reform efforts, such as those undertaken by NSF and its collaborators, are perceived. To gather information that will help us and others (practitioners, administrators, and policymakers) understand these perceptions, a survey was designed with input from the principal investigators/project directors of the selected RSI collaboratives, i.e., Delta, Appalachia, Texas, Michigan, and Coastal. It was thought that the persons who would be the best informants on the questions and issues under consideration at this time would be the administrative contact for the RSI, a school principal, and the local facilitator. Also, the respondent pool (participating school districts) was selected by the RSI collaborative administrator(s) with instructions to select only those districts that had substantive involvement with RSI. While the term “local facilitator” is not universally used, it was operationally defined as the person selected to serve as “teacher partner,” “resource teacher,” or a person with similar responsibilities.

The results of this survey, conducted during 2002, are summarized and presented in this report. Copies of the survey instruments and other information pertaining to the administration of the survey are included in the appendices. In this section, we want to identify some of the important findings, as related to the purpose of this evaluative study. Every point or possible finding will not be addressed here. However, those who find use for this information for other purposes may find these data useful.

As stated earlier, the NSF identified six drivers as recognition of “Educational System Reform.” In earlier reports [*A Summary of RSI School Personnel’s Perceptions of the Drivers for Educational Systemic Reform* (April 2001) and *A Summary of RSI School Personnel’s Perceptions of the Drivers for Educational Systemic Reform—Part Two* (September 2002)], it was concluded that there is strong support and recognition of the drivers and the indicators developed and validated by the Research Advisory Team¹ for the WMU study. It was agreed that these are reflective of systemic reform and should be the primary focus of ongoing reform efforts. These findings are consistent in the two studies cited, which includes input from six RSI collaboratives (UCAN, Delta, Appalachia, Texas, Coastal, and Michigan). In that regard, the following section provides an analysis of the extent to which each driver is present in the schools represented by the respondents of the current survey.

¹An appointed team of ten nationally known professionals with expertise in a broad spectrum of areas, i.e., evaluation, rural education, policy studies, school administration, science and math education, educational change and improvement, etc.

Driver 1: Implementation of comprehensive, standards-based curricula as represented in instructional practice, including student assessment, in every classroom, laboratory, and other learning experience provided through the system and its partners.

Status: Clearly, all respondents expected that the curriculum would be aligned with recognized standards, and this expectation is perceived to be realized in practice. In terms of impact, there is some evidence that there have been more laboratory-oriented, hand-on activities and that these are related to the alignment of the curriculum with standards. While not specifically determined in this survey, most of the states represented in this study have also instituted statewide testing/-assessment programs that are intended to be reflective of the established standards and benchmarks recognized by that state. Whether the RSIs are responsible for the decision to align the curriculum is not a certainty, but it is clear that the RSIs have been instrumental and in many cases the vehicle for the alignment process to proceed in science and math. In some cases, this served as the model for alignment in other subject areas.

Driver 2: Development of a coherent, consistent set of policies that supports: provision of high quality mathematics and science education for each student; excellent preparation, continuing education, and support for each mathematics and science teacher (including all elementary teachers); and administrative support for all persons who work to dramatically improve achievement among all students served by the system.

Status: We do not have evidence that there existed or that there have been changes that resulted in policies pertaining to these issues. However, administrative contacts and principals did rate policy statements among some of the highest rated impacts. What we found is that schools generally follow the rules/policies set forth by their respective states with regard to the required curriculum and graduation requirements. In practice, there is evidence that more courses and more challenging opportunities for studying science and mathematics occurred in many locations. In a small school and especially in rural communities, practice is far more important than policies, and that seems to be a positive outcome or finding. School principals did give a high rating in terms of impact with regard to “Increased requirements and expectations of students in math/science.” In terms of professional development, the RSIs offered or facilitated the offering of a number of opportunities for teachers. The quality of these offerings or the appropriateness to the educational reform/improvement in science and math has not been determined. However, teachers, especially elementary teachers, speak well of these experiences; and the respondents in this study indicated that one of the important outcomes/impact has been improved teacher attitudes and work habits. Administrative support for the RSI effort is at least partially reflected in the ways in which the administrative

contacts and school principals were involved, i.e., spending time on behalf of the RSI and indirectly as facilitating professional development efforts, appointing a local facilitator (often taking a recognized and highly successful teacher from the regular classroom for this assignment), etc.

