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## INTRODUCTION

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the Saginaw Schools according to administrators, teachers, high school students, and parents? In what areas are schools performing as well as desired and where do inadequacies exist? What areas of operation warrant immediate attention to remedy weaknesses? What are perceptions about current educational issues? The answers to these questions are important to education, therefore, an effort was made during April and May, 1981 , to gather information about them through a needs assessment survey.

The results of this survey are being reported in two different formats. The first type of report (Part 1 ) dealt specifically with determining an actual level of need based on the difference between what respondents feel "is," and "what should be." This report, the second in the series (Part 2); deals with the attitude of responding groups cowards current educational issues. A fart 1 and Part 2 report will be provided at the district-wide, instructional and cluster levels.

Who Was Included in'Saginaw's School-Community Study?
Information was gathered from administrators, teachers, parents, and senior high students. During, April and May, 1981, the polled individuals completed questionnaires, to provide the necessary survey data. There were over 2,100 respondents to the instruments (see Appendix A for the exact count of usable returns by respondent group). This report presents responses firm elementary, junior high, senior high, and central office administrators
separately. The combined results of these groups with the addition of special education and adult and continuing education administrators in the zdministrator system total are also presented. Since the number of special and adult and continuing education administrators were so small, they were not included except in the system total.

How will the Findings of the Study be Reported?
A series of reports will result from this study:
I. District-Wide Comprehensive Needs Assessment Study: presenting the system total and totals by groups of elementary, secondary, special education, and adult and continuing education teach\&r, administrators; paren:s; and students. Intended audiences include: Board of Education, superintendent, administrators, teachers, and comunity.
II. Instructional Level Reports: presenting summary information for elementary, junior high, senior high, special education, adilt and continuing education, and administrator (this report) levels. Intended audiences include: Board of Education, superintendent, assistant superintendents, and central office administrative staff.
III. Cluster evel Reports: presenting summary informain for each elementary, junior high, and senior hith school cluster. Intended audiences incluide: assistant superintendenis, principals, teachers, parents, and students.

The intent of provicing the results in this type of format is to provide for decision-makers the kinds of information that will be useful in reaching decisions within rheir realm of responsibility. A companion "Part 1 " type of report for each level will also be made available.

## How were the Data Collected?

The data for students and parerits were gathered from samples drawn from the various populations while all teachers and administrators were polled. Parents were surveyed by means of a mailed questionnaire, while questionnaires for all other respondents were hand-delivered. Many of the questions were adapted from the Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the schools. The "Part 2" fortion of this questionnaire contained a total of 24 multiple choice questions concerning attitudes toward current educational issues. Parents and administrators were asked to respond to all 24 questions, teachers to 17 questions, and students to 15 questions.

## PRESENTATION OF DATA

One of the major purposes of this needs assessment study was to identify areas in which consensus existed for the respondent groups concerning their atticudes toward educational issues. These educational issues may be of importance in setting policy, making decisions, or developing new programs in the future. The responses presented should help decision makers better understand each group.

The overall findings of all respondents and each respondent group separately will be presented in the section which follows. The percent choosing each multiple choice option is presented for all groups and the total. The number of respondents by group (to each question) is also provided.

A number of similarities and differences between groups are highlighted in a short summary section. The reader is encouraged to study the results in detall because any summary must by its very nature ignure some of the finer points.
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## SUMMARY

A number cf similarities and differences observed between administrator respondent groups are highlighced below in list form. The decision rule for determining a similarity is agreement either in a positive or negative direction. Agretment is reached when $51 \%$ or more of all groups (disregarding the "don't know" responses) had responses in one direction. A difference occurs when one or more groups are no longer in agreement. Comments are offered when app:opriate to amplify the meaning of the response patterns noted.

