REL Customer Satisfaction Survey

Responses to Public Comments

January 2011

1. Several reviewers recommended modifications to the topic areas for items A1 and B6.
   a. (b) Change *Assessment/Using Data for Decisions to Assessment (Formative and/or Summative)*.
      - This change was made.
   b. (b) *Using Data for Decisions* should be a separate item from *Assessment/Using Data for Decisions.*
      - This change was made.
   c. (f) *High School Reform and Dropout Prevention* should be separate items.
      - This change was made.
   d. (g) *Leadership*, *School Accountability* and *School Improvement* should be three separate items.
      - This change was made.
   e. (g) Change *School improvement* to *Support for Low Achieving Schools*.
      - This change was made.
   f. (j) Change *Preparation for College and Careers to College and Career Readiness*.
      - This change was made.
   g. (n) Change *Science/Technology* to *STEM*.
      - This change was made.
   h. (p) *Supplemental Educational Services* and *School Choice* should be separate items.
      - This change was made.
   i. (q) Change *Teachers/Related Personnel* to *Teacher Evaluation Systems* (or perhaps *Educator Evaluation Systems)* If separated, use teachers, principals, and "other" to capture curriculum supervisors, school psychologists, etc.
      - Changed to *Teacher/Staff Evaluation*.
   j. Add *Teacher/Staff Evaluation* to list.
      - This change was made.
   k. Add *Longitudinal Data Systems* to list.
      - This change was made.
   l. Add *Professional Development* to list.
      - This change was made.
   m. Add *School Turnaround* to list.
      - This was not added. It is very similar to *Support for Low Achieving Schools*, which was added (see e above).
   n. Add *Content Standards and Curriculum* to list (then list math, reading/writing and STEM under this item or somehow cluster the content areas).
      - This change was made.

      o. Add *School Time* (The comment noted that this is a bigger issue than school finance or more accurately, the issue is one of resources which might be defined as people, time and money).

- This was not added because we do not believe respondents will understand what is meant by *School Time*.

2. Use a 3-level response structure for items A1 and B6.
   - This change was made.
3. Name the RELs by contractor (e.g., McREL) or even include the name of the previous contractor.
   - This change was made.
4. Separate any questions that pertain to RELs in general from questions that pertain to their region's REL in particular.
   - Added language to help clarify the REL program nationwide versus the specific regional REL. The order of items was not changed to separate items that pertain to RELs in general from items that pertain to the specific regional REL. Items appear in a certain order to maintain skip patters.
5. Question A2 asks to what extent respondents rely on various sources for information. Source d. lists *Other products or resources from the U.S. Department of Education* – could possibly add, *including websites such as Doing What Works*.
   - This change was made.
6. On A2 (a), write out the name of the lab for that region.
   - This change was made.
7. On A2 (e) list ASCD, NASSP or a couple of other professional associations rather than just CCSSO.
   - This change was made.
8. The stem of A3 needs to indicate whether or not we are referring to the regional lab or all of the labs. The comment said "Maybe move this item to section B and insert it between the current B1 and B2."
   - This change was not made because the item refers to education research or technical assistance overall, not just research and assistance accessed through the RELs.
9. On A4, insert the following after "sources": "that you identified in A2 above."
   - This change was not made because adding the statement "that you identified in A2 above" makes the stem lengthier and somewhat confusing.
10. Revise the introductory statement to section B to *We would like to find out about your experience with (all the RELS or just the one in the respondent's region).*
    - This change was made.
11. Expand B2 to include different REL services as a 'check all that apply'.
    - This change was made.
12. For B2, write out the regional lab name or just say "by the RELS" asking about the whole system as opposed to individual regional lab.
    - This change was made.
13. On B4, option 6, eliminate the term *professional development* and add *technical assistance*.
    - This change was made.

14. Question B4 has an option for a "REL sponsored a conference, training, or workshop I attended", but since events have been a very important part of what the RELs have been doing in the last

few years, perhaps add a question explicitly about knowledge of and attendance at/participation in a REL-sponsored event? (Question B5 asks about reports specifically, so a question about events would be in the same vein.)

- This change was not made. In the stem of item B1 we mention events when asking about the respondent's familiarity with the REL program. Item B2 includes events as an option. We feel that adding a separate question just for events would be duplicative and add unnecessary burden. We ask about reports separately in B5 for the reasons described in response to #15 below.

15. Move B5 to later in the survey or include more services in the question.

- This change was not made. The response to B5 (along with B2) determines if the respondent is asked B6-B8, so it should come before B6. We ask about reports separately from other services in items B2-B4 because respondents may have read reports from RELs other than their regional REL or respondents may not know which REL produced a report that he/she read.

16. For B6, create four response options by combining the two "high" and the two "low" degree columns.

- This change was made.

17. For B6, make the list reflective of the topics the RELs have actually addressed. Otherwise, match it to the categories in A1, but this is a bit unfair to the Labs as some items on this list have emerged (particularly the four assurance areas) since they wrote their proposals and tackled their projects.

- This change was not made. In order to reduce the burden on respondents, the items that appear in B6 are driven by responses in A1.

18. Could also ask more explicitly HOW respondents access (or would like to access?) the support/work of the RELs – in-person, through a website, through newsletters (electronic? paper?), through webinars, etc.

- This change was not made because it would be duplicative of B2 and B4.

19. For B7 (b), change *that the region faces* to *what you or your organization face*.

- This change was made.

20. For B7 (c), change *for the region* to *for you or your organization*.

- This change was made.

21. For B7 and B8, rephrase the stem of the question to summarize the list of REL services rather than particularly highlighting the reports produced (maybe reports, conferences, Bridge or EEP events, issue briefs, etc.).

- This change was made.

22. For B7 and B8, combine the two "high" and the two "low" ratings to end up with four choices.

- This change was made.

23. Combine B7 and B8.

- This change was made.

24. For B7 and B8, eliminate the overall relevance and overall usefulness questions.

- This change was made.

25. Revisit the language for item B8. Options were provided by, produced by, from.

- This was changed to "any reports from the RELs."

26. Delete item B10.

- This change was made.
27. For B11, response option 2, what is a state level advisor?
    - Removed response option 2.
28. For B11, response option 3, change to district-level superintendent or assistant superintendent. The comment asked "Do you want to distinguish these two from other district-level central office administrators as you have in response option 4? Why not have district-level Board members to parallel the state level options?"
    - This change was made.
29. In a few places, it is not clear if respondents would be able to distinguish clearly REL contributions from those of others assisting states.
    - Attempted to clarify REL from others assisting states.
30. The comment said "You might ask respondents to come up with a specific example of how questions or issues of their state were assisted by the REL. i.e., what was most prominent for that state?"
    - This change was not made. We feel that is captured through the other items in the survey and open-ended items often do not produce usable data.