Driver 3: Convergence of the usage of all resources that are designed for or that reasonably could be used to support science and mathematics education—fiscal, intellectual, material, curricular, and extra-curricular—into a focused and unitary program to constantly upgrade, renew, and improve the educational program in mathematics and science for all students.

Status: The results of this survey do not provide adequate information to make a judgment with regard to Driver 3.

Driver 4: Broad-based support from parents, policymakers, institutions of higher education, business and industry, foundations, and other segments of the community for the goals and collective value of the program, based on rich presentations of the ideas behind the program, the evidence gathered about its successes and its failures, and critical discussions of its efforts.

Status: In many respects, this expectation or area of hope has been a disappointment. While many respondents had this expectation, there has been little success in substantive involvement of parents and the community in this reform effort. While there are instances of what has been termed “successful” events—i.e., math or science night, a science fair, etc.—there is virtually no evidence that this driver is present in most of the communities or that it will ever be present using current strategies. In higher education, participation has been largely on the basis of individuals who were contracted to provide specific services: workshop presenter, resource person, etc. However, higher education (colleges and universities), which might be represented by math and science departments’ major involvement and commitment to the goals of RSIs, is not a part of current RSI projects or local reform efforts.

Driver 5: Accumulation of a broad and deep array of evidence that the program is enhancing student achievement, through a set of indices that might include achievement test scores, higher level courses passed, college admission rates, college majors, Advanced Placement Tests taken, portfolio assessment, and ratings from summer employers, and that demonstrate that students are generally achieving at a significantly higher level in science and mathematics.

Status: While this was identified as the second highest rated expectation by all three groups of respondents, none listed it among its highest realizations. Only among school principals did we find that “Improved student achievement scores” received a rating

above 3.0 (Impact to Some Extent) on estimated impact, and the calculated value for the school principals group was only 3.1. Granted, there are more indicators of student achievement than test scores, but there are virtually no data to indicate that there is a “broad and deep array of evidence that the program is enhancing student achievement” or that there is an effort to establish this at the local school level. This is not to say that this is not a goal and even an accomplishment at the RSI collaborative level.

Driver 6: Improvement in the achievement of all students, including those historically underserved.

Status: In terms of the RSI projects, other reports of the WMU study have cited the homogeneous nature of most of the communities. Generally, they could be described as economically poor, not well educated, with an adult population of maybe 50 percent with high school diplomas or GEDs, few opportunities for employment and virtually none that require advanced studies in math or science, school populations of one racial type, and relatively low expectations for education and careers/employment outside the immediate area. By definition, the RSIs are supposed to serve poor, rural schools; therefore, the real underserved are the whole school population. However, there are subpopulations within the schools themselves, and the respondents reported that the “curriculum is more challenging for all students” and that this was an expectation, a realization, and an impact. Evidence was not obtained that would allow us to extend this interpretation to subgroups.

Following are other findings based on this survey:

- Expectations did not exceed realizations. The exceptions to this are generally confined to the areas of greater expectations for monies from the project to be available at the local level and that parents and the community would be more involved.
- Realizations that exceeded initial expectations are few, but to a substantial extent fall within the areas of leadership training and support and leadership from a local facilitator.
- Alignment of science and math curricula with a recognized set of standards and the provision of a more challenging curriculum for all students are highly notable outcomes or areas of impact. (With the advent of the statewide standards movement and the “No Child Left Behind” program of the George W. Bush administration, the RSIs were timely forms of resources, expertise, and assistance to local schools in these projects.)
- Although likely not the only factor in some cases, the RSI program seems to have had a broad impact on various elements of schools—the students, teachers, and the administration—including increasing the awareness of math/science-related careers, increased

student interest in science fairs and other forms of competition, improved student access to laboratory/activity-oriented instruction, more challenging curricula, integration of technology into instruction, advocacy for math/science among all teachers, teacher ownership in the curriculum, policies that support higher quality education, leadership training, etc.

It might be useful to consider some of the following comments (edited quotes) as concluding comments about the RSIs from the perspective of the local schools, as reflected in this 2002 survey.

