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ABSTRACT

This study examined whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs affected student academic achievement in the pilot schools used for the BIA's effective schools improvement efforts. Data were obtained about ten effective schools correlates from ten BIA elementary schools in the BIA's first-year efforts to implement the effective schools improvement process.

An effective schools questionnaire was developed and used to obtain the perceptions of the professional staff regarding the implementation of the effective schools correlates in the ten schools located throughout the United States. Standardized test scores from 1988 and 1992 were collected and compared with the perceptions of staff regarding the impact of the effective schools correlates. Principals completed a form pertaining to the profiles of the school and principal.

The professional staff perceived their school improvement to be greater than the standardized achievement test scores indicated. Principals reported spending some time on the implementation of the correlates.

The analysis showed no significant relationships at grade levels four, five, and six between the correlates implemented and the scores on the reading or language arts standardized achievement tests. There was a significant relationship at the grade four level between six correlates and the mathematics achievement test scores. There was a significant relationship at the grade six level between four correlates and the science achievement test scores. There was a significant relationship at the grade four and the grade six levels between two correlates and the social studies achievement test scores. The
staff's perceptions were that student achievement improved significantly from 1988 to 1992, but the actual test scores did not show any significant improvements. The correlates perceived by professional staff as showing improvements and corresponding to raised achievement test scores included safe and orderly environment, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance. The implementation of the effective schools correlates had some effect on standardized achievement tests, especially in the areas of mathematics, social studies, and science.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In historical terms, American Indians have been exposed to formal education processes for a relatively short time. During this short time, however, failed attempts to educate them adequately using conventional United States schooling processes have been documented by numerous studies and congressional reviews. Various federal and public programs have sought to mainstream Indian people into conventional United States education systems while ignoring American Indian traditional cultural values and heritage. Generally speaking, these efforts have failed.

Indians and Education in Recent Times

In the 1990s, despite the present federal policy of Indian self-determination, American Indians throughout the nation continue to find themselves confronting almost insurmountable economic and social problems on reservations. Although Indian leaders and parents recognize education as offering hope, emphasis on education is often relegated to the low end of the spectrum in the daily struggle for survival.

The solution to the vicious cycle of low educational achievement and high dropout rates that contribute to problems of poverty, alcoholism, unemployment, and other social ills among Indian people lies in educational programs grounded in and recognizing the traditional values and richness of the tribal culture. Indian children must be educated to meet the challenges of their tribal worlds as they exist within the larger society. Although education offers hope, educators must recognize that the standard educational approach in the United States has not worked for American Indians.
The relationship between the government of the United States and the governments of the various federally recognized American Indian tribes is based on the Constitution of the United States. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes." This clause of the Constitution, in conjunction with American Indian treaties, federal legislation, and court cases, has established and shaped the role and policies of the federal government toward Indian tribes in all areas including education.

As a result of this relationship, the contemporary educational experiences of many American Indians may differ slightly when compared with the educational experiences of mainstream Americans. Not until the latter part of the 19th century did the federal government acknowledge this constitutional relationship and its responsibility for Indian education by appropriating funds and enacting legislation which impacted Indian education (Fowler, 1992). The federal government's actions have caused the approaches to educating Indian children to vary. Even so, Indian student achievement has been less than stellar.

Havighurst (1970) concluded that the lower average school achievement of American Indian children must be due to a combination of their home experiences and their school experiences. Bryde (1970) indicated that cultural, not genetic, factors make the difference in the relative achievement of Indian and white students. Fuchs and Havighurst (1972) reported family background influences school success for many Indian pupils because the family's Indian culture may be disconnected from the demands of schooling. Havighurst (1957) pointed out that American Indian children generally do poorly on tests when compared to non-Indians. He indicated that minority students, including Native American students, do not do as well as non-minority students on achievement tests. However, separate studies conducted by Dressner (1983), Havighurst (1957),
Levensky (1970), and McShane and Beiser (1981) showed that on non-culturally biased tests the intelligence quotient of Indian students is equivalent to the intelligence quotient of the general population.

Educators have the responsibility to plan for the needs of Indian students and to meet their needs so Indian students have the opportunity to receive an adequate education. In 1985, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs (BIA/OIEP) adopted the effective schools framework for school improvement. These processes of school improvement have had significant success in public schools across the country. The BIA/OIEP decided to use the effective schools research in an effort to improve the 180 BIA-funded schools in the United States. To improve performance, the BIA/OIEP organized a group of educators to look into the premises of effective schools and to distribute this information to the schools. The BIA/OIEP believed the effective schools framework would help BIA schools to meet student needs, increase academic achievement, and begin to improve the social ills that affect Indian communities. The effective schools improvement effort was the beginning of an era to help BIA schools become more effective.

**Effective Schools**

Glen Robinson (1985), President and Director of Educational Research Service, characterized the cluster of studies that has come to be called the "effective schools research" as the most important body of educational information to be developed in the past two decades. The effective schools research is having a profound impact on the quality of teaching and learning in the United States. Because of this research, a reliable data base exists on the basic differences between effective and ineffective schools. This research is important because it identifies and describes the school characteristics most conducive to the teaching and learning process. Robinson (1985) reported that educators can identify effective schools where students' achievement in basic skills is far above expectancy levels.
Educators can also identify ineffective schools where students' achievement is far below expectancy levels. Research by Brookover (1979), Edmonds (1978), Lipham (1981), and Purkey and Smith (1982) indicated certain schooling practices are more effective than others because they help teachers and administrators provide better instruction and they help students learn.

Between 1979 and 1984, a substantial amount of research in effective schooling practices was conducted. Although research by Brookover (1979), Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980), Edmonds (1979), Evertson (1981), and Weber (1971) has been used to identify a set of effective schooling practices, those practices have not been validated against the specific cultural characteristics and learning styles of American Indian children. Educational researchers and practitioners continue to search for instructional methods that address the relationship between how children learn to learn and the ways in which they are expected to demonstrate learning in the classroom. The old attitudes and beliefs about how children learn may need to be unlearned by those who work with Indian students.

The effective schools research is especially significant because it shows that important determinants of student achievement lie within the control and management of the schools, and it also provides a research base for assessing and altering the learning climates of specific schools. This information was especially interesting to the BIA/OIEP team who were investigating research pertaining to demographics similar to Indian schools and students. The BIA/OIEP wanted to implement practices that would cause student success regardless of family background, home experiences, and socioeconomic status.

Bureau of Indian Affairs Involvement in the Effective Schools Movement

The involvement of the BIA in the effective schools process began in 1985 (Our Children, 1988-89) when the Bureau adopted the effective schools model as its primary focus for school improvement. In a 1987 meeting, the BIA/OIEP and the Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) sponsored a seminar entitled "How Effective Instructional Leaders Get Results" for school principals. At this meeting, Wilson Babby, Director of the BIA/OIEP, and others gave presentations about the effective schools research. At the conclusion of the meeting, Babby requested that Betty Walker, the Minneapolis Area Education Program Director, develop a plan for school improvement for BIA-funded schools. In February 1988, Walker formed a working committee of principals, school board representatives, agency superintendents, tribal college representatives, and others. The working committee met in Orange County, California, to evaluate the appropriateness of effective schools research for the BIA/OIEP. The committee developed a self-nomination process for obtaining pilot schools as well as an action plan for the committee to follow through May 1988.

The working committee recommended formation of the Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST) to be comprised of representatives from all segments of BIA schools and the OIEP to coordinate the Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. The BEST would help in the planning and implementation of the effective schools process in the BIA schools.

The Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST) reviewed the effective schools research and identified a number of variables that distinguish effective from ineffective schools. These variables have been called correlates and vary in number from five to ten, depending on the researcher.

Edmonds (1979) articulated five characteristics of effective schools: (1) promoting high expectations for student success, (2) developing a clear and focused school mission, (3) requiring frequent monitoring of student progress, (4) providing a safe and orderly school environment and climate, and (5) providing strong instructional leadership. The Connecticut State Department of Education added two more: (6) promoting the opportunity to learn/time on task and (7) expecting home/school/community relations (Our Children, 1988-89). Dr. John Brown from California added (8) developing curriculum and
instruction including specific content and variety of methodologies (*Our Children*, 1988-89). The Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST) added (9) promoting cultural relevance and (10) sharing governance and participatory management (*Our Children*, 1988-89).

The Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools Improvement Efforts implemented the five characteristics of effective schools, the two added by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the one added by Dr. Brown, and the two added by the BEST to accumulate ten correlates. These correlates were used as a basis for the development and implementation of training offered to the BIA schools chosen to be part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' effective schools process. The research information from each of the correlates was used as part of the training offered to the pilot schools. The principals and staff were to learn about each of the characteristics of the effective schools correlates and implement them in their school environment to become a more effective school.

The effective schools process used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools Improvement Efforts included training consisting of developing awareness of effective schools research. The training also provided orientation of school personnel to the research and selecting a team at each of the school sites. Each staff returned to their school after the training to create a mission statement for the pilot school, to choose and gather data from the school, to select goals and activities to work on at the school, to communicate goals and activities to all school personnel, and to draft and gain approval of a plan of improvement. The school team was also responsible for implementing and monitoring the improvement plan and evaluating all of these data in terms of the mission of the school to be more effective (*Our Children*, 1988-89).

One of the first sessions conducted by the BIA/OIEP was to provide effective schools awareness sessions for agency superintendents of education and area education program administrators. The National Training Institute sponsored by the National Indian
School Boards Association provided an awareness session for school board members, principals, and others from BIA-funded schools.

To begin the process, the BIA/OIEP asked the 180 BIA-funded schools to apply for participation in the effective schools effort. This effort would enhance the interest and commitment of the schools selected for the process. After the initial meeting with the agency superintendents, letters were sent to all BIA-funded schools outlining the process of self-nomination for selection as a pilot school. The BEST reviewed the 66 self-nominations and recommended 19 schools to be the pilot schools for the effective schools improvement process.

In September 1988 at a principals' meeting, the OIEP Director announced the 19 schools to participate in the Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. These schools were called the 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. Commitment and instructional leadership training was held for the professional staffs of the 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. In addition, an awareness session on effective schools was conducted for the BIA/OIEP central office staff in November 1988 (Our Children, 1988-89).

Thus began the process of the BIA's efforts to improve education for Indian students. Other training sessions were held after the initial commitment training to help principals and staff grow professionally. This first set of 19 pilot schools started the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. Presently over 90 of the 180 BIA schools are involved.

**Need for the Study**

Indian students throughout North America have experienced disproportionate school failure in educational systems. Educational failure is regarded by too many in the dominant society as the natural consequence of the minority group's inherent inferiority. The process of blaming the minority group for its own failure effectively screens from critical scrutiny the way in which the educational system causes school failure among
minority students (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991). People who work with Indian students directly or indirectly cannot understand causes of minority students' academic difficulties or plan effective ways of reversing these difficulties unless the issues are viewed as more complex than just the mismatch between the language of the home and that of the school or a lack of adequate teaching strategies. According to Ogbu (1978), minority cultures that maintain a strong sense of pride in their own language and culture as well as a pride in the dominant society tend not to experience school failure.

Furthermore, Cummins (1986) shared that considerable research data indicate that minority groups are experiencing above-average levels of school failure and that the extent to which the students' language and culture are incorporated into the school program constitutes a significant predictor of academic success. In addition, Cummins explained that educators who see their role as encouraging students to add a second language and culture to supplement rather than supplant their native language and culture are more likely to create conditions in which students can develop a sense of empowerment. Several investigators suggested that the learning difficulties of minority students are often caused by the way children designated "at risk" are taught. These students frequently receive intensive instruction that confines them to a passive role and induces a form of "learned helplessness."

Though education has not always served as a tool for improving the lives of American Indians, education should be a liberating force in the lives of Indian children. Schooling should empower Indian students to be lifelong learners who are self-directed and politically active tribal members and citizens, able to participate and prosper in their communities, their states, the nation, and the world.

For decades educators and educational researchers have attempted to find reasons for the high rate of academic failure among minority youth. Genetic characteristics, racial segregation and discrimination, and cultural deprivation have been offered as explanations
for low achievement. The BIA/OIEP is in the process of making changes in the educational system of schools under the BIA, including incorporation of the effective schools research. This study will examine the effectiveness of selected BIA schools that work with Native American children. National and tribal leaders and educators need to know if the implementation of the correlates from the effective schools research is making a difference in the achievement of Native American students. They also need to know if the perceptions of the professional staff at these schools are being affected by the implementation of the effective schools research.

Although there are ample data on effective schools with other minorities in urban schools, little research has been conducted in the area of effective schools in connection with the Bureau of Indian Affairs initiative with schools. The proposed study will deal specifically with BIA schools that work with Native American students and that have made an effort to implement the effective schools research in their schools.

The results of this study will provide educational decision makers with research-based information which may be utilized as they seek to modify educational delivery systems and the educational programs for American Indian students. It will provide American Indian people with information which may be used as a catalyst for change in the education of their children.

Endeavors such as the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts directed toward the improvement of Indian education make learning more meaningful and relevant for Indian students, so they will be encouraged to continue their education, to be successful in school, and eventually to become productive citizens. One objective of the effective schools improvement process in the BIA schools is that all students receive both a quality education and equal opportunity to learn. With the help of the training from the effective schools efforts and knowledge about teaching and learning, the BIA schools can do a better job of educating students. The lesson for those who try to make schools and classrooms
more effective is that it may not be easy but it can be done. It is necessary for those who work with Indian students to have a vision of what they wish schools to be, a plan for achieving the vision, and persistence and determination to make it happen.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools, as evidenced by standardized achievement test scores. This study was based on the perceptions of principals and teachers in the pilot schools and on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized achievement tests at each school for grades four, five, and six in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Theoretically, a set of factors which contributes to the improvement of education for American Indian elementary school children can be identified. This study was designed to measure whether or not school staff members perceived the Bureau of Indian Affairs' implementation of the ten correlates related to improving the quality of education as affecting student achievement in the BIA schools.

**Delimitations**

The following delimitations apply to this study:

1. Only ten schools of the 19 Bureau of Indian Affairs pilot schools were part of the study. Three of the schools were high schools; they were eliminated. Of the remaining 16 elementary schools, five had changed standardized tests between 1988 and 1992 and were excluded for this reason. Of the 11 schools that represented the population, one chose not to participate because of the use of standardized test scores as a measurement of effectiveness. The remaining ten schools agreed to participate. One school considered itself both an elementary and junior high school, and the data from that school were used. The institutions that participated were Standing Rock Elementary School, Ft. Yates, North
Dakota; Lower Brule Day School, Lower Brule, South Dakota; Second Mesa Day School, Second Mesa, Arizona; Jemez Day School, Jemez Pueblo, New Mexico; Laguna Elementary School, Laguna, New Mexico; Taos Day School, Taos, New Mexico; Leupp Boarding School, Winslow, Arizona; Lukachukai Boarding School, Lukachukai, Arizona; Little Eagle Day School, Little Eagle, South Dakota; and Wingate Elementary School, Ft. Wingate, New Mexico.

2. Only administrators, teachers, and professional support staff who had been at the schools since 1988 were surveyed to determine their perceptions of the effective schools correlate implementation and effects on student achievement.

3. Only Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores from the 1988 and the 1992 Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (fourth edition) were collected from the ten schools for grades four, five, and six.

Assumptions

This study was based on the following assumptions:

1. The effectiveness questionnaire accurately, reliably, and validly measured the staff's self-perceptions of the impact of the effective schools process.

2. The participants in the study responded to the effectiveness questionnaire accurately, honestly, and openly.

3. The standardized test data supplied from each school were valid and reliable.

4. The participants knew enough about the effective schools research to have common understanding of terms.

5. BIA schools are a unique type of school because the federal government has control over all activities and programs implemented in the system. The effective schools correlates can be adapted to this unique setting to improve the teaching and learning process.
6. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills is an accurate test of achievement for American Indian students.

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purpose of this study, several terms were defined. They are as follows:

- **American Indian.** A term which refers to the indigenous people of America. In the United States, the term refers to those indigenous people who are members and descendants of members of federally recognized Indian tribes, bands, or other organized groups of Indians, including those tribes, bands, or groups terminated since 1940 and those recognized by the state in which they reside (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991). This term will be used interchangeably with the terms "Native American" and "Indian" in this study.

- **BIA Effective Schools Project.** The project designed by the Office of Indian Education Programs to be implemented in BIA schools to improve their effectiveness.

- **Boarding school.** A school which provides room and board for students.

- **Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST).** An advisory committee to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs especially formed to advise schools identified as the effective schools (Our Children, 1988-89).

- **Bureau Effective Pilot Schools.** The first 19 BIA schools selected in 1988 to participate in the BIA's school improvement process called the Effective Schools Project.

- **Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).** The agency in the United States Department of the Interior responsible for providing services to federally recognized Indian tribes.

- **Clear and focused mission.** A clearly articulated mission of the school through which staff share an understanding of and a commitment to instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability (Our Children, 1988-89).
Correlates. The ten characteristics of effective schools that were implemented in the BIA's improvement efforts.

Curriculum and instruction. A way of focusing and organizing educational activities and programs around the desired outcomes students will demonstrate. Curriculum and instruction can be based on locally defined needs which reflect the culture as indicated by the BIA correlate (Our Children, 1988-89).

Cultural relevance. Elements of a culture made meaningful to learners, including the way those elements apply in life situations (Our Children, 1988-89).

Day school. A school which does not provide living accommodations but usually provides breakfast and lunch for the student population.

Effective schools. "A school in which all the students learn the intended curriculum, regardless of socio-economic status, gender, or ethnicity" (Our Children, 1988-89, p. 7).

Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. The process used by the BIA/OIEP to improve education for Indian students in Bureau-funded schools.

Elementary student. Any student enrolled in kindergarten through grade eight who does not attend a junior high school or middle school.

Frequent monitoring of student progress. A system by which teachers regularly and frequently gather data for analysis about student progress toward outcomes. Feedback to students about their progress is provided frequently. Multiple assessment methods are used. Results of measurement are used to improve student performance and instructional programs (Our Children, 1988-89).

