**Appendix C3 – School Leader and Facilitator Survey**

**Public Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number.  The valid OMB control number for this information collection is [1850-NEW].  Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.  The obligation to respond to this collection is voluntary.  If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate, suggestions for improving this individual collection, or if you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual form, application or survey, please contact Elizabeth Nolan at the U.S. Department of Education, 230 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 730-1532 directly.

*Your school has partnered with the Regional Educational Laboratory West to study the impact of a new toolkit on improving reading comprehension instruction. As part of that study, you are invited to complete the following survey, because you are either the school principal or the person responsible for reading comprehension professional development. We ask you to complete this survey twice, at the beginning and end of the study. For each completed survey, we will offer you a $50 gift card.*

*Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary. You may skip any question or the entire survey. However, your responses would help improve reading comprehension supports, so we hope you will participate.*

*Your responses are confidential. Your survey is associated with a unique identifier rather than your name and survey responses will be aggregated so individuals cannot be identified.*

***Toolkit-Like Activities Text in Brackets and Italics is for Toolkit Facilitators Only***

Have you led any of the following professional learning activities on reading comprehension instruction for teachers in your current school between June 2023 and May 2024?[[1]](#footnote-2)

1. Have you provided workshops to train teachers on reading comprehension instruction in this time period?

1. Yes
2. No

2. [If yes] How often did you provide those workshops?

1. 1–2 times
2. 3–5 times
3. 6–10 times
4. More than 10 times

3. [If yes] What materials or tools did you use to plan for and provide the workshops?

Open-ended response

4. Have you facilitated teacher study groups on reading comprehension instruction *[using toolkit ideas or materials]* in this time period?

1. Yes
2. No

4.1. [If yes] How often did you facilitate these study groups?

1. 1–3 times
2. 4-5 times
3. 6–10 times
4. More than 10 times

4.2. [If yes] What materials or tools did you use to plan for and facilitate these study groups?

Open-ended response

5. Have you observed teachers’ reading comprehension instruction and provided feedback to teachers for the purpose of improvement *[using toolkit ideas or materials]* (please exclude evaluation observations) in this time period?

1. Yes
2. No

5.1. [If yes] Approximately how many teachers did you observe and provide feedback for this purpose in this time period?

1. 1–2 teachers
2. 3–4 teachers
3. 5–6 teachers
4. 7 or more teachers

5.2. On average, how often did you observe a teacher for this purpose in this time period?

1. 1–2 times
2. 3–4 times
3. 5–6 times
4. More than 6 times

5.2. On average, how often did you provide feedback to the teacher on the observed lesson for this purpose in this time period?

1. Fewer than half of the observed lessons
2. More than half of the lessons and fewer than 80 percent of the observed lessons
3. 80 percent or more of the observed lessons

5.3. [If yes] What materials or tools did you use to observe teachers and provide feedback?

Open-ended response

6. Have you worked with teachers individually to review data on their students for the purpose of improving their reading comprehension instruction in this time period?

1. Yes
2. No

6.1. [If yes] How many teachers did you work with?

1. 1–2 teachers
2. 3–4 teachers
3. 5–6 teachers
4. 7 or more teachers

6.2. [If yes] On average, how often (total) did you meet with teachers to review data for improving instruction during this time period?

1. 1–2 times
2. 3–4 times
3. 5–6 times
4. More than 6 times

6.3. [If yes] What materials or tools did you use to plan for and conduct these meetings?

Open-ended response

6.4 [If yes] What topics did you cover in these coaching sessions?

1. Action planning
   1. Yes/No
   2. Approximate percent of teachers in the school coached on action planning
2. Continuous improvement cycles
   1. Yes/No
   2. Approximate percent of teachers in the school coached on continuous improvement cycles
3. Other
   1. Yes/No
   2. Approximate percent of teachers in the school coached on other topics

7. Have you or your colleagues conducted an assessment of your school’s supports and gaps for literacy instruction in this time period?

1. Yes
2. No

7.1. [If yes] How much time total did it take for you and your colleagues to conduct this assessment?

Amount of time

7.2. [If yes] What materials or tools did you use to guide this assessment?

Open-ended response

7.3. [If yes] What was identified as the greatest strength? Gap?

Open-ended response

***Nature of and Support for Professional Development***

Rate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the reading comprehension professional development experiences of teachers at your school this year. *[Please include Toolkit activities]*

1. *[Toolkit]* Reading comprehension professional development activities have been convenient enough to promote teachers’ participation.
2. Disagree strongly
3. Disagree somewhat
4. Agree somewhat
5. Agree strongly
6. *[Toolkit]* Reading comprehension professional development activities were sufficiently resourced (for example, substitute coverage, funding to cover expenses, stipends) to allow teachers to participate in the professional development they need to do their jobs successfully.
7. Disagree strongly
8. Disagree somewhat
9. Agree somewhat
10. Agree strongly
11. District-provided reading comprehension professional development offerings (workshops, inservices, online courses, etc.) have enough slots and availability to accommodate all teachers who wish or need to participate.
12. Disagree strongly
13. Disagree somewhat
14. Agree somewhat
15. Agree strongly

***Cost Analysis Data Collection***

1. [Intervention schools only] Please indicate the number of hours you have spent implementing the toolkit between June 2023 and May 2024.
2. 0 hours
3. 1-20 hours
4. 21-40 hours
5. 41-60 hours
6. 61-80 hours
7. More than 80 hours

11.1. [If greater than 0 hours] Please rate the degree to which compensation affected the amount of time you spend implementing the toolkit

0=compensation did not affect the time I spend implementing the toolkit

10=compensation was essential for me to spend time implementing the toolkit

1. [Intervention schools only] Please provide a roster of all school-level staff required to implement the toolkit and the hours spent by each staff category

Roster of staff and their hours

1. [Intervention schools only] Please provide a list of all school-level nonpersonnel resources required to implement the toolkit and quantities of each resource

Roster of resources and their quantities

***Background Information***

1. Which of the following best describes your position as a school leader this school year?
2. Principal
3. Vice principal/assistant principal
4. Director
5. Reading coach
6. Reading specialist
7. Other
8. Including this school year, how many years have you had this position in your current school?

Number of years

1. Including this school year and your current school, how many years have you had this or a similar position in your current district?

Number of years

1. Including this school year and your current school, how many years have you had this or a similar position, total, in any location?

Number of years

1. In addition to your administrative responsibilities, do you currently have official teaching responsibilities (that is, formally instruct K–12 students as the teacher of record in one or more classes)?
2. Yes
3. No
4. Did you enter teaching through an alternative route to certification program? (An alternative route to certification program provides an accelerated path to licensure for individuals who already hold a bachelor’s degree.)
5. Yes
6. No
7. Which of the following teaching certificates do you hold?
8. Elementary Certificate
9. Early Childhood Certificate
10. Special Education Certificate with an Early Childhood Endorsement
11. Principal certification
12. Do you hold any of the following endorsements?
13. Bilingual Endorsement certificate
14. Gifted Endorsement certificate
15. Reading, K–8 Endorsement
16. Reading, K–12 Endorsement
17. Reading Specialist, K–12 Endorsement
18. What is your highest degree earned?
19. Bachelor’s
20. Master’s
21. EdD
22. PhD
23. Other
24. What is your gender?

Open-ended response

1. What is your race/ethnicity?

Open-ended response

1. For the May 2024 survey, we will ask about professional development in the period between June 2023 and May 2024. For the September 2024 survey, we will ask about June to September 2024. For the May 2025 survey, we will ask about October 2024 to May 2025. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)