Our thinking is that there will be spill over to the grade levels above and below. As the supervisor and evaluator of these individuals, I can attest to the improved instruction and assessment. In addition, student achievement as measured by the teacher-created, on-going assessments, is much more meaningful. Teachers are using this information to drive their instruction. Our students do not take a standardized state assessment for math and science until the upper grades, so it will be a few years before we feel the full impact of the curriculum and instruction improvement.

I am convinced that increased student learning and student achievement in math and science impacts all areas of learning in a positive manner. Math and science activities are invitational and exciting. Puts the pressure on.

The RSI technical assistant has worked “seamlessly” with other support initiatives.

The RSI has had a profound effect on our school district. Given the isolated nature of both the town and its occupants, change has not occurred here in over 30 years. Teachers are resistant and untrustful of research, new instructional techniques, and benchmarks/standards. The RSI has provided the necessary groundwork for my staff to begin working as a team.

APPENDIX A

Lists of Contact Persons

ARSI Contact Person List

Coastal RSI Contact List

Delta RSI Contact Person List

MiRSI Contact Person List

Texas Contact Person List

ARSI Contact List

Fname	LName	Code	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
Peggy	Ginn	A1	Adams County/Ohio Valley Schools	141 Lloyd Road	West Union	OH	45693
Homer	Delk	A2	Alvin C. York Agricultural Institute	P.O. Box 70	Jamestown	TN	38556
Teresa	Caudill	A3	Bath County Board of Education	405 W. Main Street	Owingsville	KY	40360-2017
Karen	Hatfield	A4	Bath County Board of Education	405 W. Main Street	Owingsville	KY	40360-2017
Richard	Adkins	A5	Boone County Schools	69 Avenue B	Madison	WV	25130
Carla	Jeffers	A6	Campbell County Board of Education	P.O. Box 445	Jacksboro	TN	37757
Wayne	Kitts	A7	Campbell County Schools	P.O. Box 445	Jacksboro	TN	37757
Paula	Little	A8	Clinton County Schools	Route 4 Box 100	Albany	KY	42602
Betty	Jones	A9	Cocke County Schools	305 Hedrick Drive	Newport	TN	37821
Damon	Rasnick	A10	Dickenson County Schools	P.O. Box 1127, Volunteer St.	Clintwood	TN	24228
Randy	Clark	A11	Fentress County Schools	P.O. Box 963	Jamestown	TN	38556
Joyce	Watson	A12	Floyd County Schools	106 North Front Avenue	Prestonsburg	KY	41653
Rick	Davis	A13	Graham County Schools	P.O. Box 605	Robbinsville	NC	28771
Shaunna	Patton	A14	Johnson County (KY) Schools	253 North Mayo Trail	Paintsville	KY	41240
David	Timbs	A15	Johnson County (TN) Schools	211 North Church Street	Mountain City	TN	37863
Frieda	Mullins	A16	Knott County Board of Education	P.O. Box 869	Hindman	KY	41822
Gary	Perdue	A17	Lee County Public Schools	5 Park Street	Jonesville	VA	24263
Vickie	Garrison	A18	Leslie Co. Schools	P.O. Box 949, School Street	Hyden	KY	41749
Barbara	Hoskins	A19	Leslie Co. Schools	P.O. Box 949, School Street	Hyden	KY	41749
Kim	King	A20	Letcher County Schools	218 Park St., P. O. Box 788	Whitesburg	KY	41858
Belinda	Forman	A21	Lewis County Schools	Drawer 159	Vanceburg	KY	41179
Nancy	Wilcher	A22	Lincoln County Schools	305 Danville Avenue	Stanford	KY	40484
Dan	Plumley	A23	Lincoln County Schools	10 Marland Avenue	Hamiln	WV	25523
Phyllis	Doty	A24	Logan County Schools	P. O. Box 477, 506 Holly Ave.	Logan	WV	25601
Renee	Diamond	A25	McCreary County School District HC 69, Box 24		Stearns	KY	42647
Carol	Hatem	A26	Meigs Eastern Local School District 320 1/2 East Main Street	P.O. Box 684	Pomeroy	OH	45769
Carol	Hatem	A27	Meigs Local School District 320 1/2 East Main Street	P.O. Box 684	Pomeroy	OH	45769
Catherine	Hacker	A28	Menifee Board of Education	P.O. Box 110	Frenchburg	KY	40322
Terri	Caton	A29	Morgan Local Schools	PO Box 509	McConnellsville	OH	43756
Nancy	Williamson	A30	Oneida City School District PO Box 4819	195 N. Bank Street	Oneida	TN	37841
Melinda	Turner	A31	Owsley Elementary/High School	P.O. Box 340	Booneville	KY	41314
Don	Armstrong	A32	Stockdale Elementary School	1170 Tile Mill Rd	Beaver	OH	45613
Lyn	Stidham	A33	Powell County Schools	P. O. Box 430	Stanton	KY	40380
Doris	Weekley	A34	Roane County Schools	P.O. Box 609, 108 Chapman Ave.	Spencer	WV	25276
Shelby	Reynolds	A35	Rockcastle County Schools	245 Richmond St.	Mt. Vernon	KY	40456
Betty	Stewart	A36	Rowan County Board of Education	121 East Second Street	Morehead	KY	40351
Linda	Keeton	A37	Scott County Schools	208 Court Street	Huntsville	TN	37756
Carol	Hatem	A38	Southern Local School District 320 1/2 East Main Street	P.O. Box 684	Pomeroy	OH	45769
Linda	Dills	A39	Swain County Schools	P.O. Box 6	Bryson City	NC	27313
Sue	Schneider	A40	Swain County Schools	P.O. Box 6, Drawer U	Bryson City	NC	28713
Mary Ann	Hale	A41	Vinton County Local School District	307 West High Street	McArthur	OH	45651