High expectation for student success. A standard set where the school displays a climate of expectations in which staff believe and demonstrate that students can attain mastery of essential skills (Our Children, 1988-89).
Home/school/community relations. A situation where home, school, and community have a clear understanding of the school's mission. This understanding takes place through an open and active involvement of parents and other community persons in the school's activities. The community and parents/guardians are involved in the school, and the school is involved with the parents/guardians and community at their level (Our Children, 1988-89).

Instructional leadership. A process where the principal acts as the instructional leader who communicates the mission of the school to staff, parents, community, tribal leadership, and the students. The leader understands and applies characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program (Our Children, 1988-89).

Office of Indian Education Programs (OIEP). The central office for Indian Education. In 1980, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Education separated when P. L. 95-561 went into effect. This office was formed to oversee Indian Education (Our Children, 1988-89).

Opportunity to learn/Student time on task. A system where teachers work to maximize instructional time and where students are doing what the teacher has planned for them to do in the academic setting without distractions (Our Children, 1988-89).

Participatory management/Shared governance. Shared decision making by parents, students, staff, administration, and tribe. A management style that enables all involved to feel their contributions are important and valued. A sense of ownership among all groups is developed (Our Children, 1988-89).

Safe and orderly environment. An atmosphere that is orderly, purposeful, and free from threat of physical harm. The atmosphere is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning (Our Children, 1988-89).
Tribe. A division or group of the indigenous peoples of North America. An endogamous social group descended from a common ancestry and composed of numerous families, exogamous clans, bands of cultural, religious, and linguistic homogeneity, and commonly united politically under one head or chief (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991).

Research Questions

1. What perceived effects have the effective schools correlates (safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance) had on school improvement and student achievement?

2. What are the professional staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts?

3. What effects has the implementation of the effective schools improvement efforts had on student achievement as defined by standardized test scores?

Organization of the Study

This study has been organized in a purposeful and thoughtful fashion. The first chapter contains the background for the study, including an overview of Indian education in recent times. The effective schools research over the past two decades was presented. In addition, the Bureau of Indian Affairs' involvement in the effective schools movement is explained. Finally, the need and purpose for the study are shared. The second chapter is a review of literature regarding Indian students and school achievement. It also explains the federal government's influence on Indian education. A connection between the effective schools literature and Indian student achievement and background is reviewed. The chapter then presents research on each of the ten correlate areas identified as essential in effective schools. Finally, current Indian education and school improvement is discussed along with
the concerns in Indian education today, including the need for cultural relevance and partnerships being important to student success. The third chapter explains the methodology used to collect the data and how the data were analyzed. The fourth chapter presents the data, and the fifth chapter presents a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools, as evidenced by standardized achievement test scores. This study was based on the perceptions of principals and teachers in the pilot schools and on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized achievement tests at each school for grades four, five, and six in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Theoretically, a set of factors which contributes to the improvement of education for American Indian elementary school children can be identified. This study was designed to measure whether or not school staff members perceived the Bureau of Indian Affairs' implementation of the ten correlates related to improving the quality of education as affecting student achievement in the BIA schools.

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section provides an overview of American Indian education. Section two is a review of effective schooling practices. Section three reviews the literature on school improvement and current Indian education issues.

American Indian Education

This section will address school achievement and intelligence. It will also address the federal government's influence on Indian education. Finally, it will address school achievement and background.
School Achievement and Intelligence

In a 1981 study, Brod and Brod found that American Indian children often do poorly in school when compared with non-Indian children. Reports show American Indian children often have lower school achievement than non-Indians (Coleman et al., 1966; Coombs, Kron, Collister, & Anderson, 1958; Havighurst, 1957).

In studying the school achievement and intelligence of American Indians, Havighurst (1957) found that many educators attributed the lack of school achievement by American Indian children to the belief that American Indians are not as intelligent as other races. In addition, Levensky (1970) found that educators cited the Indian child's academic grades as proof of this assumption because the grades for Indian children frequently are lower than the grades for non-Indian children. Bryde (1970) cited studies by Garth, Serafini, and Dutton (1925) and Telford (1932), which found the intelligence quotient scores of Indians to be lower than the scores for non-Indians. These results were used to strengthen the assumption that Indians are not as intelligent as non-Indians.

Havighurst (1957) found that American Indians, as a group, do score lower than the general public on standard intelligence quotient tests. However, Havighurst (1970) and Levensky (1970) reported that American Indian children are as intelligent as any other racial group when tested on non-culturally biased tests such as the Good-enough Draw a Man test used by Levensky. Using this test and other culturally fair tests, Levensky and others reported that the intelligence quotient scores of American Indians are equal to those of the general public.

McShane and Beiser (1981) determined that the manner in which the intelligence test is administered may have a substantial effect upon the American Indian child's score. They suggested that American Indian children may need more time to complete the test than other children need. They also recommended that the intelligence test administrator explain to American Indian children that some questions will seem hard so that the child does not
become bored or frustrated with the test and give up. The implications of intelligence test scores, the manner in which tests are given, and the lower school achievement of Indian students may indicate the unique educational needs of the American Indian population. Reviewing the history of Indian education could serve as a catalyst to actions that could be beneficial for educating Indian students.

In summary, American Indian children often score lower on standardized achievement tests than do non-Indian children. Even so, American Indian children are just as intelligent as the children of any other race. What is needed to demonstrate this are culturally fair tests. The cultural content of the test affects the choice and relevance of items included. Most standardized tests include items that are not relevant to the culture of American Indian children and result in scores that are lower than those from the group on which the tests were normed. The lower school achievement may demonstrate a need to review the unique educational needs of Indian students.

Federal Government's Influence on Indian Education

The first Europeans on the North American continent were received by people who had developed formal and informal education methods structured for the purpose of teaching their children the tribal culture. The final report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission (Task Force Five, 1976) described this educational process:

Education has always been a need of human society, and every society evolved a process of educating its youth for active adult participation in that society. The Indian society devised a means for socializing the youth and transmitting the culture. The educational process was active and not passive. The boys and girls learned by doing. The process was not highly structured and was dependent upon parents, relatives, and tribal elders for implementation. The curriculum could be described as informal but relevant. The life styles of Indians turned to the natural forces surrounding them and the overall goal of education was to preserve and maintain their way of life. Indian children were expected to grow up as their parents were, to perpetuate tribal customs, values, traditions, and ethics. Because American Indians did not have a written language, much of what was learned was by word-of-mouth transmission. The basic thrust of Indian education was traditional in the sense that the past was revered. (p. 5)
The European influence imposed a more structured educational system. Formal education of the Indians was conducted by various religions denominations whose goal was to civilize and Christianize the Indians. In 1611, western education and formal schooling were first introduced to the American Indians by Roman Catholic priests, who were the first missionaries to America (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972).

As the English settlers began their westward expansion, the Indians were resettled on reservations. Treaties, negotiated with the Indians in return for land, began to include provisions for Indian education (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Thompson, 1978). In 1778, the first Indian treaty was signed with the United States government although previous treaties had been made with European nations and the Continental Congress (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Thompson, 1978). In 1794, the first treaty with the federal government which provided for Indian educational services was signed by the Delaware, Tuscarora, and Stockbridge tribes (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Task Force Five, 1976). The educational stipulations in the early treaties with the federal government provided for the services of farmers who were to teach the Indians agricultural methods. Between 1784 and 1868, 120 treaties containing educational provisions for Indian tribes were signed (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Thompson, 1978).

In 1802, the federal government passed the first in a series of Trade and Intercourse acts. The 1802 act appropriated $15,000 for Indian education. Through this legislation, the United States assumed responsibility for providing various services, including education, to Indians (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Task Force Five, 1976).

The Act of 1819, known as the Early Civilization Fund, provided an annual fund for Indian education. These funds supported mission schools established by various religious denominations which implemented the government's policy of civilizing and Christianizing the Indians. The curriculum consisted of the English language and the four Rs: religion, reading, writing, and arithmetic. Although the missionaries worked among
the Indians for nearly 300 years, they are essentially considered failures insofar as their attempts to Christianize the Indians (Task Force Five, 1976).

According to the report from the National Advisory Council on Indian Education (1974), Indian students often left school with an understanding of the principles of Christianity and a solid grasp of reading and writing skills, but they still shied away from the white man's way of life. One observer of the times noted, with obvious frustration, that after the Indians returned home they also returned to their former lifestyles. The report indicated that "instead of civilizing and converting the rest, they have immediately relapsed into infidelity and barbarism themselves" (National Advisory Council on Indian Education, 1974, pp. 106-107).

In 1870, the federal government, in another attempt to civilize the Indians, appropriated $100,000 to establish industrial training schools for Indian students. The first of these, Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania, opened in 1878. It was followed by Haskell in Lawrence, Kansas, and schools in Forest Grove, Oregon, and Chilocco, Oklahoma. Several of these schools were set up in former military barracks, and the discipline and regimen of the schools were also modeled after the military (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Szasz, 1977). The curricular goal was to teach Native Americans agriculture and vocational skills to prepare them for assimilation. The curriculum consisted of basic academic courses combined with vocational courses, such as agriculture, textiles, blacksmithing, and carpentry (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Task Force Five, 1976). Although these schools were for older students and offered vocational courses, they were not much more than primary schools (Task Force Five, 1976).

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) was established in 1836 by the Congress of the United States, and in 1892 this Bureau became responsible for Indian education (Task Force Five, 1976). The act enabled the states to contract with the BIA to deliver Indian
health, education, and welfare services. These funds were designed to assist in the upgrading of education for American Indians (Brod & Brod, 1981).

The Meriam Report (1928), cited by Croft (1977), was the first extensive critical appraisal of Indian affairs. Meriam gave an unfavorable report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' educational program for American Indians. He cited low pupil achievement, high attrition rates, irrelevant programs, and inadequate facilities as indicators of substandard education. Meriam condemned the cruelty evidenced at boarding schools and the policy of removing Indian students from their homes. He recommended that day schools replace boarding schools, that Indian schools be models of excellence, that the quality of teachers be improved, and that efforts be made to provide a relevant curriculum for the students (Szasz, 1977; Task Force Five, 1976). In the early 1930s, John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, began implementing Meriam's recommendations (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Szasz, 1977).

In 1934, two significant legislative acts were passed to help implement the recommendations. Under the Johnson-O'Malley Act (1934), which was amended in 1936, the federal government provided supplementary funds to public school districts to offset the financial deficit of unmet extraordinary and exceptional cases of need related to educating American Indian students. This act led to the enrollment of thousands of Indian students in the public schools (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Szasz, 1977; Task Force Five, 1976). The second act, the Indian Reorganization Act (1934), sometimes referred to as the Indian Bill of Rights, stopped the sale of Indian lands, established a modified form of tribal self-government, and provided for reservation day schools (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Szasz, 1977; Task Force Five, 1976). As reported by Brightman (1971), when the act was passed, 75% of Indian children attending school were in boarding schools; within ten years, 67% of Indian children were attending day schools on the reservations. Sixteen boarding schools had been closed, and 84 day schools had been opened.
In the mid 1960s, the period of Indian self-determination began (Fowler, 1992; Jeanotte, 1981; Szasz, 1977). The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was significant in ushering in this period because it provided for Head Start, Upward Bound, Job Corps, VISTA, and Community Action Programs which were planned and operated by Indian communities (Task Force Five, 1976). In 1966, 1969, and 1970, three major Indian education studies were published. The first, by Coleman et al., was entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. The second report, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge*, is known also as the Kennedy Report. The third was by Havighurst and was entitled *The National Study of American Indian Education: The Education of Indian Children and Youth*. These reports paved the way for major reforms in Indian education (Jeanotte, 1981). They also helped in the passage of the Indian Education Act of 1972 (Fuchs & Havighurst, 1972; Task Force Five, 1976). Through Title IV, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965) and P. L. 81-874 (1958), the federal government made additional funds available for Indian education (Brod & Brod, 1981). Assessments to document the need for federal funds for Indian education were also required under Title IV, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965).

The BIA's education division budgeted significant amounts of money to help carry out its mission. The United States Department of Education provided an additional $55.4 million set aside for Indian programs such as bilingual education, education of the handicapped, and vocational and adult education and $104.3 million for facilities operation, maintenance, and construction. An overall financial picture showed a general increase in constant dollar funding of the United States Department of Education's Impact Aid for public schools, a gradual decrease in Indian Education Act funding, and generally stable funding of Indian set-aside programs (Charleston, 1988b).
In summary, Indian students have not demonstrated their academic abilities in the educational systems that have been available to them. The federal government's efforts to provide education for Indian students have not been very successful.

School Achievement and Background

A major concern for many educators is the limited progress documented in student achievement among Indian children. American Indian children appear to be equal in intelligence with the general population; yet, as a group, American Indians are usually below grade level in school achievement. Recognizing this trend, the federal government has provided entitlement programs and supplementary funds to assist in bringing the academic standing of American Indian children up to grade level.

Cultural and genetic factors have been suggested as barriers to the American Indian child's school achievement. Theories relating genetic factors to student achievement have long impacted the Indian child's school success. Jeffrey (1978) believed the research of Jencks (1972) was the most "significant study of education since the 1966 Coleman Survey" (p. 191). Jencks believed that the Indian child's test scores could be explained by genes, family environment, and interaction between genes and family background. This study stated Indian students fail because of their genetic makeup and environmental conditions.

A great proportion of the American people believe that family background and home environment are principal influences on the quality of pupil performance. The popularity of that belief continues partly because many social scientists and opinion makers continue to espouse the belief that family background is the chief influence on whether or not a child will do well in school. Such a belief suggests that there is no professional responsibility to be instructionally effective (Edmonds, 1979).

Cotton and Savard (1981c) referred to research reported by Coleman et al. (1966) when they stated, "Various home factors such as parents' socio-economic status,
educational level and attitudes toward education had more influence on children's school performance than all school-controllable factors combined" (p. 63). Coleman et al. attributed achievement differences to family background, structure, integrity of the family, and family size. Havighurst (1970) pointed out that because minority children, including American Indians, frequently come from low-income families, their lack of success in education is often tied to socioeconomic status. Bryde (1970) stated that cultural, not genetic, factors account for the difference in the relative achievement of Indian and white students. Cultural disparity between the home and the school may affect the child's school achievement. This disparity may also be due to the low socioeconomic status of many American Indian families. These two factors are inseparable.

The disparity between traditional Indian values and values fostered and supported by public education may cause conflict for the Indian child and for Indian families who want their children to adopt traditional Indian values. Underhill (1970) cited cultural conflict as a major problem of Indian youth. Cultural conflicts become an increasing problem, as O'Malley (1982) stated, "Today many Indian people continue to live in a world of transition; hence, current values held by Indians may reflect the influence by dominant society in varying degrees" (p. 23).

The American Indian parent's attitude toward education and the school is reflected in the habits, attitudes, and practices of the child (Bryde, 1970). Brookover and Lezotte (1977) and Cotton and Savard (1981c) reported any degree of parental involvement with the school to be positively related to the American Indian child's achievement in school. Williams (1976) reported that minority parents want to have increased communication with the school. She found parents often lack the knowledge of how to become involved in the system or, because of their personal school experience or lack of education, they may be hesitant to communicate with the school. Increasing the connection between the school and home can also increase student success. Though Edmonds (1979) indicated that the
schools are responsible to assure that all children learn, he also stated that the backgrounds of children should not predetermine their success in school. In a study reported by Brod and Brod (1981), American Indian high school students were asked to suggest how parents could help their children to succeed in school. These students thought parents should help their children study, encourage their children, make sure their children attend school, explain the importance of education to their children, and get more involved in school activities.

In effective schools, teachers care about what they teach and what their students learn, they believe that all children can learn, and they provide a setting in which the learning can occur (Edmonds, 1982). One need of students is to be understood and taught by sensitive and knowledgeable teachers. Teachers who are tribal members have been reported as being effective teachers because they understand the culture of the students (Task Force Five, 1976). American Indian teachers would serve as role models for American Indian children (Task Force Five, 1976). Fuchs and Havighurst (1972) cited three principal advantages to having more Indian teachers and assistants in the schools:

First, Indian students would see role-models among young Indian men and women in their own schools, and thus would be encouraged to go on further with their own high school and college education. Second, Indian teachers would generally have more empathy with Indian culture and history than would white teachers. Third, the teaching profession would offer many jobs to young Indians. (p. 202)

McConnell (1974) found increased Indian staff resulted in increased parental involvement within the Indian community which also helped students achieve success. Havighurst (1970) concluded that the lower average school achievement of American Indian children must be due to a combination of experience in their homes and their school experience.

O'Malley (1982) reported a need to examine effective schooling practices for American Indian children both from the perspective of what is considered effective for American Indian children and what is considered to be effective nationally. The BIA
Effective Schools Improvement Efforts decided to examine and implement the effective schools efforts in their schools (*Our Children*, 1988-89).

The effective schools improvement process was developed and established in order to help improve BIA schools. A dissertation study was conducted relating to the implementation efforts of the BIA (Bordeaux, 1990). The purpose of this study was to determine if differences existed between groups on the acceptance of and perceived implementation of five effective schools correlates in the participants of the first year of the OIEP effective schools improvement effort. The five correlates used were clear and focused mission, instructional leadership, frequent monitoring of student progress, high expectations for student success, and safe and supportive environment. There were 19 pilot schools which began the process in the fall of 1988. The study was designed as a self-reported descriptive study. The survey population was divided into seven subgroups: OIEP central office administrators, line office administration, the Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST), school principals, school staff on the School Effectiveness Team (SET), school board members, and school staff not on the SET.

The findings were reported by subgroup according to the acceptance of the five correlates, the perceived implementation of the five correlates, and the acceptance and perceived implementation of the 25 substatements. To be considered positive, correlates had to have at least a 75% rate and substatements a 60% rate of positive response. The conclusions stated that those who participated in the staff development had a higher level of acceptance and perceived implementation. The central office administrators and school staff not on the SET at the school did not accept the correlates or perceive that their implementation had made or would make a difference in the school. All of the groups reported they did not think there was planned improvement using the correlates (Bordeaux, 1990).
According to Bordeaux's study, the correlates found to be weakest were instructional leadership and high expectations. The correlate found to be the strongest was frequent monitoring of student progress. This information gave both BIA's BEST and the BIA schools pertinent data which they could use to improve the BIA school programs throughout the United States. The Bureau of Indian Affairs had made a commitment to provide Indian students with a quality education and to enhance the quality of life, promote economic opportunities, and carry out the responsibility to protect and improve the trust assets of Indian people.