## Similarities

- All administrator : sups believed that student absenteeism, ir part, is responsible for lowered student achievement ( $1.3 n g e$ 90\% to $100 \%$ ).
- All administrator groups favored a back-to-basics . -movement (range $79 \%$ to $100 \%$ ).
- All groups were inclined toward sending their children to a special public school that has strict discipline and puts emphasis on the three R's (range $63 \%$ to $88 \%$ ).
- All groups felt the Saginaw News does not sive a fair and accurate picture of the Saginaw Public Schools (range $71 \%$ to $91 \%$ ).
- All groups felt trat joh pracement services should be operated by the schools (range $55 \%$ to $100 \%$ ).
- All groups believed sanior high students should be permitted to graduate in three years instead of four if they can meet the academic requirements (range $55 \%$ to 69\%).
- All administrator grouns agreed that the middle school concept, where grades $6-8$ would be taught in the same building, should be inscalled in our schools (range 54\% to 91\%).
- All groups felt vacant schools should be disposed of when they were closed due to a drop in enrollment (range 44\% to 80\%).
- Ali administrator groups favored an increase in state taxes to cover the cost of inflation in school expenditures (range $86 \%$ to $100 \%$ ).
- All administrator groups agreed that they would close buildings as their first priority to reduce school expenditures (range $69 \%$ to $80 \%$ ).
- All groups favored both the requirement that parents meet prior to the start of school with school personnel for the review of their children's progress and the suggestion that parents attend one evening meeting monthly to learn about ways to improye their children's behavior and school work (range $55 \%$ to $82 \%$ and $55 \%$ to $86 \%$ ).
- The majority of all administrator respondents either felt that extra-curricular activities are extremely important or fairly important to a young person's education (scale-extremely important, fairly important. not too important.
- All groups favored voluntary integration of the school district (range $80 \%$ to $100 \%$ ).


## Differences

- Elementary and junior high administrators felt voluntary integration would improve the quality of education, while senior high and central office administrators were evenly split on whether or not voluntary integration would improve educational achievement. This may mean that people see integration as a social goal rather than one to primarily improve academic achievement.
- Elementary, junior and senior higi administrators agreed that high school students should be allowed to finish college work while still in high school (54\%, 55\%, and $73 \%$ respectively), while central office administrators disagreed (52\%).
- Elementary administrato:s gave a "great deal" confidence rating (scale--great deal, fair amount, very little, none) to the school board's ability to deal with school problems, while the remaining administrative groups gave the school board a "fair" rating (range $54 \%$ to $64 \%$ ).
- Senior high administrators were equally split on wi.ether lerge class sizes negatively affect student achievemant, while cantral office administrators felt large classes do litele to affect achievement (72\%); and elementary and Junior high administrators felt large classes do negatively affect achievement ( $70 \%$ and $64 \%$ respectively).
- Elementary, senior high and central office administrators found holding teachers and adminiswrators more accountable for student progress (range $75 \%$ to $91 \%$ ), while junior high adainistrators were equally divided on this issue (36\% favor and 36\% oppose).
- Elementary, senior high and central office administrators agreed that labor unions have hurt public schools (range 57\% to 75\%), while junior high administrators were equally split in their responses ( $45 \%$ help and $45 \%$ hurt).
- It seems that the policy co dismiss frequently absent students applies to secondary level students for most respondents. Junion and senior high administrators felt that 'frequently absent students should be dismissed from school ( $64 \%$ and $73 \%$ respectively); while elementary and central office administrators felt these students should not be dismissed ( $78 \%$ and $52 \%$ respectively).
- Seniar high administrators were equally split on their agreement with a state tax increase so chat real estate taxes related to school expenditures could be lowered ( $36 \%$ yes and $36 \%$ no), while all other groups favored such an increase ? range 64\% to 83\%).
- The question of whether tine parents, the schools, or the courts should handle student behavior problems such as striking a teacher obtained a range of diverse responses. Elementary and central office administrators felt it was the schools' job ( $62 \%$ and $50 \%$ respectively). Junior high adoinistrators were equally split between the schools and the courts ( $43 \%$ and $43 \%$ respectively). Senior high administrators were in favor of the :ourts dealing with such problems (43\%).

APPENDIX

SURVEY GROUPS AND RETURN RATES FOR THE 1981 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL-CONRUNITY VEEDS ASSESSYENT

| Groups Surveyed | Count and Description of Individuals in Sample or Population | Returns <br> $\#$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parents | A sample of 4,392 parents who were registered and voced in November, 1979 and/or October, 1980 millage elections. (Followup mailed to low return rate areas.) | 867 | 20 |
| Elementary Teachers | All 476 teachers paid February 26, 1981. | 326 | 68 |
| Secondary Teashers | Al1 406 teashers paid February 26, 1981. | 203 | 30 |
| Special Education Teachers | All 111 teachers at Millet Center, Handley Elementary (support staff), and Holland Education paid February 26, 1981. | 75 | 68 |
| Adult \& Continuing Education Teachers | Al1 71 ceachers paid February 26, 1981. | 29 | 41 |
| Administrators | All 122 administrators or tecbnicians paid February 26, 1981. | 84 | 59 |
| Students | A sample of approximateiy 495 studencs from grades 10,11 , and 12 of both high schools. | 603 | 122 |

## APPENDIX A

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS RETURNING THE 1981 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLCOMMUNITY NEEDS ASSESSMENT BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL AND/OR BASE LOCATION

| Instructional Level and/or |
| :--- | :---: |
| Base Location |$\quad$| Returns |
| :---: |
| Number |
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