ARSI Contact List

Rick	Teeters	A42	Waverly City School District	500 E. Second St.	Waverly	OH	45690
Wayne	Roberts	A43	Wayne County Schools	534 Albany Road	Monticello	KY	42633
Nina	Prewitt	A44	Whitley County Schools	116 North 4th St	Williamsburg	KY	40769
R. A. (Buddy)	Shull	A45	Wise County Schools	P.O. Box 1217	Wise	VA	24293
Joanie	Staab	A46	Wolfe County Board of Education	PO Box 160, Main Street	Campton	KY	41301

Coastal RSI Contact List

Fname	Lname	Code	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
Pat	Alexander	C1	Charles City School	10910 Courthouse Rd.	Charles City	VA	23030-3426
John	Dunn	C2	Camden School	174 North 343	Camden	NC	27921
Rita	Collie	C3	Pasquotank School	1200 S. Halstead Blvd.	Elizabeth City	NC	27906
Kenneth	Wells	C4	Perquimans School	411 Edenton Road	Hertford	NC	27944
Cindy	Williamson	C5	Whiteville City School	107 W Walter St.	Whiteville	NC	28472
Paul	Pope	C6	Columbus School	P O Box 729	Whiteville	NC	28472
Cleo	Richardson	C7	Marion 1 School	616 Northside Ave.	Marion	SC	29571
Cindy	Fowler	C8	Marion 2 School	PO Box 689	Mullins	SC	29574
Jane	Pullen	C9	Marion 7 School	PO Drawer 1439	Rains	SC	29589-1439
Maxie	Knowlton	C10	Clarendon 3 School	PO Drawer 270	Turbeville	SC	29162

