

Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better?

APPENDIX I: Curricula Questions from Teacher Survey

12. How frequently do you use the following Language Arts curriculum programs in your classroom?

	Daily	Once or Twice a Week	Once or Twice a Month	A Few Times a Year	Never
a. Harcourt Brace Spelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Houghton Mifflin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. McGraw Hill/MacMillan's Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Open Court	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Phonics SRA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Scholastic Phonics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Scott Foresman	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Write Source Language Program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Other (<i>please specify</i>):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. How frequently do you use the following Math curriculum programs in your classroom?

	Daily	Once or Twice a Week	Once or Twice a Month	A Few Times a Year	Never
a. Harcourt Brace	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Houghton Mifflin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. McDougal Little	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. McGraw Hill	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Prentice Hall	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Progress in Math	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Saxon Math	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Scott Foresman	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Success with MathCoach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other (<i>please specify</i>):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

APPENDIX 2A: Descriptive Statistics of Reported Language Arts Curriculum Usage Frequency by High Intensity Usage Category

Language Arts Program	Number of Schools	Average Response (Scale of 1 to 5)	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
High Intensity Open Court Usage = 1 & High Intensity Houghton Mifflin Usage = 0					
Harcourt Brace Spelling	72	1.13	0.27	1.00	2.33
Houghton Mifflin	72	1.30	0.43	1.00	3.00
McGraw Hill/MacMillan's Reading	72	1.21	0.38	1.00	3.25
Open Court	72	4.96	0.09	4.59	5.00
Phonics SRA	72	1.82	0.54	1.00	3.00
Scholastic Phonics	72	1.21	0.33	1.00	2.80
Scott Foresman	72	1.26	0.41	1.00	2.60
Write Source Language Program	72	1.26	0.45	1.00	3.54
Other	72	2.75	1.18	1.00	5.00
High Intensity Open Court Usage = 0 & High Intensity Houghton Mifflin Usage = 1					
Harcourt Brace Spelling	177	1.25	0.37	1.00	3.38
Houghton Mifflin	177	4.86	0.23	4.00	5.00
McGraw Hill/MacMillan's Reading	177	1.24	0.36	1.00	3.14
Open Court	177	1.11	0.27	1.00	2.88
Phonics SRA	177	1.34	0.47	1.00	4.31
Scholastic Phonics	177	1.33	0.40	1.00	2.83
Scott Foresman	177	1.22	0.39	1.00	3.00
Write Source Language Program	177	1.32	0.46	1.00	3.13
Other	173	3.26	1.16	1.00	5.00
High Intensity Open Court Usage = 0 & High Intensity Houghton Mifflin Usage = 0					
Harcourt Brace Spelling	16	1.18	0.21	1.00	1.71
Houghton Mifflin	16	3.01	0.66	1.72	3.87
McGraw Hill/MacMillan's Reading	16	1.66	0.78	1.00	3.67
Open Court	16	2.36	1.22	1.00	4.11
Phonics SRA	16	1.56	0.85	1.00	4.22
Scholastic Phonics	16	1.45	0.61	1.00	3.00
Scott Foresman	16	1.22	0.30	1.00	2.00
Write Source Language Program	16	1.26	0.48	1.00	3.00
Other	16	3.67	1.06	1.00	5.00

APPENDIX 2B: Descriptive Statistics of Reported Math Curriculum Usage Frequency by High Intensity Usage Category

Math Program	Number of Schools	Average Response (Scale of 1 to 5)	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
High Intensity Scott Foresman Usage = 1 & High Intensity Harcourt Brace Usage = 0					
Harcourt Brace	50	1.08	0.17	1.00	1.88
Houghton Mifflin	50	1.24	0.40	1.00	2.69
McDougal Little	50	1.01	0.04	1.00	1.23
McGraw Hill	50	1.08	0.14	1.00	1.47
Prentice Hall	50	1.03	0.06	1.00	1.25
Progress in Math	50	1.02	0.11	1.00	1.75
Saxon Math	50	1.16	0.34	1.00	2.30
Scott Foresman	50	4.85	0.26	3.87	5.00
Success with MathCoach	50	1.12	0.23	1.00	2.00
Other	49	2.66	0.95	1.00	5.00
High Intensity Scott Foresman Usage = 0 & High Intensity Harcourt Brace Usage = 1					
Harcourt Brace	96	4.77	0.25	4.05	5.00
Houghton Mifflin	96	1.31	0.38	1.00	2.82
McDougal Little	96	1.01	0.04	1.00	1.21
McGraw Hill	96	1.12	0.20	1.00	2.25
Prentice Hall	96	1.03	0.11	1.00	1.75
Progress in Math	96	1.01	0.06	1.00	1.47
Saxon Math	96	1.06	0.27	1.00	3.40
Scott Foresman	96	1.09	0.15	1.00	1.75
Success with MathCoach	96	1.04	0.14	1.00	2.00
Other	94	2.57	1.14	1.00	4.67
High Intensity Scott Foresman Usage = 0 & High Intensity Harcourt Brace Usage = 0					
Harcourt Brace	119	1.20	0.51	1.00	3.94
Houghton Mifflin	119	2.87	1.83	1.00	5.00
McDougal Little	119	1.03	0.14	1.00	2.33
McGraw Hill	119	1.47	1.12	1.00	5.00
Prentice Hall	119	1.03	0.12	1.00	2.00
Progress in Math	119	1.08	0.36	1.00	3.75
Saxon Math	119	2.32	1.82	1.00	5.00
Scott Foresman	119	1.17	0.42	1.00	3.80
Success with MathCoach	119	1.03	0.09	1.00	1.60
Other	117	2.84	1.28	1.00	5.00