**Effective Schooling Practices**

Identifying effective schools is a dominant issue in education in light of the increasing concern for achievement and accountability. In the last decade, educational research efforts concerning effective schools have focused on identifying the characteristics of an effective school. Researchers have produced a surge of reports and papers demonstrating that schools can and do have an effect on student achievement because of schooling characteristics (Frederick, 1987). Research by Brookover (1979), Edmonds (1978), Purkey and Smith (1982a), and Villanova (1984) indicated that certain schooling practices are more effective than others because they help teachers and administrators provide better instruction and they help students learn. Although various authors categorize these practices in different ways, the basic findings of effective schools research can be placed into five broad categories: (1) leadership, (2) curriculum, (3) school environment, (4) classroom instruction and management, and (5) assessment and evaluation (Edmonds, 1978).

Glen Robinson, President and Director of Educational Research Service, summarized the cluster of studies that has come to be called the "effective schools research." This cluster and related studies on teaching and learning comprise the most important body of educational information to be developed in the past two decades. This
research is important because it identifies and describes school climates most conducive to the teaching and learning process (Robinson, 1985).

The traditional American belief that good schools can and do enhance student learning through the actions they take was severely challenged in the mid 1960s by the conclusions of Coleman et al.'s (1966) massive study, *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, that had been mandated by Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Coleman Report concluded that school resources have little impact on student achievement independent of the student's family background and socioeconomic status. The Coleman Report, addressed to President Lyndon Johnson and Congress, stated the following:

> But this fact alone is important: Differences in school facilities and curriculum, which are the major variables by which attempts are made to improve schools, are so little related to differences in achievement levels of students that, with few exceptions, their effects fail to appear even in a study of this magnitude. . . . Taking all results together, one implication stands out above all: That schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social content. (p. 316)

Robinson (1985) noted that these widely disseminated conclusions had a devastating effect on education. They lowered school expectations, caused despondency among teachers, and decreased confidence of the public in the importance of public education. At the same time, though, the implication that schools could do little to compensate for the effects of non-school factors on student achievement was challenged by many educators.

Robinson (1985) reported that educators knew that there were effective schools where students' achievement in basic skills was far above expectancy levels. There were also non-effective schools where student achievement was far below expectancy levels. Slowly, study after study began to identify and confirm the factors related to higher achievement in basic skills among students in specific schools. The research found that when schools were matched on student background and socioeconomic characteristics,
differences in student achievement levels of school corresponded to differences in school management, instructional process, and learning climate.

According to Robinson (1985), schools can no longer be excused for not being effective merely because a large portion of their students are either minority or from lower socioeconomic families. There are many documented cases where such schools have been turned around—and in a relatively short time.

Later, in 1981, Professor Coleman himself conducted another massive study. This time he found that schools did make a difference in student learning, even when background and socioeconomic status were taken into account. Thus, Dr. Coleman reversed his previous conclusion ("Coleman Report," 1981).

The effective schools research is not without critics. Some reviewers of the research have alleged several deficiencies in concept and methodology. Despite the shortcomings perceived by some reviewers, the body of effective schools research and related studies support both theory and common sense about what constitutes good schools. Moreover, there is a degree of consistency and rhythm in the research findings, across studies differing in design and quality. "Most importantly, there is increasing evidence that effective schools research is useful as a framework for school improvement" (Robinson, 1985, p. 3).

The effective schools research that Robinson (1985) reviewed indicated that no single factor accounts for school success in generating higher levels of student achievement. Rather, exemplary pupil performance results from many policies, behaviors, and attitudes that together shape the learning environment.

Schools can make a difference in what, how much, and how well all students learn. During the 1980s, several characteristics were identified which, if initiated, could help schools become more effective. These characteristics included instructional leadership, curriculum and instruction, cultural relevance, school mission, monitoring and feedback of
student progress, opportunity to learn/time on task, high expectations, home/school/community relations, safe and orderly environment, and participatory management/shared governance (Edmonds, 1989; Our Children, 1988-89). The remainder of this chapter will discuss each of the correlates and provide research on each area.

**Instructional Leadership**

The quest for a clearer understanding of what makes certain principals more effective than others has spanned several decades (De Bevoise, 1984). Taken collectively, the "effective schools" studies reflect the view that the direct responsibility for improving instruction and learning rests in the hands of the school principal (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The central role of the principal has been viewed as building manager, administrator, politician, change agent, boundary spanner, and instructional leader (Greenfield, 1982; Rutherford, Hord, Huling, & Hall, 1983). Over the years, this role has been revised to address the need for all stakeholders to become involved in the school improvement process (Allen, 1995). However, effective leadership continues to be essential in the development, implementation, and innovation of effective and visionary programs in the school programs.

Several distinctions between more effective and less effective principals have consistently emerged from the educational research. For example, Rutherford (1985) noted the following:

[Effective principals] (1) have clear, informed visions of what they want their school to become--visions that focus on students and their needs; (2) translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for their teachers, students and other school administrators; (3) continuously monitor progress; and (4) intervene in a supportive or corrective manner when this seems necessary. (p. 32)

Edmonds (1979) shared his observations that the effective principals identified in his studies spend most of their time out in the school, usually in the classrooms. The effective principals are constantly engaged in identifying and diagnosing instructional problems. The diagnosis is always accompanied by the collegial offerings of alternative
ways to teach that particular content. The alternative ways evolve from a lot of interaction between teachers and principals. During the dialog between the teacher and the principal, decisions are made about the most appropriate style to teach in a specific situation. Edmonds (1979) indicated that one of the manifestations of instructional leadership is frequent principal-teacher discourse, which is focused on diagnosing and solving instructional problems in the classroom. Principals in the effective schools clearly focus on and/or facilitate the instructional purposes of their schools (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1988) and are considered instructional leaders.

Principals who are strong instructional leaders place a high priority on their role in instruction and the beneficial effect they have on students' learning. According to Andrews and Soder (1987a), this is especially pronounced for ethnic minority and poor children. Gersten, Carnine, and Green (1982) agreed in the description of principals as playing a strong role in a school's success. The principal's articulation of a schoolwide emphasis on reading and math, setting high expectations for students, imparting a belief that teachers are responsible for students' learning, and not blaming parents and environmental factors for failure is necessary and important to student academic success. Thus, it appears from both the school effectiveness work and from innovation research that a key to enduring, sustained effective educational services is the site administrator, especially the principal (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Brookover, 1981; Edmonds, 1979).

During the 1970s and 1980s, the focus on school improvement centered on the principal as instructional leader, who was accountable for the academic achievement of students. Instructional leadership is a somewhat new term in the literature on effective principals. In the 1960s and early 1970s, researchers concentrated on demographic characteristics of principals, such as race, age, physical appearance, sex, formal education, aspirations, and years of teaching experience to determine how effective they could be as a principal. These studies produced little information about how principals exercise
leadership, generally, or how leadership affects the instructional process. Ultimately, personal traits were shown to be unreliable predictors of leadership effectiveness (Rutherford et al., 1983).

Studies of teachers' perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader suggest that many practicing principals are perceived as instructional leaders. Studies have demonstrated that the teachers' perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader are essential to the reading and mathematic achievement of students, particularly among low-achieving students (Andrews & Soder, 1987a; Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986; Lezotte & Passalacqua, 1978). In addition, Andrews, Soder, Houston, and Jacoby found that when behavioral descriptors such as resource provider, instructional resources, communicator, and visible presence were used in which teachers perceived their principal to be strong, average, or weak instructional leaders, there were significant differences in incremental growth in student academic achievement (Andrews et al., 1986; Andrews, Houston, & Soder, 1985; Andrews & Soder, 1986). Thus, principals play a critical role in shaping the conditions in a school. For example, a perception among teachers that the principal is a strong instructional leader is likely to improve instructional practices in the classroom (Andrews et al., 1986; Andrews & Soder, 1987b). If the quality of schools is to improve, the professional practice of school principals must also improve. To do so, it is crucial that educators understand the characteristics of effective leadership (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Among the components of effective schools is the correlate of instructional leadership. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) observed in their sample principals such characteristics as a propensity to set clear goals and to have these goals serve as a continuous source of motivation, a high degree of self-confidence and openness to others, a tolerance of ambiguity, a tendency to test the limits of interpersonal and organizational systems, a sensitivity to the dynamics of power, an analytic perspective, and an ability to
be in charge of their jobs. This research broadly interprets the concept of instructional leadership. The instructional leader must take action or delegate to others in order to promote growth in student learning. Furthermore, Persell and Cookson (1982) reviewed more than 75 research studies, which reported recurrent behaviors that seem to be associated with strong principals. Several of the behaviors correlate with the studies by Rutherford (1985) and Sergiovanni (1984). They include (1) demonstrating a commitment to academic goals, (2) creating a climate of high expectations, (3) functioning as an instructional leader, (4) being a forceful and dynamic leader, (5) consulting effectively with others, (6) creating order and discipline, (7) marshaling resources, (8) using time well, and (9) evaluating results. Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) also reported the same behaviors of effective principals.

Other distinctions that characterize an effective leader include those reported by Sergiovanni (1984), who described the important difference that exists among incompetent, competent, and excellent schools is their leaders. According to Sergiovanni, schools managed by incompetent leaders simply do not get the job done. Typically, such schools are characterized by confusion and inefficiency in operation and malice in human climate. Student achievement is lower in such schools. Teachers may not be giving a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Student absenteeism, discipline, and violence may be problems. Conflicts may characterize interpersonal relationships among faculty or between faculty and supervisors. Parents may feel isolated from the school. Sergiovanni believes competent schools, by contrast, measure up to these and other standards of effectiveness. They get the job done in a satisfactory manner. Excellent schools, however, exceed the expectations necessary to be considered satisfactory. Students in such schools accomplish far more and teachers work much harder than can ordinarily be expected.

Effective principals use goals to provide a focus for communication, conveying support of the enthusiasm for goal-related work, and for bringing school needs to district
administrators (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). The vision established by the instructional leader and the process for the development of vision help provide a climate of high expectations and mutual respect among staff members and students (Persell & Cookson, 1982).

Bennis and Nanus (1986) argued that a compelling vision is the key ingredient of leadership in the excellent organizations they studied. Vision refers to the capacity to create and communicate a view of a desired state of affairs that induces commitment among those working in the organization. As a communicator, the principal articulates a vision of the school that heads everyone toward that vision (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Effective principals use their leadership to set and communicate high goals for the personnel in their buildings. They convey high expectations for students, for staff, and for their own performance. They emphasize dedication and hard work and encourage greater professionalism and initiative by staff (Robinson, 1985).

These leaders also believe in monitoring a student's progress through the years (Mortimore & Sammons, 1987). In addition, effective principals assess their environments, know their limitations and strengths, and understand the kinds of programs and outcomes they desire for students. They not only see themselves as pivotal points around which these elements turn, but they believe in their abilities to influence each of those parts. They direct their energies toward improving the academic climate of their schools and the quality of the instructional organization (Dwyer, 1984).

In order to improve Indian education, tribal leaders, education policymakers, and educators must strengthen the education systems serving Indian children (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991). According to Robbins and Tippeconnic (1985), in a system based upon tribal values, like a BIA school, it is important that the leaders be able to recognize and understand the Indian community's social and educational goals. It is also important that the focus of leadership maintains and improves the education system for
Indian children. The leadership in Indian school systems should be consistent with the tribal value and belief structure of that community.

The effective Indian educational leaders support teacher education and other professional training for larger numbers of American Indian students and adults. These leaders make sure staff inservice training is promoted and targeted toward specific school and program goals.

The effective principal must also be a resource provider. Persell and Cookson (1982) found that successful principals are good at acquiring needed materials. They get the resources that will help their teachers deliver. Teachers say that when they go to their principal with an idea, he or she knows about resources, is well versed in the literature, and knows people who can provide staff assistance and development (Andrews & Soder, 1986). Principals of effective schools are leaders who introduce ideas; involve the entire district staff, students, and patrons in crystalizing the ideas; and work to motivate them to continue until the task is completed (Lipham, 1981).

According to Stringfield and Teddlie (1988), reporting about the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study, the effective principal became increasingly active in targeting staff development for some, occasionally all, of their teachers whenever resources were available. In effective schools, Lipham (1981) found the administration committed to securing inservice training, specialized materials, resource people, or whatever was necessary to best equip the school staff to produce. Lipham (1981) and Dwyer (1984) found the effective school leader makes sure resources are allocated for improvement and continues to re-evaluate the project as it develops to make sure it is on target and the goals are being met.

The community also proved an important source of influence on the activities of principals. Thus, effective principals are aware of the constraints and problems posed by their respective communities. Whether their schools serve poor or wealthy neighborhoods,
these leaders find opportunities to extend the available human and material resources to their schools. They strive to make their schools integral parts of their neighborhoods and, in the process, find valuable resources and security (Dwyer, 1984).

Smith (1983) suggested that the community perceptions of the district's strengths be assessed to ensure that public opinion is not reducing the school's effectiveness. The citizens' regard for the school as being important and effective is necessary as an indirect condition for effective schools (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982). In addition, the abilities the principals have in communicating and exhibiting public relations skills, such as verbal fluency, when communicating with parents and community members can help when dealing with school issues. The effective principals use a wide variety of communication processes, such as parent newsletters, flyers, parent meetings, open houses, and phone discussions (Robinson, 1985).

Effective principals are never content just to identify problems (Edmonds, 1982). Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) found principals they studied were never satisfied. They wanted more for their students, and they were continually looking for ways to obtain it. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) made the point that the principals they observed were not willing to simply "keep the peace" and maintain smooth-running organizations. To some degree, all were innovators, constantly seeking ways to effect school improvement with an emphasis on student learning.

Curriculum and Instruction

The primary function of schooling is teaching and learning. An effective school is one which demonstrates both quality and equity in its program's outcomes (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985). Research is becoming more convincing about the belief that all students can demonstrate school success, especially when success is defined as mastery of the essential curriculum (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985).
The school is more than a collection of people, subjects, and grade levels. The qualities of the school as a whole can either enhance or detract from the classroom learning environment. A central focus on learning is important in pursuing instructional effectiveness (Robinson, 1985). A pervasive and broadly understood instructional focus emphasizing basic skills needs to be contained in a written curriculum for each subject area (Frederick, 1987) but not limited to a written document. Squires (1980) stated that a coordinated curriculum is an important component of an effective school.

Goodlad (1984) described several levels of curriculum as the written, taught, resourced, experienced, tested, and ideal. The written curriculum is the formal or planning document that describes what should be taught. The written curriculum is intended to provide the whole structure of what is to be taught. The taught curriculum is described by Goodlad as that which is presented in the classroom. The resourced curriculum is the texts and learning materials that represent what is to be taught. The experienced curriculum is what the students perceive from what they are taught. The tested curriculum is that learning found in the school's measurement instrument, usually a standardized test. Finally, the ideal curriculum consists of new and innovative ideas that can inspire and renew teachers.

The ultimate responsibility for the delivery of the curriculum rests with the classroom teacher. In successful schools, teachers are involved in curriculum planning and participate in developing their own written curriculum guidelines (Sparks, 1993). The teachers are knowledgeable about the content and utilize pedagogical skills needed for teaching the specific curriculum (School Effectiveness, 1980). Teachers in effective schools work to assure continuity of instruction across grades to allow for a smooth transition from one grade level to the next (Robinson, 1985). The teachers in these schools are prepared with a plan and a structured learning environment for the children (Robinson, 1985). Teachers make efforts to use available time creatively and curricula are coordinated within and among grades (Stringfield & Teddlie, 1988).
Teachers in effective schools are encouraged to plan their instructional strategies to meet the objectives of the lessons and the needs of the learners. Venesky and Winfield (1979) reported that the most effective teachers plan alternative strategies and approaches for teaching each objective so they are prepared to meet the needs of individual learners. Doherty and Peters (1981) reported that adequate materials, space, and staff to accommodate and facilitate the meeting of the individual learning objectives make education more meaningful.

In effective schools, Doherty and Peters (1981) reported that the scope and sequence of the curriculum from district goals to expected student outcomes are in place. These goals are communicated to staff, students, parents, and the school community. Staff, students, and the community know the scope of the curriculum and the priorities within it (Robinson, 1985).

School effectiveness is associated with a high degree of alignment among instructional objectives, curricular materials, and testing instruments. There needs to be alignment between the intended, taught, and tested curriculum (Sparks, 1993). If schools are to be results-oriented and effective for virtually all students, teachers have to believe that if they teach the intended curriculum and students learn it, students will do well on the measurement devices. According to Dempster (1993), teachers in 99% of the school districts nationwide do not believe this because there is a huge gap between what is taught and what is tested.

Reform-minded scholars and educators have argued that decreasing the size of the curriculum will benefit students. There is far too much in the curriculum to be able to teach all of it well (Sparks, 1993). Exposing students to less material but to greater depth will lead to greater learning than the current practice of exposing students to a large amount of often disconnected information (Dempster, 1993).
In schools working to be more effective, the curriculum articulation is clear, the expectations for "all" students to master the curriculum are in place, and the faculty as a whole, through research, looks for ways to overcome variation in opportunities to learn. Effective principals and teachers want to find ways of increasing the number of students moving successfully through the content to promote mastery and success (Burns, 1978).

Instructional leaders can work to ensure that curricular materials used in their schools are consistent with the school's instructional objectives. It is essential that the instructional objectives used are aligned with the instruments used to monitor student progress (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). Robinson (1985) shared the research he studied, adding that high achieving schools had instructional programs that were goal-oriented and that directed school resources toward achieving specific instructional goals.