Delta RSI Contact List

FName	Lname	Code	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
Dick	Young	D1	Brinkley Schools	200 Tiger Drive	Brinkley	AR	72021
Peggy	Burnett	D2	Cross County Schools	428 Second St.	Hickory Ridge	AR	72372
Dennis	Meins	D3	Dermott Schools	Highway 35 East	Dermott	AR	71638
Shirley	Teeter	D4	Dumas Schools	Caller #8880	Dumas	AR	71639
Alberta	Dunbar	D5	Eudora Schools	111 N. Archer St.	Eudora	AR	71640
Betty S.	Beazley	D6	Forrest City Schools	2505 Sycamore St.	Forrest City	AR	72335
Carolyn	Love	D7	Holly Grove Schools	P.O. Box 489	Holly Grove	AR	72069
James	Hendricks	D8	Marshall Schools	P.O. Box 310	Marshall	AR	72650
Bernie	Bell Roberts	D9	Marvell Primary School	PO Box 1870	Marvell	AR	72366
Diane	Barrett	D10	McGehee Schools	P.O. Box 767	McGehee	AR	71654
Dale	Ball	D11	Newport Schools	406 Wilkerson Dr.	Newport	AR	72112
Jeanine	Wood	D12	Palestine/Wheatly Schools	104 Cherry	Marianna	AR	72675
Sylvia	Moore	D13	Parkins Schools	P.O. Box 861	Parkin	AR	72373
James	Trammell	D14	St. Joe School	P.O. Box 69	St. Joe	AR	72675
Glenda	Hendrix	D15	Witts Springs Schools	P.O. Box 1019	Witts Springs	AR	72686
Beth	Boeckmann	D16	Wynne Schools	P.O. Box 69	Wynne	AR	72396
Karen	Reed	D17	Allen Schools	P.O. Drawer C	Oberlin	LA	70655
Dr. Susan	Aysenne	D18	Assumption Schools	4901 Highway 308	Napoleonville	LA	70390
Susan	Welch	D19	Avoyelles Schools	221 Tunica Drive West	Marksville	LA	71351
Mary Lou	Revere	D20	Bogalouosa City Schools	1403 North Avenue	Bogalouosa	LA	70427
Mary	Stephens	D21	Caldwell Schools	P.O. Box 1019	Columbia	LA	71418
Sharon	Gilmore	D22	Catahoula Schools	P.O. Box 290	Harrisonburg	LA	71340
Michelle	Bethea	D23	Concordia Parish Schools	P.O. Box 306	Clayton	LA	71326
Voleria	Milliken	D24	East Carroll Schools	P.O. Box 792	Lake Providence	LA	71294
Knight	Roddy	D25	East Feliciana Schools	P.O. Box 8771	Clinton	LA	70722
Mordessa	Corbin	D26	Franklin Schools	P.O. Box 627	Gilbert	LA	71336
Janet	Marionneaux	D27	Iberville Schools	P.O. Box 151	Plaquemine	LA	70765
Ann	Powell	D28	Madison Schools	1100 Johnson St.	Tallulah	LA	71282
Karron	Watts	D29	Morehouse Schools	909 Larche Lane	Bastrop	LA	71220
Virginia	Langland	D30	Pointe Coupee Schools	9078 Gravois Lane	Maringouin	LA	70757
Susan	Tyree	D31	Richland Schools	P.O. Box 599	Rayville	LA	71269
Carol	Johnson	D32	Tensas Schools	P.O. Box 318	St. Joseph	LA	71366
Sandy	Morgan	D33	Washington Schools	P.O. Box 587	Franklinton	LA	70438
Chris	Elms	D34	West Carroll Schools	P.O. Box 1318	Oak Grove	LA	71263
Joan	Martin	D35	West Feliciana Schools	3494 Red Clover Ave.	Zachary	LA	70791
Steve	Bartlett	D36	Winn Schools	P.O. Drawer 430	Winnfield	LA	71483
Bobby	Brown	D37	Adams Schools	310 Seargent Prentiss Dr	Natchez	MS	39120
Dorothy	Chesser	D38	Amite Schools	3017 Peoria Ave.	Liberty	MS	39645
Susan	Murphy	D39	Carroll Schools	P.O. Box 256	Carrollton	MS	38917
Tracy	Cook	D40	Claiborne Schools	Old Hwy. 18	Port Gibson	MS	39150
Dr. Wilma	Wade	D41	Clarksdale Municipal Schools	P.O. Box 1088	Clarksdale	MS	38614
Beverly	Culley	D42	Coahoma Schools	P.O. Box 820	Clarksdale	MS	38614
Eddie	Anderson	D43	Coffeerville Schools	16849 Okahoma Street	Coffeerville	MS	38922
Dr. Danye	Long	D44	Columbia Schools	P.O. Box 271	Columbia	MS	39429
Bettie	McDaniel	D45	Copiah Schools	112 School Drive	Hazlehurst	MS	39083
Patricia	Brown	D46	Coahoma Aggie Schools	1046 Hollie Beth Lane	Clarksdale	MS	38614
Mark	McLeod	D47	Covington Schools	P.O. Box 757	Collins	MS	39428
Lynn	Washington	D48	Drew Schools	288 Green Avenue	Drew	MS	38737
Loretta	Shird	D49	Durant Schools	65 West Madison St.	Durant	MS	39063
David	Hargell	D50	East Tallahatchie Schools	411 East Chestnut St.	Charleston	MS	38619
Eva	Guice	D51	Franklin Schools	Rt. 1 Box 167-1	Meadville	MS	39653
Margie	Pulley	D52	Greenwood Schools	401 Howard St.	Greenwood	MS	38935
Marie	Brown	D53	Hazlehurst Schools	122 School Drive	Hazlehurst	MS	39083
Judy	Smith	D54	Holly Springs Schools	150 East College Avenue	Holly Springs	MS	38635
Dr. Pastella	Hampton	D55	Holmes Schools	313 Olive Street	Lexington	MS	39095