APPENDIX 3: Regressions of 2005 Growth API on Domain 1 Composite Variables with Curriculum Interactions

	Composite Variables with High Intensity Open Court/ Scott Foresman Indicators	Composite Variables with High Intensity Open Court Indicator Interactions	Composite Variables with High Intensity Scott Foresman Indicator Interactions
Teachers report alignment and consistency in curriculum and instruction	6.77 (1.82)*	1.97 (0.54)	4.88 (1.29)
Principal and district have clear and shared expectations that guide coherence around the curriculum	7.20 (2.53)**	7.69 (2.55)**	5.34 (1.71)*
District addresses instructional needs of EL students	-0.37 (0.05)	6.33 (0.75)	1.53 (0.18)
District, principals, and teachers utilize state standards to guide curriculum and instruction	4.13 (1.23)	5.95 (1.64)	5.95 (1.57)
Math and language arts are integrated with other subjects.	6.43 (2.05)**	6.32 (1.73)*	5.95 (1.74)*
Open Court high-intensity usage (OCH)	9.11 (1.23)	62.40 (1.61)	
Scott Foresman high-intensity usage (SFH)	13.62 (1.97)**		57.62 (1.43)
Teachers report alignment and consistency in curriculum and instruction/OCH interaction		17.61 (2.16)**	
Use of Open Court language arts curriculum program/OCH interaction			
The school and district places a priority on consistency of curriculum/OCH interaction		-0.77 (0.11)	
Use of Scott Foresman math curriculum program/OCH interaction			
District addresses instructional needs of English learner students/OCH interaction		-20.73 (1.46)	
District, principals, and teachers utilize state standards to guide curriculum and instruction/OCH interaction		-5.02 (0.66)	
Math and language arts are integrated with other subjects/OCH interaction		-1.72 (0.22)	
Teachers report alignment and consistency in curriculum and instruction/SFH interaction			13.74 (1.52)
Principal and district have clear and shared expectations that guide coherence around the curriculum/SFH interaction			11.75 (1.73)*
District addresses instructional needs of EL students/SFH interaction			-16.47 (1.08)
District, principals, and teachers utilize state standards to guide curriculum and instruction/SFH interaction			-4.02 (0.64)
Math and language arts are integrated with other subjects/SFH interaction			-3.62 (0.46)
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Robust t statistics in parentheses. Open Court and Scott Foresman high-intensity usage indicators are defined as follows: 0=No and 1=Yes.			

Appendix 3 (continued) – Regressions of 2005 Growth API on Domain I Composite Variables with Curriculum Interactions			
	Composite Variables with High Intensity Open Court/ Scott Foresman Indicators	Composite Variables with High Intensity Open Court Indicator Interactions	Composite Variables with High Intensity Scott Foresman Indicator Interactions
Parent education level: percent high school graduate or some college	-32.39 (1.17)	-28.34 (1.03)	-39.41 (1.44)
Parent education level: percent college graduate or graduate school	54.87 (1.04)	40.83 (0.75)	48.21 (0.90)
School enrollment	-0.00 (0.12)	0.00 (0.03)	0.00 (0.07)
Percent African American	-0.09 (0.29)	-0.11 (0.36)	0.04 (0.12)
Percent Asian	0.52 (1.19)	0.46 (0.99)	0.51 (1.12)
Percent Hispanic	-0.13 (0.50)	-0.16 (0.63)	-0.14 (0.54)
Percent eligible for free/reduced meals	-0.46 (1.53)	-0.43 (1.48)	-0.51 (1.73)*
Percent English learners	-0.51 (2.16)**	-0.62 (2.75)***	-0.43 (1.78)*
Student mobility	2.69 (3.55)***	2.90 (3.81)***	2.46 (3.32)***
Percent enrolled in migrant education programs	-0.34 (1.33)	-0.36 (1.45)	-0.26 (1.00)
Constant	527.27 (7.23)***	494.29 (6.69)***	547.98 (7.72)***
Observations	248	248	248
Adjusted R-squared	0.2428	0.2424	0.2510
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Robust t statistics in parentheses. Reference groups are defined as follows: for parent education level - less than high school; for minority percent of enrollment - percent of students that are white or American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islanders (note: latter three categories make up less than 4% of students in school sample).			