An effective school can demonstrate quality in its programs through outcomes. The outcomes of any program are documented when mastery is achieved in the school's curriculum. Six levels of curricula were discussed in this study. They are the written, taught, resourced, experienced, tested, and ideal. The ultimate responsibility of delivering the curriculum to the students belongs to the teacher. It is absolutely necessary to hold teachers accountable for what they teach and what students learn. This accountability can be measured using the school's curriculum.

**Cultural Relevance**

American Indians, with languages and cultures found in no other place in the world, are in danger of losing their distinctive identities. Many members of the younger generation know little or nothing about their Indian languages, cultures, rich histories, fine arts, and other unique features of their cultural identities. It is necessary to reaffirm the value of Indian languages and cultures. The knowledgeable elders, once important teachers in transmitting historical, cultural, and practical knowledge to the young, are no longer a part of the educational systems. In addition, the intellectual leaders, historians,
spiritualists, medical experts, and philosophers are no longer trained through a formal tribal process of education during the youngsters' upbringing. If Indian cultures remain important today, as many Indian political and educational leaders believe they do, they must again become a part of the educational process.

In order to make learning more meaningful for Indian students, the school's academic design should meet the unique language and culturally related educational needs of these students. The Indian Nations At Risk Task Force (1991) suggested that well educated American Indian citizens need a renewal of the language and culture base to be more successful in school.

Language has been found to be the basis for intellectual development and for transmitting knowledge. The language base is strongly influenced and set by age three. For this reason, students must establish language competence early in order to develop their academic and intellectual skills. The importance of learning standard English is essential for school success because English is the language used by teachers in schools. It has been found that the language providing the greatest potential for intellectual development is the language reinforced at school and at home. The strength in using two or more languages has been demonstrated through bilingual or multilingual children who have a greater opportunity to develop their analytical and conceptual skills than do monolingual children. The use of the language and culture of the community served by schools forms an important base from which children are educated and reach academic achievement (Hakuta, 1984; Mohatt & Erickson, 1981; Padilla, Hakuta, Fredrikson, Robson, & Chassin, 1991). Schools that respect and support a student's language and culture are significantly more successful in educating those students.

Saxe (1990) discussed the direct relationship between students' understanding of their culture and their role in society and their ability to function comfortably in society and
to achieve academic success. He stated that "when students' relationships with the larger society are strained, their chances for academic success appear to diminish" (p. 45).

For Indian children, there is a need for cultural relevance in all areas of the curriculum. It is important to assure that materials requested by teachers fit the needs of both the students and the curriculum. The local culture and Indian language are considered by many to be relevant parts of the curriculum for American Indian children. Yaz (1973) contended textbooks and curricular materials normally used in schools present only middle-class, Anglo-Saxon values. This may serve to confuse, bewilder, and disenchant minority students. Schools that adjust their curriculum to accommodate the variety of cultures served are more successful than schools that do not make such adjustments (Robinson, 1985).

The perspective from which a school's curriculum is presented can significantly influence Indian students' attitudes toward the school and academic performance. The school must be academically challenging with high expectations for all students (Yaz, 1973). In addition, the curriculum and assessment should be driven by the goals that parents and the community have helped set for the school. Furthermore, using assessment results to guide curricula and instructional changes helps improve student achievement (What Works, 1987).

Nelson and Coburn (1982) reported that when educating American Indian children, it is important for the teacher to utilize culturally appropriate instructional methods as well as materials. They defined culturally appropriate instructional methods as including the sensitivity, empathy, relevance, and effectiveness with which a lesson is taught. In a similar vein, Sizemore (1967) emphasized the standards for academic achievement of American Indian children should not be lowered in any school to accommodate the Indian students, but rather the curriculum and curricular standards should be geared to the students' needs.
O'Malley (1982) found in many instances teachers who work with Indian children come into the school setting unaware of the Indian culture and values or of the traditions and history of the Indians in the local area. This lack of information can lead to misunderstandings which Cavendar (1971) pointed out may cause parents of the school children and members of the Indian community to label the teacher as being insensitive to Indian students. It is important for the teacher to be knowledgeable regarding the local traditions and customs. Sizemore (1967) emphasized that training offered to individuals who work with Indian populations should provide emphasis on the strengths of the Indian students rather than on their weaknesses. Fuchs and Havighurst (1972) agreed that the teacher should be aware of Indian culture and traditions and that the teacher should become involved in the Indian community.

Yaz (1973) reported that curricular materials and tests often depict American Indian people in a manner which caused Indian children to become ashamed of their Indian culture. Cotton and Savard (1981a) identified the use of culturally biased curricular materials as a factor which may contribute to a lower self-esteem on the part of American Indian children. McCluskey (1975) concluded that it is the school curriculum that makes the difference in the relative achievement of Indian and white students. Havighurst (1970) stated the following:

The school program should be developed with curriculum, atmosphere, and that the behavior of teachers and students be aimed primarily at maintaining respect for Indian culture and the dignity of Indian peoples while maximizing the capability of students to move comfortably between two social orders, and through teaching skill and competence in the non-Indian culture and economy. (p. 5)

Teaching about the local reservation and Indian culture was reported by Pecoraro (1979) to produce a positive change of attitude toward Indians on the part of both the Indian and non-Indian students. Pecoraro found this instruction in Indian culture also produced a positive change of attitude on the part of the families of the students and upon
the school staff. Culturally responsive education was found to enhance the self-esteem and school attitudes of Native American children (Cotton & Savard, 1981a).

**School Mission**

Effective schools exhibit quality in terms of learning. According to Robert Rossmiller (1986), from the Center for Effective Schools, "the objective of effective schools is that all students receive both a quality education and equal opportunity to learn" (p. 7). Allen (1995) made the following statement:

> The lesson for those who are trying to make their schools and classrooms more effective is that it may not be easy but it can be done with: a vision of what we wish schools to be, a plan for achieving the vision and persistence and determination to make it happen. (p. 4)

A strong sense of academic mission (McCormack-Larkin 1985) is included in an effective school environment. The school environment contains specific expectations for students, staff, and parents. In addition, the mission is formed from the atmosphere created when students, staff, and parents combine their talents and energies to strive for educational excellence (Smith, 1983). The Bureau Effective Schools Team (BEST) described school mission as a clearly understood and accepted purpose statement that guides local education decision making and is the driving force for designing the education process to meet the needs of all students (Allen, 1995).

Lezotte and Bancroft (1985) pointed out that school improvement is based on the effective schools research which begins with a clear and unambiguous statement. It is important that whatever the mission is it ought to be broadly understood (Edmonds, 1979). Sparks (1993) quoted Lezotte as stating the following:

> It doesn't make sense to add resources to an organization that doesn't have a clear sense of mission. Most schools have a mission statement but few have a sense of mission. If you ask "what does this school care about?" you should get essentially the same answer from everyone. (p. 10)

A necessary component for developing a clear, broadly understood, and supported mission is to have input from all stakeholders in the educational system and local
community. Parents, teachers, business, community, and tribal leaders are involved in developing and implementing system-wide improvement/reform plans and strategies to accomplish the school's mission and intent of Goals 2000, also known as the Educate America Act. The school's mission statement is the basis for the school's belief and philosophy statement which reflects the community's beliefs. The school and community should share a common understanding of the mission (Allen, 1995). Allowing and encouraging the educators, students, parents, grandparents, and community members to work together to enforce and encourage the same academic goals is the major emphasis of Goals 2000. Sergiovanni (1984) emphasized that in excellent schools a sense of purpose rallies people to a common cause. Work has meaning and life is significant. The teachers and students work together with spirit and accomplishments are readily recognized.

An academically effective school also has clear goals related to student achievement, teachers and parents with high expectations, and a structure designed to maximize opportunities for students to learn (Purkey & Smith, 1982b). It is important to use the mission as a basis for plans and student outcomes. "A mission defines a school's purpose for students who then have a clear understanding of what is expected of them" (Allen, 1995, p. 18). The school's mission addresses the whole child, reflecting academic, social, and special needs of the students. To assure the mission is carried out, it is important that orientation for staff includes emphasis on the school's mission and vision and an expected student performance (Allen, 1995). It is clear from the organization theory literature (Perrow, 1970) and the school effectiveness literature (Hallinger, 1981; Lezotte & Passalacqua, 1978) that schools that promote academic achievement have clearly defined goals based on academic matters. Since all areas of the schools have goals associated with the school's mission, then all aspects of the school program reflect the school's mission statement (Allen, 1995).
Successful schools develop action plans involving setting clear goals, devising specific ways to reach the goals, directing school resources toward achieving the goals, and creating a school environment supporting goal attainment. Any organization is more cohesive if all parties understand its major purpose (Robinson, 1985).

One of the schools in the Milwaukee School District in March 1979 designed and implemented an academically effective program in the school. They used the effective schools research which included development of a strong sense of academic mission. The amount of time spent on non-academic activities was significantly decreased to allow more time for academic learning (Edmonds, 1979). The leader played an important part in the role of the academic mission by articulating its major purposes and undertaking systematic dissemination of the mission (Edmonds, 1979). The mission must be disseminated in all communications and must be displayed frequently and prominently throughout the school. The mission, vision, and expected student performance are disseminated to students, parents, and community members in order to share with others the school's expectations and accomplishments (Allen, 1995).

Monitoring and Feedback of Student Progress

Lezotte and Bancroft (1985) reported that the organizational literature clearly implies that in complex organizations, such as schools, "what gets measured gets done!" (p. 25). Goals without accompanying monitoring systems are tenuous at best. The assessment of student outcomes as the primary basis for judging the effectiveness of a school may seem obvious but is a major necessity for student progress.

The data Mortimore and Sammons (1987) collected concluded that schools contributed substantially to students' progress and development. In fact, for many of the educational outcomes, especially progress in cognitive areas, the school is more important than background factors in accounting for variations among individuals. Students benefit not only from continuity of staffing but also from consistency in teacher approach to
assessing progress. In schools where all teachers continually monitor student progress, the impact on students' achievement is positive.

Effective schools have a system for monitoring and assessing pupil performance tied to their instructional objectives. In effective schools, student progress is continually monitored and assessed in a variety of purposeful ways on a routine basis (Brookover, 1976; Robinson, 1985). Teachers pick a few areas and test and monitor, like a physician with vital signs, and then follow up if indicated by results. The faculty do not continue practices that do not work. Giving frequent feedback to students on their academic performance is also a necessary element to student academic progress. The frequent monitoring of students' learning and adjusting teacher behaviors when necessary will increase student achievement (Allen, 1995).

Robinson (1985) shared his findings that showed that students seem to benefit when teachers take the time to give them feedback about their work. Routine assessment procedures make checking student progress easier. Devoting time to giving students corrective feedback if their responses are incorrect, closely monitoring students' work, assessing frequently, and implementing cooperative goal structures all promote student achievement (D'Amico, 1982). Feedback on student academic progress is obtained frequently when multiple assessment methods such as teacher-made tests, samples of student work, mastery skills checklists, and criterion-referenced tests are used. The results of testing are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program (Villanova, 1984). Students who hear results quickly and who receive feedback that is simple and clear can use this information to help themselves understand and correct errors. This process also enables academic achievement to occur (Robinson, 1985).

Other types of immediate feedback have proven to be beneficial to student academic achievement. Technology has enhanced the ability to give frequent feedback, allowing
students to monitor their own learning (e.g., computerized practice tests, instant results on work, and ability to see correct solutions) (Allen, 1995). Technology also allows the teacher to provide programs that will meet students' needs on a one-to-one basis. The computer program can give the students immediate feedback of results even if the teacher is unavailable.

Just as important as measuring progress is setting policies to determine what measurements to use, when they will be used, and how often measurements of student progress will occur. Policies in the area of student progress seem to be related to academic success. One such policy is a homework policy. Homework is an integral part of the student's day and if consistently used throughout the school, it clearly helps establish high expectations for students (Robinson, 1985). It is important to note that homework is developmentally appropriate and serves to tie learning to the real world (Allen, 1995). Effective teachers assign homework which students are easily able to complete (Robinson, 1985). Effective schools that utilize homework to extend learning time and promote parental involvement in the learning process of their children enhance academic achievement. Other important policies used to help improve student academic achievement are attendance, grading policies, and time on task. Smith (1983) reported that children whose parents encouraged daily study and daily attendance did better in school. Stallings and Mohlman (1981) reported that clear and consistently enforced school policies on student attendance and tardiness helped produce an atmosphere of high academic expectations while reducing tardiness and absence rates. Purkey and Smith (1982b) reported that schools with high student achievement have good attendance, assign more homework, offer a strong academic program, and emphasize high standards. Likewise, when an incrementally based schoolwide grading policy is monitored by the principal, academic success is enhanced (Brookover et al., 1982; D'Amico, 1982; Wynne, 1980). Stallings (1980) studied school policies on interruptions of classroom instructional time.
When instructional time in reading was protected by school policies that minimized interruptions, students scored higher in basic reading skills (Stallings & Mohlman, 1981). Schools in which policies require that progress reports be sent to the parents of all students numerous times a year convey to students and parents the importance the staff places on academic work (D'Amico, 1982).

In similar fashion, a schoolwide policy on monitoring student performance in conjunction with instructional objectives communicates to students that they are held responsible for and expected to learn to specific amounts of information and range of skills (Edmonds & Frederiksen, 1978; Wynne, 1980). Effective schools had systematic programs for assessing and monitoring student progress toward specific learning objectives. Test results in effective schools were thoroughly reviewed by teachers and principals. Students were provided with prompt feedback regarding their progress toward specific learning objectives. The testing program is considered an accurate measurement of the curriculum, and the test results are used to make modifications in the instructional program.

The goals and objectives approach to instruction has caused many schools and school systems to revise their procedures and instruments for assessing student learning. The problem is how to measure student progress toward specific learning objectives in an accurate, timely, and efficient manner. The problem can be addressed if the curriculum is aligned as to what is intended to be taught, what is actually taught, and what is tested. There must be agreement on outcomes first and how they will be measured (Allen, 1995). For educators to know that they have taught effectively and to ascertain that students are learning with efficacy, they must be able to describe the resulting knowledge, skills, and behaviors that indicate student mastery (Robinson, 1985). In order to measure student progress more explicitly, standardized, norm-referenced, paper-and-pencil tests will give way to curricular-based, criterion-referenced measures of mastery. Authentic assessment
will be used, including products of student work in performance assessment and portfolio assessment. The monitoring feedback of student progress, relying less on standardized, norm-referenced tests and more on curricular-based measuring systems, will result in improved student performance (Allen, 1995).

Robinson (1985) cited that teachers in higher achieving schools had access to effective diagnostic systems for assessing and monitoring student progress toward specific learning objectives. These diagnostic support systems specified the particular skills each student had mastered and those the students had yet to master. Such information allowed for better planning of lessons, more purposeful grouping for instruction, and deployment of school resources where they were most needed to help students who were falling behind.

Mortimore and Sammons (1987) stated that the value of recordkeeping has been noted as an important aspect of teachers' planning, assessment procedures, and providing feedback on performance. In situations where teachers report keeping written records of individuals' work and using them to monitor progress, the impact is positive. In schools where teachers spend more of their time discussing the content of work and less time on routine matters and the maintenance of work activity, the impact is also positive (D'Amico, 1982).

As student progress is evaluated, staff members in effective schools are also evaluated in their progress toward meeting district instructional standards and individual professional growth objectives (Smith, 1983). The importance of giving feedback to teachers on their performance and on the amount of learning that is occurring in their classrooms is just as essential as student feedback (Allen, 1995). Supervisory cycles, including goal setting conferences, observations, and post-observation conferences, are employed in effective schools to assess teacher progress. In fact, the staffs of effective schools were found to periodically evaluate and assess their own effectiveness. This
evaluation involved review of test results and other evidence of student progress toward learning objectives. Staffs in effective schools were more accepting of the concept of accountability than were staffs in non-effective schools (Robinson, 1985). Teachers in effective schools were more likely to believe that student test scores were a valid index of their own teaching effectiveness, while teachers in non-effective schools perceived little relationship between student test scores and their own teaching effectiveness (Robinson, 1985).

If student progress is not monitored frequently and the students are not provided with feedback on their progress, few positive outcomes will occur. Slavin stated that "any child leaving 3rd grade without reading has a slim to no chance of getting into the educational mainstream" (Allen, 1995, p. 11). Lezotte stated that "if students linger very long in failure they probably will not come out of it" (Allen, 1995, p. 11).

**Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task**

High standards for academic achievement were reported by Clark et al. (1980) to be common in effective schools. Students in these schools were told what they were expected to learn and the standards of quality that would be acceptable. The school placed equal emphasis on the learning of all students and promoted the philosophy that all students would learn a challenging curricula.

Effective leadership, a coordinated curriculum, and monitoring and feedback of student progress are important components of an effective school. Each of these facets has an impact on the student, but just as important to the student is the impact of the opportunity to learn/time on task standard (Squires, 1980). The opportunity to learn/time on task standard of effective schools research allocates a maximum time to curriculum and active involvement on essential learner objectives. Few interruptions are expected in the teaching and learning environment. This concept leads to intensive engagement where students can master and demonstrate the intended outcomes (Allen, 1995).
The teachers in effective schools expect all children to strive to meet these standards (Larson, 1977). Stallings (1980) reported that teachers in effective classrooms are prepared to teach and use a minimum of transition time to move from one activity to the next. Teachers and students recognize that classroom time is valuable and should be used for learning. Teachers become more skilled at interdisciplinary curriculum and practice organized abandonment, deciding what goes and what stays. They may need to declare some things are more important and abandon some less important content.

The teachers in these effective classrooms expect their students to arrive in class with the necessary materials and come prepared to begin work. Effective teachers will also adjust time for those who need more time for mastery (Allen, 1995). In addition, effective schools promote inclusion for special education students (Allen, 1995). Teachers in effective classrooms allocate class time to the various lessons and activities so very little time is spent on non-learning activities (Smith, 1983). Teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in the essential skills (Allen, 1995). Effective teachers set time limits for the completion of assignments, and students are encouraged to pace themselves to complete the assignments within the given amount of time. Students who finish early are expected to read or work on their projects, while students who fail to finish the assignments are expected to complete the work in their extra time or at home (Smith, 1983).