Delta RSI Contact List

FName	Lname	Code	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
Bonnie	Horton	D56	Humphreys Schools	P.O. Box 678	Belzoni	MS	39038
Dr. Sammie	Crigler	D57	Indianola Schools	Highway 82 E	Indianola	MS	38751
Betty	Jackson	D58	Jefferson Schools	Hwy 33 Route 2 Box 35C	Fayette	MS	39069
Dr. Ceroy	Jefferson	D59	Jefferson Davis Schools	P.O. Box 1197	Prentiss	MS	39474
Tommy	Spells	D60	Leflore Schools	1901 Highway 82 West	Greenwood	MS	38930
Tammy	Fairburn	D61	Lawrence Schools	346 Thomas E. Jolly Drive	Monticello	MS	39564
C. E.	Craft	D62	McComb Schools	P.O. Box 868	McComb	MS	39648
Bettye	Bell	D63	Natchez-Adams Schools	7 McCabe St.	Natchez	MS	39120
Michael	Britt	D64	North Panola Schools	202 Lewers St.	Como	MS	38619
Ben	Cox	D65	North Pike Schools	1036 Jaguar Trail	Summit	MS	39666
Dr. Robert	Maniece	D66	Quitman Schools	Drawer E	Marks	MS	38646
Carol	Stigler	D67	Senatobia Schools	102 West Porter	Senatobia	MS	38668
Sara	McCullouch	D68	South Panola Schools	209 Boothe Street	Batesville	MS	38606
Dr. Brenda	Jackson	D69	South Pike Schools	2252 W. Bay St.	Magnolia	MS	39652
Latanya	Calhoun	D70	Sunflower Schools	P.O. Box 129	Ruleville	MS	38771
Jerry	Stigler	D71	Tate Schools	302 Court Street	Senatobia	MS	38668
Gail	Carter	D72	Tunica Schools	P.O. Box 758	Tunica	MS	38676
Blanche	Moore	D73	Walthall Schools	814-A Morse Avenue	Typertown	MS	39667
Jeanie	Black	D74	Water Valley Schools	P.O. Box 647	Water Valley	MS	38965
Pat	Anderson	D75	West Marion Schools	2 West Marion Street	Foxworth	MS	39483
Howard	Hollins	D76	West Tallahatchie Schools	P.O. Box 129	Webb	MS	38626
Barbara	Parker	D77	Wilkinson Schools	488 Main St.	Woodville	MS	39669
Deloris	Scott	D78	Yazoo City Schools	516 E. Canal St.	Yazoo City	MS	39194

Michigan RSI Contact List

Fname	Lname	Code	Address1	Address2	City	State	Zip
Katherine	Larkin	M1	Alba School District	5935 Elm St. P.O. Box 10	Alba	MI	49611
Linda	Olson	M2	Arenac Eastern School District	200 Smalley St. P.O. Box 98	Twining	MI	48766-0098
Bernice	Pudney	M3	Atlanta Community Schools	10500 Co Rd. P.O. Box 619	Atlanta	MI	49709-0619
P.T.	Jones	M4	Baldwin Community Schools	525 4th St.	Baldwin	MI	49304-9525
RSI Contact Person		M5	Baraga Area Schools	210 Lyons St. P.O. Box 428	Baraga	MI	49908-0428
Claudia	Blanko	M6	Brimley Area Schools	7134 S. Hwy M 221	Brimley	MI	49715-9299
Mary Jo	Dismang	M7	Houghton Lake Community Schools	6001 W. Houghton Lake Drive	Houghton Lake	MI	48629
Karen	Christensen	M8	Marion Community Schools	510 W. Main St. P.O. Box 0	Marion	MI	49665-0715
Rich	Sgarlotti	M9	Nah Tah Wahsh PSA	N14911 Hannahville Rd. B1	Wilson	MI	49869-9612
Barbara	Parmenter	M10	Pine River Area Schools	17445 Pine River Rd.	Leroy	MI	49655-9579
Nancy	Berkompas	M11	Rudyard Area Schools	11185 W. Second St. P.O. Box 246	Rudyard	MI	49780-0246
Nancy	Corl	M12	Tahquamenon Area Schools	700 Newberry Ave.	Newberry	MI	49868-1598
Ellen	Bonter	M13	Vanderbilt Area Schools	947 Donovan St.	Vanderbilt	MI	49759-9773
Esther	Mudge	M14	Whitefish Township Schools	7221 N. M-123 P.O. Box 58	Paradise	MI	49768-0058
Marilyn	Herriman	M15	Whittemore-Prescott Area Schools	P.O. Box 250	Whittemore	MI	48770-0250
Susan	Denise	M16	Wolverine Community Schools	13131 Brook St. P.O. Box 219	Wolverine	MI	49799-0219

