



Advancing Evidence.  
Improving Lives.



# STATE SUPPORT TEAMS IN OHIO

## Appendices to the Evaluation Report

---

**JULY 2025**

Steven Hurlburt, Kerstin Le Floch, Caitlin Scott, Enid Rosario, Justin Luu, Damon Blair  
*American Institutes for Research and Marzano Research*

---

## Contents

Appendix A. Methods .....	1
Appendix B. Supporting Details for Key Findings.....	13
Appendix C. Detailed LEA Administrator Survey Results.....	21
Appendix D. Detailed Building Administrator Survey Results .....	31

# A Methods

This evaluation was designed to provide an assessment of Ohio’s State Support Team (SST) system, a key part of the state’s regional infrastructure for supporting schools identified for improvement and the districts that serve them. Commissioned by the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce (the Department), it examined the features of SST services, their perceived quality, alignment with local plans, and effects on educators and students.

A mixed-methods design was used to develop a well-rounded understanding of the SST system’s implementation and effects. The evaluation included surveys of Local Education Agency (LEA) and school leaders, interviews with selected administrators, a document review of Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs) and LEA One Plans, and analysis of student outcome data. The goal was to generate actionable insights into how the SST system supports school improvement efforts and to inform future policy and practice across Ohio’s 16 SST regions. Exhibit A-1 summarizes the evaluation questions and the primary data sources used to address each one.

Exhibit A-1.

## Evaluation questions and data sources

Evaluation question	Surveys	Interviews	Document review	Extant data
<b>Features of services</b>				
What services do SSTs provide?				
How do services differ across regions and by district and school characteristics?	●	●		
<b>Educators’ perceptions</b>				
How satisfied are schools and districts with the services provided by SST consultants?				
To what extent do perceptions of the quality of these services differ by region and across district and school characteristics?	●	●		
To what extent do LEA and school leaders believe that services provided by their SST helped improve educator practices?				
To what extent do LEA and school leaders believe that services provided by their SST helped improve educator practices?				

Evaluation question	Surveys	Interviews	Document review	Extant data
<p><b>Alignment</b></p> <p>To what extent do the grant activities, action steps, and overall impacts outlined in SDAs align with the goals, strategies, and outcomes identified in LEA One Plans, and how does this alignment vary across regions?</p> <p>How well do the SDAs' stated impacts align with the adult and student measures included in the LEA One Plans, and how does this alignment vary across regions?</p>			●	
<p><b>Outcomes</b></p> <p>To what extent do schools achieve the outcomes articulated in LEA One Plans within the expected timeframe(s)?</p>			●	●

## LEA and school leader surveys

Using an online survey administration platform (Qualtrics), the evaluation team administered surveys to two types of respondents: LEA leaders—including community school sponsors—who received SST services during the 2023–24 school year and school leaders—including community school principals—in the district’s schools identified for improvement. While both groups received separate surveys, many of the items were similar in content. The surveys were designed to address key evaluation questions related to the implementation of SST services, including their features, perceived quality, alignment with local needs, and their perceived effect on educator practices and student outcomes.

After collaborating with the Department to develop the instruments, the evaluation team pilot tested the surveys in November 2024. Following minor refinements, the full survey was administered in two waves—one in late December 2024 and another in January 2025. Multiple reminders were sent during each wave to encourage participation. In total, 58% of LEA leaders (103 of 177) and 46% of school leaders (139 of 304) responded. Response rates varied by SST region, as shown in Exhibit A-2. In addition, some community school sponsors submitted responses for multiple LEAs, resulting in a higher number of LEA responses than individual respondents.

Exhibit A-2.

**Survey response rates by State Support Team (SST) region, 2024–25**

SST region	# of LEA responses	% of LEAs	# of school responses	% of schools	# of LEA and school responses	% of LEAs and schools
1	7	41%	21	66%	28	57%
2	6	50%	1	8%	7	29%
3	15	50%	23	45%	38	47%
4	2	40%	1	50%	3	43%
5	8	62%	12	55%	20	57%
6	10	59%	8	53%	18	56%
7	5	45%	4	44%	9	45%
8	11	69%	15	68%	26	68%
9	9	69%	10	50%	19	58%
10	6	67%	9	60%	15	63%
11	11	35%	1	27%	12	30%
12	5	83%	1	20%	6	55%
13	10	67%	10	42%	20	55%
14	4	50%	4	30%	7	39%
15	4	67%	5	56%	9	60%
16	0	0%	4	50%	4	25%

***Approach to conducting survey analyses***

The evaluation team conducted descriptive analyses of survey responses from LEA and building administrators. Most survey questions were identical across both surveys, with only a few differing (LEA survey: 14; school survey: 6, 15, 16). Because of this consistency, responses from both surveys were combined for reporting. Eleven respondents held leadership roles at both the LEA and building levels and completed both surveys. Their responses were included in both the LEA and school datasets to accurately reflect their contributions

Exhibit A-3 outlines the methods used to analyze survey responses. Detailed results for both surveys are available in Appendices C and D.

Exhibit A-3.