According to Allen (1995), a high percentage of the time students are engaged in whole class or large group, teacher-directed planned learning activities. In the area of grouping for instruction, Smith (1983) reported that effective schools use whole group instruction when introducing concepts. Smith discovered that small, heterogeneous groups are more advantageous when students are in the process of mastering concepts. The development of student study and learning skills is integrated within the instructional program, emphasizing how to learn.
Brophy (1979) reported that during the lessons, teachers in effective schools ask questions to check for student understanding. These effective teachers make sure all children are given the opportunity and adequate time to respond. Throughout the year, effective teachers use regular reviews to check for student retention of important concepts (Stallings, 1980). Smith (1983) noted that teachers in effective classrooms utilize activities and assignments with which students will have a high degree of success. Holt (1964) cited this as an appropriate method for catching and holding the child's attention. He found that by reducing the child's boredom and resistance to accomplishing the task, the child will be more successful in school. Most effective teachers utilize a variety of instructional approaches to complement and expand the preferred learning styles of their students.

The effective schools have access to resources, including time, trained staff, library, computers, and classroom materials. All classrooms have adequate, up-to-date materials for all students, including manipulatives and equipment for science and other lab requirements (Allen, 1995). The schools that promote student academic success have access to computer technology for instruction, for administration, for satellite uplinking, and for networking (Allen, 1995). The library is organized as an active learning center with a collection which serves to meet the needs of students. New instructional materials and technology are selected by school curriculum committees to match the content and philosophy of the school's curriculum (Allen, 1995).

D'Amico (1982) stated that when classrooms are well managed, learning occurs, more time is devoted to instruction, and self-concepts are enhanced. It is difficult to establish a demanding academic climate in a chaotic classroom. Practices that contribute to an orderly classroom include establishing clear rules and procedures and enforcing them consistently and fairly, organizing the physical environment to prevent disruption, and promptly handling study disruptions (McCormack-Larkin, 1985). Mortimore and Sammons (1987) emphasized that students benefit when their school day has sufficient
structure. Teachers who organize a framework within which students can work, yet allow them some freedom within this structure, are most successful. The teachers make the learning environment one of quality. The classroom becomes more mastery based and more humane, not punitive.

Evertson (1981) reported that teachers in effective schools pay attention to student interests, problems, and accomplishments. The effective teachers use this information to show children they really care. Mortimore and Sammons (1987) expressed that maximum communication should occur between teachers and students in order to build on a working relationship. Students gain from having frequent communication with the teacher, either individually or with the whole class. The teachers communicate their high expectations and they demonstrate that all students can attain mastery of basic skills. In an effective school, the staff has the capability to help students achieve mastery (Tirozzi et al., 1990).

**High Expectations**

According to Allen (1995), the Office of Planning, Oversight and Evaluation in Washington, DC, which oversees BIA education, has defined high expectations as an atmosphere of challenge and confidence where students and staff develop to their full potential academically, socially, spiritually, culturally, emotionally, mentally, and physically. This definition continues to be a part of the effective schools philosophy as stated in the 1995 effective schools BIA training manual and is an important element for the school improvement process.

Robinson (1985), in his summary of effective schools literature, reported that effective schools operate in a climate in which the professional staff believe their students can achieve and the staff holds high expectations for student accomplishments. This climate of high expectations, in which all staff believe and demonstrate that all students can attain mastery of the essential school skills, is a necessity for student growth. It is essential for each student to be provided with equal opportunity in the learning process regardless of
differences in the student's needs. In order to meet the diverse needs in the classroom, the staff may implement various strategies, such as reteaching or regrouping, to help students attain mastery.

According to Brookover and Lezotte (1977), the staff of the improving schools tend to believe that all of their students can master the basic objectives. They tend to report higher and increasing levels of study ability. There is a belief by the staff that their students can learn, and they have a commitment to making sure that their students do learn. The teachers in effective schools respond when students are not learning (Allen, 1995). Students and teachers are encouraged to continue to do what they have been doing because what they have been doing works (Lezotte & Bancroft, 1985).

According to Brophy (1979), Good (1979), and Rosenshine (1978), one goal pertinent in all effective schools is that all staff assure that all students will meet the standards set for them. Effective teachers are expected by the administration and school board to meet teaching performance standards which are based upon effective teaching practices. The effective school as an organization reflects high expectations for both students and staff. This requires cooperation among teachers (Allen, 1995). The organization looks at the way it is structured and restructures if necessary so the school organization gives teachers access to more tools for learning for all (Allen, 1995). School organizations can help students more by transforming from institutions designed for instruction to institutions designed to assure learning (Allen, 1995). Brookover (1979) and Allen (1995) reported that it is also essential for effective schools to have staff with high expectations for themselves. The teachers believe they are able to teach all students and they believe all students can learn. The staff believe they have the capability to help all students achieve. These attitudes and beliefs in response suggest how teachers behave in a teaching and learning situation. In addition, staff members have high expectations for each other as well and seek to upgrade their teaching skills to attain the objectives they have set
for students and to provide a challenging and meaningful curriculum. The effective teachers are willing to share their successful practices (Allen, 1995). A greater sense of control by the staff over the learning environment prevailed in effective schools by the staff. The staff were more optimistic about their ability to influence student achievement, and students believed their accomplishments depended on how hard they worked (Robinson, 1985).

Staffs in effective schools are optimistic about their abilities to influence students and do not blame their teaching problems on non-school factors, such as student abilities, student backgrounds, and lack of parental concern. Teachers maintain that students are perceived capable of academic progress, and there is great incentive to push students to achieve. School effectiveness results from concrete actions taken in response to the premise that students could and would learn (Robinson, 1985).

Such action includes teachers emphasizing rewards rather than punishment. Student learning is recognized frequently through awards and displays of student work. Genuine praise is given frequently (Allen, 1995). Teachers who are effective use verbal, symbolic, and tangible reinforcements and other learning incentives, such as games and group-oriented competitions, to help sustain student interest and motivation (Brookover, 1981; Maksimowicz, 1987-88; Slavin & Madden, 1988). The positive staff attitudes are constantly conveyed to the students. When individual teachers or an entire faculty are found to be effective in teaching all the students, such events should be celebrated. In effective classrooms, Smith (1983) found that there are incentives and rewards for both students and teachers. Teachers are rewarded for excellence and innovation (Allen, 1995). Various forms of public recognition for the academic accomplishments of the school, its staff, and students all add to students' academic success. The establishment of a strong sense of student identification and affiliation with the school is essential to building and promoting high expectations for students. In effective schools, efforts to create an
atmosphere of support and belonging include school convocations and academic honor assemblies; the use of school logos printed on notebooks, homework folders, and t-shirts; and the establishment of academic varsity teams. Students in effective schools are given opportunities to assume leadership and accept responsibilities for being a part of the school and to display a positive attitude toward the school as their educational institution (Allen, 1995).

Stallings and Mohlman (1981) and Purkey and Smith (1982a) reported that clear and consistently enforced school policies on student attendance and tardiness helped produce an atmosphere of high academic expectation and emphasized high standards. The teachers in the effective schools value the time they have with their students and have assignments or activities ready for students when they arrive. In response, students are required to bring the materials they need to class each day so class time is not wasted and students have ample opportunities to learn (Robinson, 1985).

Furthermore, effective teachers use observations and record significant daily information about their students to enhance their instructional decisions and raise expectations of students. One element of a teacher who is equipped to pursue excellence is the professional ability to study children and remain current with emerging research. A teacher who has these abilities will be constantly involved in adapting his or her work with children to produce learning that can be documented.

The more effective the teacher is in the classroom and communicating to the students the more positive effects occur where teachers communicate interest and enthusiasm to the children and use higher-order questions and statements that encourage them to use creative imaginations and powers of problem solving. Creating a challenge for students suggests that the teachers believe they are capable of responding to it. Students, staff, parents, and other community members are involved in developing local expected student outcomes which indicate high expectations (Allen, 1995). The use of
communication by the school to the community allows the community to be informed of accomplishments, policies, and programs which encourages the community to have high expectations for the school and students (Allen, 1995).

Home/School/Community Relations

Expecting involvement from parents is an important factor in the effective schools process. According to Lezotte, it is vital that schools know how to deal with increased levels of parent involvement (Allen, 1995).

Surprisingly, though, some researchers discovered evidence of a negative relationship between the total amount of parent involvement in school and student achievement. However, upon further examination, they did find parent involvement existed in the declining schools they studied but found more parent-initiated involvement in the improving schools. These findings suggest the need for a closer look at the nature and type of parental involvement expected from the school in order to expand the school improvement process. An example of this would be the crucial component of the home, school, and community's understanding of the school's mission and the role parents play in developing the mission of the school.

According to Lezotte, in an effective school "parents understand and support the school's basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school achieve its mission" (Allen, 1995, p. 34). Parents not only understand the school's mission, but they have been involved in the determination of expected student performance and outcomes and know the role they play in partnership with the school. From the beginning of development, the effective schools have ascertained parental expertise and interest would be part of the schools' improvement plans. The effective schools gather continuous input from parents throughout the year and in the planning stages for the future. The effective schools provide opportunities for parents and community members to give input about school reform efforts and other decisions through
general meetings, surveys, and committees. This also entails inviting parents to be members of improvement teams in the school. Involvement may be as simple as establishing contracts with parents in order to help them define their role in improving the academic achievement of their children and be a part of the team.

Furthermore, in effective schools, parents are encouraged to become involved with their child's education. For example, parental involvement can pertain to involvement in setting up help for students to get to school regularly, working on establishing a homework time in the evenings, attending teacher conferences, volunteering, and participating in workshops. Other ideas for parental involvement could include providing parenting classes and support groups established in the school system, promoting a monthly newsletter and/or articles in the local paper with parents' help in the decision making about what to put into the newsletter, and the writing of articles or typing of articles. Parents can also be encouraged to actively participate in school activities such as sports events, open houses, parent-teacher conferences, student performances, and special meals. Parents are also asked to support the school and the teachers by encouraging their children to learn. Cotton and Savard (1981c) reported that the most effective schools provided parents with information and techniques for helping their children to learn at home. Whatever the endeavor may be, the effective school always encourages interaction between teachers and parents in order help improve student academic achievement. Effective teachers also involve parents in activities that relate directly to improving student performance. Most importantly, the effective teachers communicate with parents in a positive manner (McCormack-Larkin, 1985).

The need for regular and consistent communication with parents and clear expectations to parents regarding the school's academic and behavioral standards affect learning and are essential elements in an effective school environment. With good communication between teachers and parents, a building of trust is established and can
flourish. Through the interaction between the school and home, the school promotes respect for families, which has a positive effect of making parents feel welcome at the school and gives a regular means to foster open and active communication with parents and other community members. Principals who practice accessibility to parents and a school with an informal "open-door" policy are more effective overall. Principals in effective schools rated their teachers higher in holding regular parent conferences, in communicating with parents, and in maintaining good parental attitudes toward the school.

Effective schools communicate and report student progress to students, parents, and the community in meaningful and understandable ways. The periodic reporting of student progress is important to maintaining effective parent assistance and support of the instructional program. The periodic reporting of student progress and program needs to the community is important for the support and involvement the community can give the school program. Research shows that higher achieving schools have a close cooperative relationship with parents and community. Such research has drawn renewed attention to the importance of school public relations. Not only are many schools and school systems reassessing their relationships with parents and the public, but a number of state and national organizations also have campaigns encouraging their local counterparts to become active in efforts to promote better school, parent, and community cooperation. This includes active involvement of the community and home in the school and of the school in the home and the community (Allen, 1995). Stringfield and Teddlie (1988) stated that the schools need to involve parents and the larger community in ways that are good for the students and for the community itself.

Moreover, as a part of their orientation, employees receive information on the community, its culture and values, and on effective and culturally appropriate strategies for developing and maintaining partnerships with families and the community. Effective schools developed and maintained a positive relationship between themselves and the
community. Robinson (1985) stated that the parents of students in effective schools were found to be more interested and more concerned about their children's schoolwork. Edmonds (1979) claimed, "Repudiation of the social science notion that family background is the principal cause of pupil acquisition of basic school skills is probably a prerequisite to successful reform of public schooling for the children of the poor" (p. 17). He asserted that the emphasis on home influence and learning would not only absolve educators of their responsibility to be instructionally effective but place unfairly the burden for learning on parents. Edmonds claims this philosophy is wrong and could impair collaboration between home and school to aid learning. Working together is more important than placing blame on others.

According to Allen (1995), the relationship between the school and parents must be an authentic partnership which is established in an effective school environment. Most importantly, Mortimore and Sammons (1987) found parental involvement to be a positive influence upon students' progress and development.

**Safe and Orderly Environment**

Effective schools have an atmosphere that is orderly without being rigid, quiet without being oppressive, and generally conducive to the instructional business at hand (Edmonds, 1979). According to Purkey and Smith (1982a), effective schools have a sense of order and good discipline and the students are expected to obey. In addition, Druian and Butler (1987) stated that the greatest amount of learning takes place in a safe and orderly environment. Saphier and King (1985) explained that a healthy school environment is an important component in the development of an effective school. This healthy, safe, and orderly environment contains within it a nurturing environment which is conducive to learning. It also promotes a climate where all are respected and where children, staff, and the community can grow together to be the best they can be. Lezotte and Bancroft (1985)
added that effective schools have "orderly, purposeful, businesslike atmospheres which are free from the threat of physical harm and is conducive to teaching and learning" (p. 24).

In fact, any effective school has a mission of teaching and learning that is grounded in the assumption that teaching and learning will occur in an atmosphere where there is safety, orderliness, and an optimistic opportunity to learn. According to Purkey and Smith (1982a), schools that are safe for students stress academic excellence. The research summarized by Robinson (1985) concluded that effective schools have climates that are purposeful and orderly. The school environment reflects the school's goals-oriented philosophy and is the result of much planning and effort. The effective schools have firm policies developed with input from the parents and the community (Allen, 1995). It is important for students and teachers to feel that the school building and classroom can provide a safe and conducive environment for learning (Robinson, 1985).

In effective schools, discipline is clear, firm, and consistent. Discipline policies are plain and concise. School regulations and penalties are subjected to periodic review and are responsive to teacher and student input. Students are supplied with copies of the regulations and penalties. Rules are enforced in a firm and consistent way. Many schools develop programs or methods to help students not only understand expected school behavior but also transfer such behavior outside of school (Robinson, 1985).

The effective schools policies spell out the expected student conduct and the consequences and rewards for good behavior in the school. Copies of the policies are provided and reviewed with every student. These policies are followed with consistency by all staff members and are based upon student rights and values (Allen, 1995). The expected behaviors and consequences for unacceptable behavior are also made known in a readily understood form to both students and parents (Brookover, 1979). The discipline policies are followed by all teachers in effective schools. These teachers work
cooperatively and consistently to enforce all rules and fairly administer disciplinary actions (Allen, 1995; Druian & Butler, 1987).

The principal, teachers, and support staff endeavor to teach students by example, and staff development is an essential component to an effective school environment. Robinson (1985) reported an atmosphere of cooperation and caring in effective schools. The staff focuses on student needs and working cooperatively within the framework of a well managed organization. This spirit of staff cooperation is also reflected by students and parents.

Furthermore, the presence of teaching techniques that foster cooperative learning and students helping each other are examples of teaching methods used to support a safe and orderly school (Allen, 1995). Teachers learn the technologies of teamwork and utilize them to enhance collaboration. The effective schools create environments which provide opportunities to structure collaborative situations throughout the school setting (Allen, 1995). Mortimore and Sammons (1987) stressed a high level of industry and order in the classroom characterizes a work-centered environment. The students appear to enjoy their work and are eager to commence with new tasks. The noise level in the effective school classroom is low, although this is not to say that there is silence in the classroom. In addition, the movement around the classroom is not excessive and generally there is a work-related atmosphere. Mortimore and Sammons' (1987) study confirmed that an effective school has a positive ethos, both around the school and within the classroom. The academic results, in an effective classroom, are favorable when there is less emphasis on punishment and critical control and greater attention to praising and rewarding students. Teachers who enjoy teaching communicate this feeling to their students, which helps contribute to a favorable classroom climate. The positive climate created by teachers for students is an important aspect of a school's effectiveness. This climate appears to be
reflected in effective schools by happy, well behaved students who are friendly toward each other and outsiders (Robinson, 1985).

The staff in effective schools are trained to utilize other effective and appropriate behavior management techniques, including strategies to enhance self-esteem and build upon the safe and orderly environment, that make the school environment more productive (Allen, 1995). The effective teachers let their students know that there are high standards for behavior in the classroom. Classroom behavior standards are written, taught, and reviewed from the beginning of the year. The rules, discipline procedures, and consequences are planned in advance. Standards are consistent with or identical to the building code of conduct. The importance of consistent, equitable discipline is applied for all students. In addition, procedures are carried out quickly and are clearly linked to students' inappropriate behavior. The most effective teachers stop disruptions quickly, and they take care to avoid disrupting the whole class. In a disciplinary action situation, the teachers focus on the inappropriate behaviors and not on the student's personality. In the case of administrative matters in handling discipline, they are taken care of with quick and efficient routines that keep class disruptions to a minimum (Robinson, 1985).

To help heighten an effective program, the effective schools have well balanced extracurricular activities based on needs, strengths, and interests of the students and include opportunities to demonstrate good citizenship and personal responsibility which provide positive interaction with peers and the community. In addition, in order to intensify the outcome of a safe and orderly environment, effective schools provide counseling activities which take place in classrooms with close coordination between counselors and all teachers, including special education staff. The counseling program provides preventive as well as crisis counseling. For more severe cases, appropriate therapy or treatment is provided for students. Furthermore, effective schools are also drug free with prevention
programs built into the school's system. These prevention programs include support
groups and individual counseling.