Texas Contact Person List

Code	District	First Name	Last name	Address	City	State	Zip
T1	Aransas County Independent School District	Thursey	Sutton	PO Box 907	Rockport	TX	78381-0907
T2	Beeville Independent School District	Nancy	Jones	2400 North Saint Mary's St.	Beeville	TX	78102-2494
T3	Blackwell Independent School District	Gary	Smith	PO Box 505	Blackwell	TX	79506-0505
T4	Brady Independent School District	Lee	Coffman	100 West Main	Brady	TX	76825
T5	Brownfield Independent School District	Jeanette	Awbrey	601 Tahoka Road	Brownfield	TX	79316
T6	Cameron Independent School District	Maxie	Morgan	304 East 12th Street	Cameron	TX	76520-0712
T7	Carrizo Springs Independent School District	Debby	Dobie	102 N. 5th St.	Carrizo Springs	TX	78834-3102
T8	Charlotte Independent School District	Alfonso	Obregon	PO Box 489	Charlotte	TX	78011-0489
T9	Clarendon Independent School District	John	Taylor	PO Box 610	Clarendon	TX	79226
T10	Crystal City Independent School District	Imelda	Allen	805 E Crockett Street	Crystal City	TX	78839-2799
T11	Dimmitt Independent School District	Doricell	Davis	608 West Halsell St.	Dimmitt	TX	79027-17986
T12	Excelsior Independent School District	Johnny	Lewis	Rt. 2 Box 816	Center	TX	75935
T13	Floydada Independent School District	Rex	Holcombe	226 West California St.	Floydada	TX	79235-2705
T14	Fort Stockton Independent School District	Lupe	Franco	101 W Division Street	Fort Stockton	TX	79735-7107
T15	Friona Independent School District	Tonya	Gober	909 East 11th St.	Friona	TX	79035-1416
T16	George West Independent School District	Steve	Lackey	PO Drawer G	George West	TX	78022-2260
T17	Haskell Independent School District	Billie	McKeever	PO Box 937	Haskell	TX	79521-0937
T18	Hereford Independent School District	Nena	Mankin	601 N 25 Mile Ave	Hereford	TX	79045
T19	Iola Independent School District	Douglas	Devine	PO Box 159	Iola	TX	77861-0159
T20	Karnes City Independent School District	Bernard	Zarosky	PO Box 38	Karnes City	TX	78118-0038
T21	Lazbuddie Independent School District	Hardy	Carlyle	PO Box 9	Lazbuddie	TX	79053
T22	Linden-Kildare Independent School District	Mary	Dowd	120 N. Taylor St.	Linden	TX	75563-0840
T23	Lohn Independent School District	Carole	Allen	PO Box 277	Lohn	TX	76852
T24	Lyford Independent School District	Irma	Mondragon	PO Box 220	Lyford	TX	78569-0220
T25	Marietta Independent School District	Paulette	Suttle	RT 1 Box 1001	Marietta	TX	75566-0187
T26	Memphis Independent School District	Ken	Baxter	PO Box 460	Memphis	TX	79245-0460
T27	Menard Independent School District	Martha	Ellis	PO Box 729	Menard	TX	76859
T28	Meyersville Independent School District	Laura	Whitson	PO Box 1	Meyersville	TX	77974-0001
T29	Motley County Independent School District	Rick	Copp	PO Box 310	Matador	TX	79244
T30	Navasota Independent School District	Roy	Gilbert	PO Box 511	Navasota	TX	77868
T31	New Home Independent School District	Leland	Zant	PO Box 248	New Home	TX	79383
T32	North Zulch Independent School District	Crawford	Helms	PO Box 158	North Zulch	TX	77872
T33	Paint Creek Independent School District	Brett	Starkweather	RT 2 Box 190	Haskell	TX	79521-9404
T34	Patton Springs Independent School District	Brenda	Karr	PO Box 32	Afton	TX	79220
T35	Pittsburg Independent School District	Melinda	Jones	PO Box 1189	Pittsburg	TX	75686
T36	Poteet Independent School District	Douglas	Killian	PO Box 138	Poteet	TX	78065-0138
T37	Queen City Independent School District	Donna	Bird	PO Box 128	Queen City	TX	75572
T38	Ralls Independent School District	Dag	Azam	810 Avenue I	Ralls	TX	79357-1509
T39	Rockdale Independent School District	Penny	Curry	PO Box 632	Rockdale	TX	76567
T40	Rocksprings Independent School District	Henri	Gearing	PO Box 157	Rocksprings	TX	78880
T41	Runge Independent School District	Harold	King	PO Box 158	Runge	TX	78151-0158
T42	Sabinal Independent School District	Juan	Jasso	PO Box 338	Sabinal	TX	78881-0338
T43	San Isidro Independent School District	Anna M.	Garcia	PO Box 10	San Isidro	TX	78588-0010
T44	Spur Independent School District	Luene	McArthur	PO Box 250	Spur	TX	79370
T45	Tahoka Independent School District	Lisa	Ramirez	PO Box 1230	Tahoka	TX	79373-1230
T46	Trinity Independent School District	Vickie	Gearheart	PO Box 752	Trinity	TX	75862
T47	Woodsboro Independent School District	Edgar	Schubert	PO Box 770	Woodsboro	TX	78393-0770
T48	Yorktown Independent School District	Jerome	Stewart	PO Box 487	Yorktown	TX	78164-0487
District Contact List Rural Systemic Initiatives in Texas as of October 7, 2002							