Appendix 4: Significant Composite Variables in Curriculum Open Court/Practice Interaction Analysis

Composite Variable – <i>Teachers report alignment and consistency in curriculum and instruction.</i>	
Domain – <i>Implementing a Coherent, Standards-Based Curriculum and Instructional Program</i>	
Teacher Survey Item	Item Description
4c	Teachers examine the scope or sequence of curriculum topics
4d	Teachers review a grade-level pacing calendar
5c	There is consistency in curriculum and instruction at the same grade level
5d	There is alignment in curriculum and instruction across different grade levels

Composite Variable – <i>Teachers have influence over hiring decisions.</i>	
Domain – <i>District and school encourage teacher collaboration and build educator capacity</i>	
Teacher Survey Item	Item Description
7e	Influence of teachers at school in the hiring of new teachers
7f	Influence of teachers at school in the hiring of new principals

Composite Variable – <i>District and principals use assessment data to monitor and evaluate teacher performance.</i>	
Domain – <i>Using Assessment Data to Improve Student Achievement and Instruction</i>	
Principal Survey Item	Item Description
25ag	I use CAT-6/CST data to identify teachers who need instructional improvement
25bc	District uses CAT-6/CST data to evaluate teachers' practices
27cg	I use curriculum program assessment data to identify teachers who need instructional improvement
28c	District uses curriculum program assessment data to evaluate teachers' practices
29cg	I use district developed assessment data to identify teachers who need instructional improvement
29dc	District uses district developed assessment data to evaluate teachers' practices
30cg	I use other commercial assessment data to identify teachers who need instructional improvement
30dc	District uses other commercial assessment data to evaluate teachers' practices
32e	I use assessment data to determine what professional development teachers need to improve in a particular area

Appendix 5: Regressions of 2005 Growth API on Domain 1 Composite Variables

	All Domain 1 Composite Variables	Set of Composite Variables That Account for Majority of Explained Variance
Math and language arts are protected from unnecessary interruptions	-2.59 (3.47)	
Math and language arts are integrated with other subjects	4.60 (4.19)	6.31 (2.03)**
Proportion of teachers using dominant language arts curriculum program	-1.83 (2.54)	
Proportion of teachers using dominant math curriculum program	2.61 (2.20)	
Teachers report alignment and consistency in curriculum and instruction	6.84 (3.44)**	6.59 (1.77)*
Teachers are consistent in their use of curriculum planning and materials	-3.74 (4.00)	
District, principals, and teachers utilize state standards to guide curriculum and instruction	5.16 (3.73)	4.39 (1.30)
Teachers meet or exceed the amount of time recommended by the state frameworks for language arts	2.76 (6.95)	
Teachers meet or exceed the amount of time recommended by the state frameworks for math	2.10 (6.95)	
School-level intensity of Open Court use among teachers	4.77 (2.08)**	3.07 (1.61)
Use of Phonics SRA language arts curriculum program	0.62 (5.47)	
Use of Scholastic Phonics language arts curriculum program	0.02 (7.50)	
Use of Houghton Mifflin math curriculum program	1.85 (1.99)	
Use of Saxon math curriculum program	-2.66 (2.83)	
School-Level Intensity of Scott Foresman use among teachers	2.60 (1.91)	3.41 (1.90)*
School uses a standards-based report card	2.03 (3.06)	
District addresses instructional needs of English learner students	5.19 (7.48)	-0.03 (0.00)
Principal and district have clear and shared expectations that guide coherence around the curriculum	6.73 (3.17)**	7.10 (2.51)**
District, principals, and teachers utilize state standards to guide curriculum and instruction	-0.57 (3.24)	
Principal acts as a knowledgeable source concerning standards and curriculum	5.67 (5.17)	
In the last four years, school has implemented a new program for English learner students	-2.59 (5.94)	
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Robust t statistics in parentheses. Reference groups are defined as follows: for parent education level - less than high school; for minority percents - percent of students that are white or American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islanders (the latter three categories make up less than 4% of students in school sample).		

Appendix 5 (continued) – Regressions of 2005 Growth API on Domain 1 Composite Variables		
	All Domain 1 Composite Variables	Set of Composite Variables That Account for Majority of Explained Variance
Parent education level: percent high school graduate or some college	-33.63 (28.05)	-30.39 (1.10)
Parent education level: percent college graduate or graduate school	38.35 (53.92)	57.31 (1.08)
School enrollment	-0.01 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.13)
Percent African American	-0.29 (0.30)	-0.12 (0.38)
Percent Asian	0.65 (0.44)	0.48 (1.11)
Percent Hispanic	-0.11 (0.26)	-0.15 (0.58)
Percent eligible for free/reduced meals	-0.51 (0.31)*	-0.45 (1.51)
Percent English learners	-0.66 (0.26)**	-0.51 (2.15)**
Student mobility	2.87 (0.80)***	2.63 (3.44)***
Percent enrolled in migrant education programs	-0.39 (0.25)	-0.33 (1.30)
Constant	459.00 (97.66)***	524.13 (7.17)***
Observations	243	248
Adjusted R-squared	0.2530	0.2485
* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%. Robust t statistics in parentheses. Reference groups are defined as follows: for parent education level - less than high school; for minority percent of enrollment - percent of students that are white or American Indian, Filipino, Pacific Islanders (note: latter three categories make up less than 4% of students in school sample).		