Purkey and Smith (1982b) reported results of a study which was concerned with
identifying the elements that make schools safe, nonviolent, and orderly institutions of
learning. Though this study did not evaluate the academic effectiveness of schools nor
focus on school characteristics that were linked with academic success, many of its
findings regarding the difference between safe schools and violent schools are relevant to
the discussion of effective schools. School governance was found to be of critical
importance in creating safe schools. In addition, those who serve as firm disciplinarians
and strong behavioral role models for students are crucial in making the schools safe.
Another contributing factor to school effectiveness is the strong relationship indicated
between schools' "structure of order" and "academic success." For example, in one of the
violent schools that was able to change, "one measure associated with the turn around
linked the improvements in the academic program and stressing the important of academic
excellence" (p. 169).

Participatory Management/Shared Governance

Leaders in tribal and local situations typically show allegiance to the American
educational system and join with the non-Indian education leaders to promote and improve
the system in the local community. It is necessary to appoint tribal leaders to work directly
with local and state agencies to promote the tribe's education goals and to ensure the
representation of the goals in local education plans and initiatives are met (Effective
Schools, 1990-91). Indian leaders must endeavor to adapt the system in minor ways to
meet the local needs of the community, such as including appropriate cultural reference
materials in the curriculum, using the Indian language as either the language of instruction
or a topic of instruction, and adding relevant curriculum topics (Robbins & Tippeconnic,
1985). The tribe and local community members must be willing to give the school leaders

Just as important is the community's belief that the school is "theirs" and that it is accountable for meeting all children's needs. The expectations of the parents, the community, and the students themselves have an influence on their ability to succeed academically (Slavin & Madden, 1988; Stallings, 1985; What Works, 1987).

The key elements needed for school restructuring include a community-wide commitment to change which means more positive attitudes among parents and students. Of great importance in the change process is the acknowledgment of change by the stakeholders in that community and the opportunity for them to develop a real sense of participation with the schools (Demmert, 1990; Education That Works, 1990; Toward a State of Esteem, 1990). Implementing a partnership between schools and parents, social service agencies, business, and industry is necessary to help improve student achievement (Slavin & Madden, 1988; Stallings, 1985; What Works, 1987).

One way effective schools choose to be more successful is in planning joint partnerships with parents, students, school officials and staff, tribal leaders, and policymakers to help the BIA school improvement implementation be effective. Schools that utilize a management style that enables all involved to feel their contributions are important and valued and a sense of ownership prevails among all involved will be productive and effective (Allen, 1995). It is important to involve those who will be affected by the decision making process. According to Allen (1995), all stakeholders need to be involved in developing the vision, mission, and plans for the school. He also added that the participatory management and shared governance should be practiced with an "open-book" manner with a free flow of information throughout the organization and community. In fact, participatory management and shared governance need to be in policy form and defined as to what it means to each group member's role.
Successful educational reform includes local empowerment, accountability, and adequate financial and political support. The complex nature of school reform requires partnerships between schools and other agencies such as social services, business and industry, and institutions of higher education. In addition, the school system needs to be flexible to allow for innovations and experimentation to occur in the school that is working with other agencies in collaborative efforts (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991; Mojkowski, 1991). A delicate balance among tribal, federal, state, local, district, and parental responsibilities is needed in order for schools to become more successful (Demmert, 1988a; Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991).

Numerous studies have shown that the responsibility for the education of Indian students must rest in the hands of the parents and communities served by schools. The schools must provide opportunities for parents from multicultural communities to develop partnerships with schools serving their communities (Our Voices, Our Vision, 1990; Robbins & Tippeconnic, 1985; What Works, 1987). Parental involvement helps ensure that the school meets expectations and also shows support for schooling as important to children's development. After all, educational improvement is tied to parental involvement, collegial planning, and cooperation among teachers, the principal, and the community. Parents, tribal leaders, and other members of the community should be welcomed as partners to the school system and shown how to become involved in their children's education (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991).

It is important to remember that parents are capable of working with local, tribal, state, and national political representatives to ensure that proper attention is paid to improving schools. Another way parents can become involved in education is to develop parental skills and continue learning throughout life. Parents should hold schools accountable for educational outcomes (Cotton & Wikelund, 1989; Demmert, 1988a;

**Concerns in Indian Education**

Even though progress is occurring, Indian education is not yet sufficient (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991). The existing educational systems, whether they be public or federal, have not met the educational, cultural, economic, and social needs of Indian communities (National Advisory Council on Indian Education, 1989). The major concerns in Indian education today are how BIA schools can improve to meet the needs of Indian students and how the school improvement process can increase the academic performance of Indian students (*Our Children*, 1988-89). The schools need to look beyond their school doors for answers.

Social problems act as direct obstructions in successfully educating Indian children. Some of the problems are easy to identify and change while others are more complicated and need a long-term team effort (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991). The nation's leaders, tribal governments, and Indian communities are all concerned about the significant increase in social problems among Indian peoples and they know action needs to be taken against the problems. Furthermore, unless greater attention is paid to strengthening the physical, mental, and spiritual health of Indians, problems will continue to multiply in tribal groups, families, and social and educational systems (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991).

The BIA decided to use the correlates from the effective schools research in an attempt to improve their schools. The BIA's effective schools initiative was in the fifth year of a five-year plan in 1992. Seventy-eight of the 182 Bureau-funded schools had participated in the effective schools program by this time (United States Department of the Interior, 1993). The process used by the BIA includes training personnel in the effective schools methods and then collecting data on outcomes similar to other school improvement
programs. The BIA/OIEP adapted the effective schools framework for school improvement in 1988. This process of school improvement has had significant success in public schools across the country (*Our Children*, 1988-89).

According to the report by the Office of Monitoring and Evaluation, the pilot schools are showing improvement in enrollment, attendance, and achievement and major changes have occurred toward improving the school program. The schools placed emphasis on high expectations, the development of good written curricula, improved parental involvement, and the use of school evaluations as tools for implementing change (*Taylor & Allen*, 1992-93). This information gave both the pilot schools involved in the process and the BEST pertinent data to use to further the effective schools improvement process.

**Summary of Literature**

Despite the many challenges they have faced over the past 500 years of contact with European, Asian, African, and other Old World nations, American Indians have survived as distinct peoples. This nation owes a great debt for all that Indians have contributed to help it become the great nation it is today. Indians must and will continue their participation in the national effort to strengthen America economically and culturally. The most important responsibility of any society is to ensure the health, protection, and education of its young children. The American people must ensure that all children in the United States have equal opportunity to receive these benefits, including all American Indian children.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools, as evidenced by standardized achievement test scores. This study was based on the perceptions of principals and teachers in the pilot schools and on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized achievement tests at each school for grades four, five, and six in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Theoretically, a set of factors which contributes to the improvement of education for American Indian elementary school children can be identified. This study was designed to measure whether or not school staff members perceived the Bureau of Indian Affairs' implementation of the ten correlates related to improving the quality of education as affecting student achievement in the BIA schools.

This chapter includes a description of the study sample. It also includes the rationale for selection of the sample; the development of the questionnaire; the procedures to be used for collecting, scoring, tabulating, and analyzing the data; and the statistical treatment of the data.

Selection of the Sample Schools

The 19 schools which participated in the first year of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools Improvement Efforts were identified as the population from which the sample would be selected. This population was selected because these schools had
implemented the BIA effective schools process for five years. No other group of BIA schools had been involved in this process during this period of time. The five-year period of implementation was considered to be an ample amount of time to see changes that might occur in the schools.

The sample was then identified as those pilot schools that were elementary schools and that had used the same standardized testing throughout the history of their participation in the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. Elementary schools were selected to allow for analysis of similar data and because the writer is an elementary school principal. Of the 19 Bureau of Indian Affairs pilot schools, three were high schools and so were eliminated from the study. Of the remaining 16 elementary schools, five had changed from using one standardized test to using another from 1988 to 1992 and were excluded for this reason. Of the 11 schools that represented the sample, one principal chose not to participate because of the use of standardized test scores as a measurement of effectiveness. The writer attended a BIA effective schools conference and had an opportunity to meet most of the principals of the 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. The one principal who did not want to participate due to the use of standardized tests agreed to participate after our meeting. However, as time passed, one school principal who had agreed to participate left, and another principal who was unfamiliar with the study was reluctant to participate. After receiving several telephone calls and sending two sets of questionnaires, the principal did not reply or distribute the questionnaires to the staff. Therefore, that school did not participate, leaving ten schools in the study.

The study remained with ten of the 11 schools participating. One school was both an elementary and junior high school, and the data from that school were used. The schools that participated in the study were Standing Rock Elementary School, Ft. Yates, North Dakota; Lower Brule Day School, Lower Brule, South Dakota; Second Mesa Day School, Second Mesa, Arizona; Jemez Day School, Jemez Pueblo, New Mexico; Laguna
Elementary School, Laguna, New Mexico; Taos Day School, Taos, New Mexico; Leupp Boarding School, Winslow, Arizona; Lukachukai Boarding School, Lukachukai, Arizona; Little Eagle Day School, Little Eagle, South Dakota; and Wingate Elementary School, Ft. Wingate, New Mexico.

Selected Sample of Professional Staff Members

The participants in the study were selected professional staff and administrators of the participating Bureau of Indian Affairs 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools in the United States. The principals of the schools were contacted by telephone to request their participation in this study. The ten school principals who agreed to participate were asked to have themselves serve as contact persons or to designate someone to serve that function. The principal or the designee was asked to identify the professional and administrative staff who would be qualified for participation in this study. Qualified subjects were professional staff members and administrators who had been at the school since the 1988 BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts began. These subjects were selected because of their ability to express their perceptions of the effective school process over the five-year period.

Development of Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix A) for gathering the necessary data was designed specifically for this study. A questionnaire had to be developed because one was not available that met the need of the study. The Bureau of Indian Affairs/Office of Indian Education Programs, Branch of Monitoring and Evaluation had a checklist which they used during their monitoring of BIA schools, but the checklist did not contain all the areas discussed in this study. The checklist was provided by Dr. Sandra Fox, a member of the Oglala Sioux tribe, who serves as Branch Chief for Monitoring and Program Evaluation in the Office of Indian Education Programs in Washington, DC. The *Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire* (1989) was appropriate to collect much of the data for this study. However, this questionnaire lacked cultural areas found in the BIA/OIEP checklist.
A merger of the two documents fit the need for this study. The *Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire* (1989) and the "School Monitoring and Evaluation Checklist" (Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1992) were used as guides to develop questions for this survey about the Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. The instrument was designed and developed to gather staff perceptions about school implementation of the ten correlates of effective schools identified by the Bureau of Indian Affairs/Office of Indian Education Programs: safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance.

The final instrument for this study contained 63 questions drawn from the ten correlates. The safe and orderly environment correlate had five questions. Four of the questions were from both instruments because the questions were the same, and one question was from the BIA checklist. The clear school mission correlate had five questions. One question was merged from the two instruments, and four additional questions were developed from the literature reviewed about mission statements because neither the *Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire* nor the BIA checklist had questions that fit this correlate. The instructional leadership correlate had six questions derived from questions on both instruments. The high expectations correlate had seven questions. One question was taken from the *Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire*, and the other six were derived from questions on both instruments. The opportunity to learn/time on task correlate had seven questions, all taken from both instruments. The curriculum and instruction correlate had six questions, all taken from both instruments. The monitoring and feedback for student progress correlate had five questions taken from both instruments. The home/school/community relations correlate had six questions taken from both instruments. The participatory management/shared
governance and cultural relevance correlates had 16 questions taken from the BIA checklist. In summary, a total of 17 questions were developed from the BIA checklist, 41 questions were combined from both instruments, four questions were developed from the literature reviewed, and one question came from the *Connecticut School Effectiveness Questionnaire*.

A pilot test was conducted to determine the appropriateness of the questions. The questionnaire was administered to three administrators, five teachers, and two professional support staff members who would not be participants in the study. These individuals were invited to comment on the appropriateness and clarity of the questions and on whether or not the questions pertained to and elicited perceptions of the effectiveness correlates used in the BIA's effort to improve its schools. In addition, respondents were asked about the degree of difficulty they had responding to the questions and about the length of time needed to complete the questionnaire. Two additional revisions were made on the basis of their suggestions. Incorporating their recommendations provided some content validity to this instrument.

**Standardized Achievement Test**

This study utilized the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized test scores from ten of the 19 pilot schools for 1988 and 1992 for grades four, five, and six. Test scores from students in grades four, five, and six were used because these students had been in school long enough to have been influenced by the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. Hence, their test scores would be more likely to show evidence of any impact of the process. Students in earlier grades would not have been in school long enough to show any change in their test scores.

The standardized test used to gather data regarding the achievement of the students was the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS). Macmillan/McGraw-Hill published the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill had been producing
recognized achievement tests that measure basic skills in reading, language, spelling, mathematics, study skills, science, and social studies. The test had been used throughout the nation for over 60 years.

The standardized achievement test was selected as a measurement tool because all BIA schools were required to administer some form of standardized achievement test. The BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts purpose was to promote and enhance academic achievement for Indian students, and a comparison of standardized test scores would be one method to monitor academic achievement.

The CTBS was selected because this test was most used by the BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. Of the 16 elementary schools in the population selected, 11 schools had administered the CTBS in 1988 and administered the same CTBS in 1992. The use of the same test over the five-year period allowed for consistency and the ability to match the same data over the five-year period.

Since the mid 1970s, standardized achievement tests have been used increasingly for purposes of instructional support as well as for the more traditional purpose of permitting comparison of local achievement levels with national norms. The CTB organization was one of the first publishers to respond to this demand for both types of information from a standardized test when it introduced the concept of "category objectives" with the 1977 edition of the California Achievement Test (CAT), Forms C and D. The achievement tests of CTBS and those of most other publishers have, since that time, offered some type of objectives-based, criterion-referenced, or curriculum-referenced scoring reports in an effort to make the testing more useful in the support of instruction (Comprehensive Tests, 1990).

CTBS was constructed on a modular basis with some modules being developed to meet the specific need for valid and reliable norm-referenced information and some being developed to meet the specific need for accurate and useful curriculum-referenced
information. Test users may now select either the norm-referenced components (CTBS/4 Benchmark and Survey Tests) or the combination of norm-referenced and curriculum-referenced components (CTBS/4 Complete Battery Tests).

The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills were given on a yearly basis in the spring of the year in the BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. The norming dates, times, and testing rules required by the testing company were followed by the BIA schools. The CTBS had to be given at a specific time of the year, usually at the end of April. A short grace period was provided at the end of this time for students who missed school for some reason during the testing days. The test days usually lasted for a period of four to five days, depending on the grade level tested. The test guide provided information on the amount of time to be allowed for each test and how the test should be administered.

The test scores for grades four, five, and six from 1988 and 1992 were collected from each of the BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools on a form provided to the principal or designee (see Appendix F). The CTBS scores were collected directly from the schools, and the writer had no control over the reporting.

**Data Collection**

The administrators of the 11 BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools were contacted by telephone, and their participation in the study was requested. (See Appendix B.) The principals who agreed to participate were contacted by telephone a second time (see Appendix C) and were given an explanation of the study and assurance of confidentiality and were asked for their commitment for continued participation in the study and to designate a contact person if the principal chose not to be the contact person. A letter was also sent to the principal (see Appendix G) with copies of the questionnaire, directions for administering the questionnaire, a letter of explanation to the teachers who participated in the study (see Appendix H), a questionnaire regarding the profile of the principal (see Appendix I), and a large pre-addressed, stamped envelope in which the questionnaires
were to be returned to the writer. Follow-up telephone contacts were made to principals who did not submit the completed questionnaires or test results in a timely manner. The follow-up letter to the designees and/or principals (see Appendix E) expressed thanks for their cooperation. What the writer requested of the principal or designee was the collection of the standardized test data for grades four, five, and six by every grade level for the years of 1988 and 1992 in the areas of total reading, total language, total mathematics, total battery, science, and social studies. The test results were requested by grade level for the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) composite scores from the CTBS and were to be placed on the form provided. (See Appendix F.) Included with the letter to the designee was a form to document the CTBS standardized test scores for grades four, five, and six for the years of 1988 and 1992. (See Appendix F.) Enclosed with the forms sent to the principal or designee was a return pre-addressed, stamped envelope. A postcard was included so the principals or designees could request an abstract of the study. The principals and designees received the same materials. When a designee received the materials, the writer sent one set of all materials to the principal for communication purposes.

Two months after the first mailing, another telephone call was made to the three principals who had not yet provided information. These three principals suggested the writer work with designees to obtain the test information. The writer then called and sent letters to the designees. (See Appendix D and Appendix E.) The purpose of the telephone call was to introduce the writer to the designee, to reiterate the principal's commitment, to describe the study, and to provide an assurance of confidentiality.

One of the principals in the three schools from which the writer received no data in two months was again contacted by telephone. At this time, the writer was informed that the principal had resigned and a new principal had been hired. The writer was introduced and reiteration of the process, study, and confidentiality was made. A follow-up letter to the principal was provided along with the questionnaires, collection of test data form, and
principal profile form. Two weeks later a telephone call was made to confirm the arrival of the questionnaires. Data were not collected from this school, dropping the number of schools in the study to ten.

The second of the three principals was contacted again regarding the questionnaires and other materials sent to the school. The principal had misplaced the materials, and a new packet of materials was sent. After two weeks, another telephone call was made. After three weeks, the data were received from this principal.

The writer traveled to the third school in another state and distributed the questionnaires and brought them back. The test data were obtained from the central office for this school.

At this point, the writer determined that an adequate number of questionnaires had been received from all ten schools and that test data from all ten schools had been collected. No further attempts to collect data were made.

**Statistical Treatment of the Data**

The Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) was analyzed from 1988 and 1992. The data obtained were treated with appropriate statistical tests. The suitable statistical treatment for analyzing the data for this study was the Pearson Correlation Coefficient which was used to measure the correlations of the staff's perceptions of the effectiveness of each of the correlate areas since the beginning of the effective schools process up to the present time. The $t$ test for two independent samples was used to measure the relationship between the standardized test scores for each school from 1988 and 1992 with correlations.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the data collected to determine whether or not the Bureau of Indian Affairs effective schools process made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools. The data are presented in two parts: data obtained from the effective schools questionnaire and data obtained from the CTBS standardized achievement tests. The findings are presented in tabular and narrative form.