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter to Contact Persons

September 30, 2002

TO: School District Contact Person for [Collaborative Project Title] RSI Project

**FROM: Jerry Horn, Principal Research Associate
The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University**

RE: SURVEY

As a part of a continuing contract with the National Science Foundation to conduct a study of the Rural Systemic Initiatives Program, we are asking your assistance in completing one of the enclosed surveys (labeled *RSI Contact Person*) and distributing one (labeled *Building Principal for RSI School*) of the other two packets to a principal of a building/school that has been actively involved in the RSI program and one (labeled *Local RSI Facilitator*) to the person with responsibilities as a local facilitator, teacher partner, or to the person whom you consider to be in a similar role or has knowledge of the program and past participation in program activities in your school district. (Since the same survey is being sent to persons in five different RSI projects, there is not a common title given to the person that we have designated as “local facilitator,” but I ask that you consider the roles of those involved in the RSI activities in your school district and distribute it to a person who has good knowledge and experience with the program across the schools in your district.) In some cases, a person might have responsibilities that correspond to more than one of the three persons designated to receive a survey form, e.g., a building principal might also serve as the contact person for the district. In those cases, distribute both packets to that individual.

It is important for you to know that this survey/study is being conducted in cooperation with and with support of the [collaborative project title] RSI and that we are not evaluating your school/district or the RSI. Rather, our longitudinal study is designed to gather information that will help us and the National Science Foundation understand the context, needs, and approaches for the improvement of mathematics and science across all of the RSIs. Thus, some of the questions/issues may not have been a part of a specific RSI’s plan, and its appearance on the survey should not be interpreted as an expectation for the past or the future or an inferred assessment of that RSI’s effectiveness.

Each of the enclosed packets contains a brief introduction, a survey form, and a self-addressed, postage- paid envelope. By asking for perceptions or understandings, we are not asking respondents to gather information or to spend an inordinate amount of time in completing the survey. However, the information that we gather from these surveys is important in our attempts to document various approaches and understandings across all of the school districts participating in an RSI program.

Thank you for your cooperation in completing the “RSI Contact Person” survey and distributing the appropriate packets to a building principal and a local facilitator. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to call me at (405) 707-7143 or Gloria Tressler at (269) 387-5895.

enc

cc [PI of corresponding RSI collaborative project]