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools, as evidenced by standardized achievement test scores. This study was based on the perceptions of principals and teachers in the pilot schools and on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized achievement tests at each school for grades four, five, and six in the areas of reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Theoretically, a set of factors which contributes to the improvement of education for American Indian elementary school children can be identified. This study was designed to measure whether or not school staff members perceived the Bureau of Indian Affairs' implementation of the ten correlates related to improving the quality of education as affecting student achievement in the BIA schools.

In order to gather the data for this study, each subject was asked to complete a questionnaire regarding perceptions of the effective schools correlates in their school. The
aggregated standardized achievement scores for 30 groups of grade level test data were collected from the ten participating schools.

The research questions that guided this study were the following:

1. What perceived effects have the effective schools correlates (safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance) had on school improvement and student achievement?

2. What are the professional staff’s perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts?

3. What effects has the implementation of the effective schools improvement efforts had on student achievement as defined by standardized test scores?

The professional staff who had been employed at the schools since 1988 or longer were asked to complete a 63-item questionnaire that contained questions pertaining to the ten correlates adapted by the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts. The questionnaire was developed on a Likert rating scale, and the staff members were to give their perceptions of the implementation of the ten correlates in 1988, which was the first year their schools were involved in the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts, and five years later in 1992.

The data in Table 1 show the percentage of schools and professionals participating in the study. Of 11 eligible BIA schools, all (100%) agreed to participate. The principal of one of the schools resigned after the first telephone contact related to the study, and the second principal was reluctant to participate but agreed to do so. After several other contacts, the principal neither distributed the questionnaires to the staff members who had worked at the school since 1988 nor completed any of the other data requested. Therefore, ten schools participated in the study.
Table 1

Study Responses from the Ten BIA Schools Participating in the 1988 Pilot Effective Schools Improvement Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Possible participants</th>
<th>Questionnaires returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ten participating school principals were sent questionnaires which were provided to the 158 professional staff who had worked at the school since 1988. Eighty-five questionnaires were returned, which represented a 54% rate of return from the professional staff.

The data in Table 2 provide the reader with demographic and biographic information about the participants and the schools in which they work. The data also provide information about efforts to implement the effective schools correlates.
Table 2  
Profiles of Principals and BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of principalship</td>
<td>6 mos</td>
<td>22 yrs</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>5 mos</td>
<td>3 yrs</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td>5 mos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position prior to a principalship</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Tchr</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>Adm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal at another school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal at BIA effective school</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlates implemented</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One school housed grades K-5. Three of the schools housed grades K-6. Four of the schools housed grades K-8, and one school housed grades K-12.

The schools ranged in size from the smallest enrollment of 95 students to the largest enrollment of 554 students. Three schools have total student enrollments over 350. Two schools have enrollments over 200 students, and two schools have enrollments over 130 students.

All of the schools were considered rural schools. The principals who completed the demographic survey were to choose from rural, urban, or city school.
The length of service for the principalship was from five months to 22 years. Six of the principals had two years or more of service in a principalship in their present school. Only one principal was in his or her first principalship. Seven of the nine principals indicated that they had served as principal in other schools, and four of the nine reported that they had been principal in other BIA-operated schools that were involved in the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts.

Two of the principals indicated their school had implemented all ten of the correlates. The correlates are as follows and correspond to the numbers in Table 2:

- (1) safe and orderly environment,
- (2) clear school mission,
- (3) instructional leadership,
- (4) high expectations,
- (5) opportunity to learn/time on task,
- (6) curriculum and instruction,
- (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress,
- (8) home/school/community relations,
- (9) participatory management/shared governance,
- (10) cultural relevance.

School number one reported working on five correlates:

- (1) safe and orderly environment,
- (2) clear school mission,
- (3) instructional leadership,
- (4) high expectations,
- (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress.

School number two reported working on three correlates:

- (2) clear school mission,
- (4) high expectations,
- (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress.

School number three reported working on all ten correlates:

- (1) safe and orderly environment,
- (2) clear school mission,
- (3) instructional leadership,
- (4) high expectations,
- (5) opportunity to learn/time on task,
- (6) curriculum and instruction,
- (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress,
- (8) home/school/community relations,
- (9) participatory management/shared governance,
- (10) cultural relevance.

School number four reported working on four correlates:

- (1) safe and orderly environment,
- (3) instructional leadership,
- (4) high expectations,
- (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress.

School number five reported working on three correlates:

- (1) safe and orderly environment,
- (2) clear school mission,
- (3) instructional leadership.

School number six reported working on some correlates, but
the data received did not indicate which correlates. School number seven reported working on all ten correlates: (1) safe and orderly environment, (2) clear school mission, (3) instructional leadership, (4) high expectations, (5) opportunity to learn/time on task, (6) curriculum and instruction, (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress, (8) home/school/community relations, (9) participatory management/shared governance, and (10) cultural relevance. School number eight reported working on eight correlates: (1) safe and orderly environment, (2) clear school mission, (3) instructional leadership, (4) high expectations, (5) opportunity to learn/time on task, (6) curriculum and instruction, (7) monitoring and feedback of student progress, and (8) home/school/community relations. School number nine reported working on one correlate: (1) safe and orderly environment. The profiles of the principal and the school were not received from school number ten.

Table 3 presents the data pertaining to research question one: What perceived effects have the effective schools correlates (safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance) had on school improvement and student achievement?

The data in Table 3 reveal the difference among the means in the perceptions of the professional staff concerning the effective schools correlates that were implemented in the schools. The t test was used to measure the difference in the staff's perceptions from 1988 to 1992 of the effectiveness for each of the correlate areas. The two-tail probability was calculated to determine whether a significant difference occurred in perceptions regarding the ten correlate areas over the five-year period from 1988 to 1992. The first year of implementation of the effective schools process in BIA schools was 1988. All ten of the effective schools correlates showed a significant difference in school improvement from
1988 to 1992 according to staff perceptions. Seven of the correlates showed a significant difference at the .001 level. One correlate showed a significant difference at the .002 level, and two correlates showed a significant difference at the .05 level. In every case, teachers perceived school improvement in addressing the correlates in 1992 as compared to five years earlier.

Table 3

Changes in Professional Staff’s Perceptions of Implementation of Effective Schools Correlates from 1988 to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Prior to 1988</th>
<th>Current in 1992</th>
<th>t test</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>-4.78</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>26.68</td>
<td>-4.53</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>-5.18</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>20.62</td>
<td>-4.88</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>-4.16</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>-4.59</td>
<td>&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The correlates that showed a significant difference at the <.001 level were clear school mission, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance. Monitoring and feedback of student progress was significant at the <.002 level, and safe and orderly environment and instructional leadership were significant at the .05 level.

A .10 level of significance was selected because the study group size was small. The unit of analysis for the achievement data was the ten schools because the schools' test data were aggregated based on the number of schools. Even though using standardized test scores was by school and not individuals, there were only eight degrees of freedom.

Table 4 presents the data pertaining to research question two: What are the professional staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts? Table 4 contains information received from the principals regarding the amount of time they spent in the implementation of the effective schools correlates in their school setting. One of the principal questionnaires was not received and the information is not included.

All respondents provided an estimate of the amount of time spent in implementing the correlates. Respondents from each school indicated that substantial efforts were being made to implement the correlates. Two principals indicated they were working on these efforts 100% of the time, and another principal indicated he or she was working on the correlates 75% of the time. Others described it as an ongoing process, a continuous process, or part of the everyday program. One school principal reported devoting six hours per week to the implementation effort.
Table 4

Amount of Time Spent on Implementing the Ten Effective Schools Correlates as Reported by School Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One hundred percent on curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Worked on all 8 correlates all year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is a continuous process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seventy percent of the time was spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is an ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Six hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It has become a part of the everyday program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is an ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>One hundred percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No data were collected from this principal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 present the data pertaining to research questions two and three: What are the professional staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts? and What effects has the implementation of the effective schools improvement efforts had on student achievement as defined by standardized test scores?

The data in Table 5 present the relationship between staff perceptions of effective schools correlates and standardized test score differences from 1988 to 1992 in reading for grades four, five, and six in the ten schools that participated in the study. No significant relationships were found. This would indicate that the staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts in relationship to raising standardized achievement test scores
in the BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools did not correlate significantly to changes in test scores in the area of reading.

Table 5

**Relationship between Staff Perceptions of the Effective Schools Correlates and CTBS Standardized Test Scores for Grades Four, Five, and Six in Reading from 1988 to 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Grade four</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade five</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade six</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>-.1070</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1520</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.0293</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0868</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1250</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>.3548</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1814</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.0185</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>.2953</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2360</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2014</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>.0277</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.0627</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.0285</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>-.0140</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1046</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1859</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>.2828</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2260</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1859</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>.2541</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0798</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2027</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>.0216</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0656</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.0709</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>.0638</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1407</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1281</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 6 present the relationship between staff perceptions of effective schools correlates and standardized test score differences from 1988 to 1992 in language arts for grades four, five, and six in the ten schools that participated in the study. No significant relationships were found. This would indicate that the staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts in relationship to raising standardized achievement test scores were not significant. The perceptions of the staff and the standardized test scores in the BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools did not correlate significantly to changes in test scores in the area of language arts.

The data in Table 7 present the relationship between staff perceptions of effective schools correlates and standardized test score differences from 1988 to 1992 in mathematics for grades four, five, and six in the ten schools that participated in the study. The data indicated significant relationships between mathematics scores and six correlates: high expectations (.021), monitoring and feedback of student progress (.028), cultural relevance (.055), home/school/community relations (.067), opportunity to learn/time on task (.090), and participatory management/shared governance (.099). All of the significant relationships were at the grade four level.

The data in Table 8 present the relationship between staff perceptions of effective schools correlates and standardized test score differences from 1988 to 1992 in science for grades four, five, and six in the ten schools that participated in the study. The data indicated a significant relationship between science scores and four correlates: home/school/community relations (.046), opportunity to learn/time on task (.051), high expectations (.093), and cultural relevance (.100). All of the significant relationships were at the grade six level.
Table 6

Relationship between Staff Perceptions of the Effective Schools Correlates and CTBS Standardized Test Scores for Grades Four, Five, and Six in Language Arts from 1988 to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Change scores for language arts from 1988 to 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>-.0532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>.0158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>-.1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>.3594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>.1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>.0357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>.3416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>.2960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>.1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>.2160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Relationship between Staff Perceptions of the Effective Schools Correlates and CTBS Standardized Test Scores for Grades Four, Five, and Six in Mathematics from 1988 to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Grade four</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Grade five</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Grade six</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>.3582</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1838</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2682</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>.4876</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0622</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1140</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>.1886</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1889</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.4376</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>.7226</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.0349</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.4266</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>.5267</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.2018</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2991</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>.4553</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>-.1781</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1498</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>.6945</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.0287</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.4165</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>.5774</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.0906</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.3687</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>.5088</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.0265</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2880</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>.6089</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.3391</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2673</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8

**Relationship between Staff Perceptions of the Effective Schools Correlates and CTBS Standardized Test Scores for Grades Four, Five, and Six in Science from 1988 to 1992**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Grade four</th>
<th>Grade five</th>
<th>Grade six</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>.3750</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.6646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>.2270</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.3707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>-.1101</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.5190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>.4243</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.3796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>.1588</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>.3084</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>.4671</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.4108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>.4820</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.3773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>.5143</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.5192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>.0305</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 9 present the relationship between staff perceptions of effective schools correlates and standardized test score differences from 1988 to 1992 in social studies for grades four, five, and six in the ten schools that participated in the study. The
data indicated a significant relationship between social studies scores and two correlates: instructional leadership (.009) for grade four and safe and orderly environment (.076) for grade six.

Table 9

Relationship between Staff Perceptions of the Effective Schools Correlates and CTBS Standardized Test Scores for Grades Four, Five, and Six in Social Studies from 1988 to 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective schools correlates</th>
<th>Grade four</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade five</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade six</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Safe and orderly environment</td>
<td>.7005</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.6220</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9718</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear school mission</td>
<td>.8774</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.3062</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9383</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional leadership</td>
<td>.9996</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.5630</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.8786</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High expectations</td>
<td>.9199</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1472</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Opportunity to learn/time on task</td>
<td>.8895</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1747</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9341</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>.9089</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1179</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9135</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Monitoring and feedback</td>
<td>.9334</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1327</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.8816</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Home/school/community relations</td>
<td>.8877</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.1394</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9377</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Participatory management/shared governance</td>
<td>.9168</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.2789</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9064</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cultural relevance</td>
<td>.8935</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.0257</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>.9364</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, this chapter presented the data collected for this study. Though the sample was small, the data indicated a good response from the participants in the study. There were three subject areas (science, social studies, and mathematics) on the CTBS that indicated a positive relationship between the staff’s perceptions of the effective schools correlates and their effect on standardized test scores.

The next chapter will present a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, and conclusions. The limitations of the study and recommendations for further action and study are included also.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five presents a summary of the study and a discussion of the findings. The chapter also presents the conclusions of the study and recommendations for further action and study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether or not the effective schools efforts initiated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a difference in student academic achievement in the pilot schools, as evidenced by standardized achievement test scores. This study was based on the perceptions of principals and teachers in the pilot schools and on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) standardized achievement tests at each school for grades four, five, and six in the areas of reading, mathematics, social studies, and science.

Theoretically, a set of factors which contributes to the improvement of education for American Indian elementary school children can be identified. This study was designed to measure whether or not school staff members perceived the Bureau of Indian Affairs' implementation of the ten correlates related to improving the quality of education as affecting student achievement in the BIA schools.

The following research questions guided this study:

1. What perceived effects have the effective schools correlates (safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity
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to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student
progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance,
and cultural relevance) had on school improvement and student achievement?

2. What are the professional staff's perceptions of the effective schools
improvement efforts?

3. What effects has the implementation of the effective schools improvement
efforts had on student achievement as defined by standardized test scores?

In order to gather the data for this study, each subject was asked to complete a
questionnaire regarding their perceptions of the effective schools correlates in their schools.
The standardized achievement test scores for students in grades four, five, and six were
reviewed and analyzed to determine academic achievement levels. The effective schools
questionnaire was developed specifically for this study, and the Comprehensive Tests of
Basic Skills (CTBS) was used to determine achievement level.

A total of 30 groups of grade level test scores were collected for grades four, five,
and six in the ten BIA 1988 Pilot Elementary Schools. There were 158 questionnaires
mailed to professional staff members at the ten pilot schools. Eighty-five questionnaires
were returned, which represented a 54% rate of return from the professional staff. The
questions pertained to the ten effective schools correlates: safe and orderly environment,
clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time
on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress,
home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and
cultural relevance. According to staff perceptions, their schools have increased the
implementation of the correlates over the past five years.

The effective schools questionnaire data were coded and analyzed with the help of
the Bureau of Educational Services and Applied Research (BESAR) at the University of
North Dakota. The data were analyzed using frequencies, the *t* test, and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient.

**Discussion of the Findings and Conclusions**

In this section, the findings and conclusions will be presented and discussed. First, a summary of the findings and conclusions is presented. Secondly, findings pertinent to each research question will be discussed incorporating information from the review of the literature.

Based on the findings of this study, the following summary is presented:

1. The principals of the pilot schools involved in the BIA Effective Schools Improvement Efforts were willing to participate in this study and were interested in the findings of this study.
2. The staff perceived their school's implementation of the effective schools correlates to be greater than the standardized achievement scores indicated.
3. Each of the principals at the schools reported spending some time on the implementation of some or all of the correlates in their school settings.
4. There were no significant relationships between the perceptions of implementation of the correlates in the schools and the scores on the standardized achievement tests in reading and language arts from 1988 to 1992.
5. There were significant relationships between the perceptions of implementation of six correlates (high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance) and the scores on the standardized achievement tests in mathematics from 1988 to 1992. All the significant findings were at the grade four level.
6. There were significant relationships between the perceptions of implementation of four correlates (high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task,
home/school/community relations, and cultural relevance) and the scores on the standardized achievement tests in science from 1988 to 1992. All of the significant findings were at the grade six level.

7. There were significant relationships between the perceptions of implementation of two correlates (safe and orderly environment and instructional leadership) and the scores on the standardized achievement tests in social studies from 1988 to 1992. One correlation, instructional leadership, occurred in grade four, and the other, safe and orderly environment, occurred in grade six.

8. The staff perceived that student achievement improved from 1988 to 1992, but standardized achievement test scores did not confirm this perception.

9. The correlates which the professional staff perceived to have improved in implementation and which corresponded to raised achievement test scores included safe and orderly environment in the area of grade six social studies, instructional leadership in the area of grade four social studies, high expectations in the areas of grade six science and grade four mathematics, opportunity to learn/time on task in the areas of grade six science and grade four mathematics, monitoring and feedback of student progress in the area of grade four mathematics, home/school/community relations in the areas of grade six science and grade four mathematics, participatory management/shared governance in the area of grade six mathematics, and cultural relevance in the areas of grade six science and grade four mathematics.

10. The staff's perceptions of the implementation of the correlates had some positive effect on standardized achievement test scores, especially in the areas of mathematics, social studies, and science.

11. Grade four and grade six showed an increase on the standardized achievement test scores in relationship to the staff's perceptions on the implementation of the correlates.
The analysis of the data resulted in the following findings for the three research questions. In this section, each research question is stated, findings which pertain to that question are presented, and discussion follows.

**Research question 1.** What perceived effects have the effective schools correlates (safe and orderly environment, clear school mission, instructional leadership, high expectations, opportunity to learn/time on task, curriculum and instruction, monitoring and feedback of student progress, home/school/community relations, participatory management/shared governance, and cultural relevance) had on school improvement and student achievement?

The staff reported that the effective schools improvement process has made a difference in the schools in which they work and had improved delivery of the correlates from the time the improvement process began in 1988 to five years later in 1992 when the data were collected.

**Research question 2.** What are the professional staff's perceptions of the effective schools improvement efforts?

According to the staff, implementation of these correlates over a five-year period had improved. Perceptions of the effective schools correlates prior to 1988 and to 1992 had increased in all the correlate areas in every school. Staff members in all ten pilot schools reported they were doing better after their school implemented the effective schools correlates into the school setting.

**Research question 3.** What effects has the implementation of the effective schools improvement efforts had on student achievement as indicated by standardized test scores?

There has been an improvement in the academic areas of science, social studies, and mathematics. A correlation between the staff's perceptions of how these areas improved in relationship to how the students improved in the academic areas showed a positive growth in the correlates of safe and orderly environment and grade six social studies, instructional
leadership and grade four social studies, high expectations and grade six science and grade four mathematics, opportunity to learn/time on task and grade six science and grade four mathematics, monitoring and feedback of student progress and grade four mathematics, home/school/community relations and grade six science and grade four mathematics, participatory management/shared governance and grade four mathematics, and cultural relevance and grade six science and grade four mathematics.

Staff members perceived greater implementation of correlates than the standardized tests indicated. These data would indicate that the staff members believed they were doing a better job in educating students than the test scores demonstrated. Teachers also reported that students had achieved more academically than was demonstrated in the testing process. However, concerns have been raised in the past as to the validity of standardized achievement testing as a means of measuring student progress of Indian students. The OIEP is no longer requiring BIA schools to use CTBS standardized achievement tests as a basis for determining student growth. A formal achievement test that the BIA schools and OIEP officials choose will be used across all BIA schools in the future. It may be more performance based. The emphasis is on providing authentic and performance-based assessment which will document higher-order skills and accelerated learning and the provision of performance standards which will assist Indian educators in promoting accurate and fair monitoring and feedback of student progress, something standardized tests have not provided in the past (Allen & Allen, 1993-94).

The research indicated that reports show American Indian students often had lower test scores on school achievement tests than did non-Indians (Coleman et al., 1966; Coombs et al., 1958; Havighurst, 1957). However, the research also indicated that Indian children were just as intelligent as any other racial group (Havighurst, 1970; Levensky, 1970). McShane and Beiser (1981) determined that the manner in which tests are administered may have an effect on the child's test score.
Conclusions

From the findings of this study, the following conclusions can be reported:

1. Professional staff members in the first pilot schools are positive about the improvements that have been made in their schools.

2. The perceptions of staff and standardized test scores do not completely correlate, but the validity of standardized test scores has been questioned by Indian people as to their validity. The standardized test scores have not demonstrated fully the capabilities of all Indian students, especially those who perform better with alternative types of assessments.

3. The data show that the relationship between staff perceptions of correlate implementation and significant improvement in student achievement occurred for some grade levels in mathematics, science, and social studies but did not occur in reading and language arts.

4. Principals in the effective schools are interested in, willing to support, and are positive about the effective schools improvement process.

5. BIA schools and communities need to improve, work together, and collaborate in order to help students become ready to participate fully as members of society.

Limitations

The following limitations apply to the findings of this study:

1. The group of schools was a small sample. Several of the original 19 pilot schools did not qualify for this study because they had changed the type of standardized test they used over the five-year period being reviewed, high schools were not surveyed, and one principal chose not to participate.

2. The schools in this study were located throughout the United States and the writer was unable to contact potential teacher respondents personally, which decreased the number of questionnaires returned.
3. Not all participants responded to the questions in the same manner. Different respondents answered the question about the number of hours spent on implementing the correlates in their school by reporting the percentage of time spent, the hours per week, and an ongoing process.

4. The interpretations of the school personnel regarding the importance of the correlates differed among individual teachers and among each of the ten schools.

Recommendations for Action

1. The findings of this study illustrate a need for the BIA effective schools to look at alternative types of assessment that measure academic achievement of Native American students using a broader perspective. The perceptions of staff in all the schools indicated that the schools had improved significantly, but the standardized test scores did not show the same significance. Staff members in the schools believe their students do better than the test scores indicate. The fact that all staff members had this perception indicates a need to look further into authentic assessment tools for Native American students.

2. The staff in the BIA schools are in need of ongoing training, technical assistance, and staff development in order to help their students be more successful. Persons and agencies responsible for staff development need to promote professional updating activities that teachers perceive as effective. The research findings in this study show that staff believe they are more effective than test scores determine. The teachers need staff development that would help them to assure success for their students.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. A study should be conducted to see how all the people, including the staff, parents, teachers, and students, perceive the effective schools process, especially in other BIA schools that have been involved in the effective schools improvement process, in later years. The findings of this study indicated that the professional staff in the 1988 BIA Pilot Elementary Schools perceived that they had made improvements, but the standardized test
scores did not show great improvements. The parents' and students' perceptions would also add pertinent information.

2. The perceptions of the professionals, parents, teachers, and students in the BIA high schools that have been involved in the effective schools improvement process should be investigated to see if there are improvements in the academic achievements at the high school level.

3. The authentic and performance-based assessment that is now being implemented in the BIA effective schools through the Educate America Act, also known as Goals 2000, should be used as a comparison to staff perceptions of school improvement to determine whether alternative assessments correlate to staff perceptions.

4. Criterion-referenced tests should be used as comparisons to staff perceptions of school improvement to determine whether they correlate to staff perceptions.

5. A follow-up study should be conducted to determine if the school improvement plans developed and implemented by BIA schools involved in the effective schools process are making a difference in the schools.

6. A study should be conducted to determine if the effective schools improvement process used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is making a difference on varied student outcomes.

7. Several studies should be conducted on the effectiveness of each of the effective schools correlates to school improvement.

8. The Bureau of Indian Affairs/Office of Indian Education Programs should continue to implement the effective schools improvement efforts in all BIA-funded schools, provide funding for resources needed to implement the efforts, and include an assessment of measurement for the effectiveness of their efforts.
9. The BIA should continue to provide assistance to schools that have been through the effective schools improvement process to enable the schools to continue their improvement efforts.
APPENDICES
This Questionnaire is being used to obtain information from professional staff members of the Bureau Effective Schools who have been involved in the Effective Schools process since 1988. Items are drawn from the research on school and instructional effectiveness. The school effectiveness characteristics assessed through this Questionnaire are the focal points of the Bureau Effective Schools Process.

The purpose of this Questionnaire is to survey your perceptions based on your experience in your school prior to 1988 and at the present time. Only professional staff members who have been in the school system for these 5 years will be surveyed. There are no right or wrong answers.

Responses are summarized and will be reported to the staff of this school in group profile form. To ensure confidentiality, do not write your name on the Answer Sheet.

INSTRUCTIONS


2. All items have five (5) possible responses, arranged on a scale from 1 to 5. The scale represents the amount of agreement with the item.

   1  2  3  4  5
   Strongly Disagree (The condition is not present.) Strongly Agree (The condition is present to the highest degree.)

3. If you do not have enough knowledge to answer the item, please leave the item blank.

4. Although some items may seem to warrant a Yes-No response, the response categories require you to indicate the intensity of your agreement or disagreement with the item.

5. Your perceptions, based on your experience in this school, are important. Items are designed to measure "school effects" so you are asked to generalize about the conditions in your school. You should respond from your own experience.

6. The person administering this Questionnaire is available to answer procedural questions, but it is your interpretation of each item that is important.

7. Each item must be read carefully. There is no time limit. Completion of this Questionnaire is expected to take approximately twenty (20) minutes.
SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

1. This school is a safe and secure place to work ........................................
2. A positive feeling permeates this school .............................................
3. Student behavior is generally positive in this school ..............................
4. The discipline policy is consistently enforced by all staff in this school ................................................................................
5. Students in this school abide by school rules ........................................

CLEAR SCHOOL MISSION

6. This school has a written statement of purpose that is the driving force behind most important decisions ........................................
7. The school's mission and/or vision statements are displayed .................
8. Progress toward achieving the mission and goals is communicated at least yearly to students, parents, and other interested parties ....
9. All aspects of the actual school program reflect the school’s mission statement ..........................................................................
10. The school’s mission reflects academic and social needs of the students as determined by the needs assessment ..........................

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

11. There is clear, strong, centralized instructional leadership from the principal in this school .......................................................
12. The principal is very active in arranging opportunities and promoting staff development activities for the faculty ...........................
13. The principal regularly brings instructional issues to the faculty for discussion ................................................................................
14. At the principal’s initiative, teachers work together to coordinate the instructional program within and between grades .................
15. The principal makes formal classroom observations ............................
16. Formal observations of teachers by the principal are regularly followed by a post-observation conference ........................................

HIGH EXPECTATIONS

17. All teachers in this school hold consistently high expectations for all students ..........................................................
18. Teachers do not believe that a student's home background is the primary factor that determines individual student achievement.

19. In this school, low-achieving students are as well-behaved as other students.

20. Teachers in this school believe they are responsible for all students mastering basic skills at each grade level.

21. This school has preventive strategies for helping students at risk of school failure.

22. In this school, remedial programs are a last resort.

23. Instruction is often presented to a heterogeneous ability group of students.

**OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN AND TIME ON TASK**

24. The school's daily schedule supports the goals of the instructional program.

25. Two hours or more are allocated for reading/language arts each day throughout this school.

26. Fifty minutes or more are allocated for mathematics each day throughout this school.

27. Pull-out programs (e.g., Chapter 1, special ed, instrumental music, etc.) do not disrupt or interfere with basic skills instruction.

28. Special instructional programs for individual students are integrated with classroom instruction and the school curriculum.

29. Teachers implement the homework policy in this school.

30. There are few interruptions due to discipline problems during class time which promotes more time on task academically.

**CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION**

31. The school has a written curriculum describing the content and process of instruction and desired outcomes for instruction provided in all regular and supplemental programs.

32. There is evidence that the curriculum is being implemented as written and clearly reflects the school's mission.

33. Language arts instruction includes much writing from the earliest grades.
34. Mathematics instruction stresses application in real-life problem solving and concrete manipulation and has less emphasis on mechanical skills and worksheets ........................................

35. All school staff appear to be competent in their teaching skills ....

36. The curriculum is community-based and developed by the school itself with less emphasis on textbooks, canned programs, and accreditation requirements when inappropriate ..........................

**MONITORING & FEEDBACK-STUDENT PROGRESS**

37. Multiple indicators are used regularly to assess student progress (e.g., grades, tests, attendance, discipline referrals, extracurricular, etc.) ..............................................................

38. Students have many opportunities to demonstrate talents in art, music, drama, dance, and athletics .................................................................

39. In this school, all teachers apply consistent criteria to assigning course grades ..................................................................................................

40. Criterion-referenced tests are used to assess instruction throughout the school ..........................................................

41. Teachers and the principal thoroughly review and analyze test results to plan instructional program modifications ...................................

**HOME/SCHOOL/COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

42. There is an active parent/school group in this school ..........................................................

43. Many parents initiate contacts with the school each month ..........................................................

44. Most parents understand and promote the school's instructional program ..........................................................

45. There is cooperation with regard to homework between parents and teachers in this school ..........................................................

46. Parent-teacher conferences result in specific plans for home-school cooperation aimed at improving student classroom achievement ...

47. Beyond parent conferences and report cards, teachers in this school use other ways of communicating student progress to parents (e.g., home visits, phone calls, newsletters, regular notes) ................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to 1988</th>
<th>Currently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT/SHARED GOVERNANCE

48. Every staff member is involved on an improvement committee .... 1 2 3 4 5
49. Students are involved in decision making .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
50. The school board makes decisions on significant matters such as budget, curriculum, outcomes, etc. ......................... 1 2 3 4 5
51. School mission and goals and desired outcomes are discussed by all stakeholders on a regular basis and school improvement is seen as everyone's role .......................... 1 2 3 4 5
52. Problems are solved at the appropriate level and not ignored or shuffled around .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
53. There is an ownership of the mission, vision, and goals by all stakeholders .......................................................... 1 2 3 4 5
54. Input on planning, decision making, and problem solving is actively sought from stakeholders ........................ 1 2 3 4 5
55. The school board makes decisions on input from affected groups and based on the school's mission ........................... 1 2 3 4 5

CULTURAL RELEVANCE

56. The physical appearance of the school reflects the tribal culture(s) ................................................................. 1 2 3 4 5
57. Textbooks are reviewed for bias, historical accuracy, etc. ...... 1 2 3 4 5
58. Instruction is made relevant to the community/students .......... 1 2 3 4 5
59. Tribal language is part of the regular curriculum .................. 1 2 3 4 5
60. Tribal history is part of the curriculum .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
61. Tribal art is included in the curriculum .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
62. Students' experiences in the home and community are appreciated and enhanced at the school .............................. 1 2 3 4 5
63. Tribal members make up an equitable portion of certified staff .... 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX B

TELEPHONE PROTOCOL
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SCHOOLS
PRINCIPAL FIRST CONTACT

1. Introduction
2. Purpose of the call
3. Explanation of the study
4. Assurance of confidentiality
5. Time required
6. Request participation
APPENDIX C

TELEPHONE PROTOCOL
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SCHOOLS
PRINCIPAL SECOND CONTACT

1. Introduction
2. Purpose of the call
3. Reaffirm participation
4. Assurance of confidentiality
5. Time required
6. Name of contact person
7. Answer questions
8. Obtain the number of staff members who have been at the school since 1988
APPENDIX D
TELEPHONE PROTOCOL
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
1988 PILOT EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS
CONTACT PERSON

1. Introduction
2. Purpose of the call
3. Principal commitment
4. Explanation of the study
5. Procedures to be followed
6. Assurance of confidentiality
7. Time required
8. Secure cooperation
9. Number of staff members in the school since 1988
10. Gather the data
11. Letter will follow
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO BE SENT AS A FOLLOW-UP TO PHONE CONVERSATION WITH THE DESIGNNEE

March 1993

Inside Address

Dear ________:

Thank you for agreeing to assist in gathering data for my study. Your assistance is critical to the completion of my study in this time I have available.

Let me assure you again about confidentiality. The information gathered will be reported in ways that will not identify individual teachers or your school.

Enclosed you will find a form on which I ask you to provide the NCE scores from the CTBS standardized test for grades 4, 5, and 6 for the year of 1988 and the year of 1992 in the areas of total reading, total language, total mathematics, total battery, science, and social studies for your school. I hope this will not take too much of your time. It is of great importance to my study that I receive this information. Please gather the information and place it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope I provided ________, the principal. ________ will return the test data to me at the same time the staff surveys are returned. I truly appreciate your cooperation and assistance.

I believe this study will contribute to our knowledge about the Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools’ Efforts and help these schools that serve Indian students. I appreciate your willingness to take the time to help me complete the study in the time I have available.

If you want a summary of the study please return the enclosed card with your address. If you have any questions please call me at (701) 244-5076. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Viola LaFontaine

Enclosures
Name of School: ________________________________

## NCE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1992</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Battery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LETTER TO BE SENT AS A FOLLOW-UP TO
PHONE CONVERSATION WITH THE PRINCIPALS

February 1993

Inside Address

Dear ________:

Thank you for agreeing to have your school participate in my study. Your school’s participation is important to the study and to the discovery of the effectiveness of the Bureau of Indian Affairs efforts to improve its use of the Effective Schools Program.

Let me assure you again about confidentiality. The information gathered will be reported in ways that will not identify your teachers or your school.

Enclosed you will find copies of the questionnaire which I developed. The questionnaire should not take more than 20 minutes to complete. I ask that you distribute the questionnaire for completion to all the staff members who have been with the school since 1988. Please have them complete it together, perhaps at the end of a staff meeting. I have enclosed copies of a letter to each of them, thanking them for their participation, explaining the study, assuring confidentiality, and a note, which they can return along with their survey, if they would like a copy of the results of my study once it is completed. When they have completed the instrument, please have them put the survey in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope and mail them to me.

For your information, I have also included with your letter a copy of the form for collecting the CTBS tests data for grades 4, 5, and 6. The designated contact person is providing this information for me, as we discussed in our telephone conversation, and will enclose the data in the same envelope along with the surveys. It would assist me if all these data could be mailed to me within a two- to three-week period after you receive the information. Thank you for your assistance in this regard.

If you want a summary of the study please write your name and address on one of the enclosed preprinted cards. If you have any questions please call me at (701) 244-5076. Thank you very much for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Viola LaFontaine

Enclosures
Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study. I am trying to learn more about the effectiveness of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Effective Schools' Efforts. You are asked to complete the Effective Schools Questionnaire I have developed. Answer the questions to the best of your ability. Completing the instrument will take about 20 minutes.

After you have completed the instrument, please put it in the large envelope I provided the principal. The principal will return them to me.

Let me assure you again about confidentiality. The information gathered will be reported in ways that will not identify you or your institution individually. Nor will anyone know how your answered.

I believe the study will contribute to the knowledge base about the Bureau of Indian Affairs School Effectiveness Process. I appreciate your willingness to take the time to help me complete the study.

If you want a summary of the study please write in your name and addressed on the preprinted notecard provided by the principal. If you have any questions please call me at (701) 477-6471 ext. #304. Thank you very much for your assistance!

Sincerely,

Viola LaFontaine
APPENDIX I

PROFILES OF
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS PILOT SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
IN THE
1988 EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS EFFORTS

NAME OF SCHOOL: __________________ GRADES: __________
PRINCIPAL: ___________________________ ENROLLMENT #S: ___________
TYPE OF SCHOOL: RURAL URBAN OTHER: ______

1. How long have you been the principal at this school?

2. What was your position prior to being a principal?

3. Have you been a principal at any other school?

4. If you have worked at another school, has this school been involved in the BIA/OIEP Effective Schools Efforts? YES NO
   If yes, what year did the school get involved in the process?

5. Would you name the correlates your school has implemented?

6. Did you have any of the correlates accomplished before you began?
   If yes, which ones?

7. Which correlates did you work on first?

8. Which correlates are you working on now?

9. How much time and energy do you feel you have given to implementing the correlates in your school?

10. How many staff do you have in your school who have been there since 1988? (professional staff)
REFERENCES
REFERENCES


McCluskey, M. L. (1975). *An analysis of selected attitudes toward school and knowledge of Indian culture held by Indian students enrolled in the Grand Forks, North Dakota public schools.* (University Microfilms No. 76-18, 160).