## Methods for analyzing survey data

Method	LEA Administrator Survey Questions	Building Administrator Survey Questions
Calculate the mean, median, and variance of the number of years of service.	1	1
Report basic tabulations of survey responses, including counts and percentages.	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18
Analyze open-response questions qualitatively for relevant and consistent themes across responses.	8, 10	7, 9
Estimate the approximate total number of hours staff participated in professional development activities during the 2023–24 school year. This was calculated by multiplying the estimated number of days (in-person and remote) personnel received direct SST services by the approximate number of hours of each professional development session.  Because questions about the average duration of direct services (question 13 in LEA survey and question 12 in school survey) were answered in two-hour blocks (e.g., “1-2 hours”), these ranges were translated into single numbers using the following conversions: “1-2 hours” = 1.5 hours; “3-4 hours” = 3.5 hours; “5-6 hours” = 5.5 hours; “7-8 hours” = 7.5 hours; “More than 8 hours” = 8.5 hours	12, 13	11, 12
Generate scale scores reflecting respondents’ perceptions of quality using their responses to Likert scale items, where “Strongly Disagree” = 1, “Disagree” = 2, “Agree” = 3, and “Strongly Agree” = 4. Three distinct scale scores—fit, timeliness, and responsiveness—were calculated using selected items from question 14 of the LEA survey and question 13 of the school survey. For each respondent, the scale score was computed as the average of their numeric responses to the relevant items. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fit scale includes responses to the following statements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Understand the issues faced by my school/LEA”</li> <li>○ “Pay attention to the needs and performance of my school/LEA”</li> <li>○ “Have expertise and skills that are relevant for my school/LEA”</li> <li>○ “Have established good rapport with the faculty and staff of my school/LEA”.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The timeliness scale score included responses to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Follow up on our requests to ensure they have been resolved”</li> <li>○ “Check in regularly to see if additional support is needed”</li> <li>○ “Respond promptly to our school/LEA’s requests for information or assistance”</li> <li>○ “Ensure that deadlines for providing services are consistently met”.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The responsiveness scale score included responses to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Listen to my opinions and those of my staff”</li> <li>○ “Express genuine concern about the challenges my school/LEA faces”</li> <li>○ “provide input that staff in our school/LEA value”.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	14	13

## LEA and school leader interviews

The evaluation team conducted 60-minute virtual interviews to gain deeper insights into topics addressed in the surveys. These interviews targeted two key respondent groups: (1) LEA administrators—including community school sponsors—and (2) school leaders.

A semi-structured interview protocol was used to capture participants' perspectives. To identify potential participants, the surveys asked LEA administrators (including community school sponsors) and school leaders whether they were interested in participating in a follow-up interview.

In total, 18 individuals were interviewed in February and March 2025, including:

- 9 LEA administrators (4 of whom also led community schools),
- 7 school leaders (4 of whom also lead community schools), and
- 2 community school leaders who served dual roles as both school and LEA administrators.

### *Approach to analyzing interview data*

The evaluation team analyzed interview data using thematic coding to identify patterns and insights aligned with the evaluation questions. Analysts developed a coding framework based on the categories of inquiry—such as features of services, perceptions of quality, implementation supports, and challenges—and applied it systematically across transcripts. This approach enabled the team to organize participant responses into meaningful themes that reflected shared experiences and divergent perspectives. The resulting themes were then mapped to the evaluation questions to ensure that findings directly addressed the study's core objectives.

## Document review

The evaluation team received two types of documents from the Department for the evaluation:

- **Service Delivery Agreements (SDAs).** Created by SSTs, these documents include information about the grant activities that the SST planned to engage in during the 2023–24 school year, along with the SST's actions/commitments and "Overall Impact" (description of the end result and its connection to the LEA One Plan).
- **LEA One Plan.** These documents include goals, strategies and actions to address these goals, and adult and student measures of progress toward these goals.

In sum, the document review included the SDAs and LEA One Plans from 240 LEAs, including 166 traditional LEAs and 124 community school LEAs. Exhibit A-4 presents the breakdown by SST region.

Exhibit A-4.

### Number of LEAs included in the document review, by SST region

SST region	Number of LEAs
1	18
2	13
3	32
4	8
5	15
6	18
7	12
8	17
9	14
10	12
11	32
12	7
13	16
14	9
15	8
16	9

### Approach to conducting the document review

The approach to reviewing these documents involved three main steps:

- 1. Developing the AI model's coding system.** The evaluation team trained an AI model to pinpoint specific information, referred to as codes, and a **codebook** to connect evaluation questions to key constructs, indicators, and characteristics. From this, the evaluation team then developed detailed queries and example answers for the AI model, ensuring contextual understanding and accurate data extraction. This allowed the AI to precisely identify and locate text within both the SDA and LEA One Plans.
- 2. Creating coded outputs.** Using the established codes and queries, the AI model extracted relevant data from both sets of documents. This process produced organized spreadsheets for each SST region, with information for each district's SDA and One Plan categorized into fields designed for the alignment analysis. These spreadsheets were then imported into *Airtable* for the final analysis.
- 3. Analyzing document alignment:** In the final step of the analysis, the evaluation team reviewed and interpreted the data following a structured qualitative approach. The process

began with a calibration exercise in which three analysts independently rated a small sample of records. This step helped assess inter-rater reliability and refine the rating criteria. As the analysis progress, a subset of records was double-coded by the lead analyst to support consistency. In addition, an AI model applied the finalized rating criteria across all records as an added layer of quality control. When discrepancies were flagged by the model, the lead analyst reviewed the differences and made the final rating decisions.

### Approach to assessing alignment

The evaluation team assessed alignment across three dimensions—SST service area to LEA One Plan alignment, adult measure alignment, and student measure alignment—in two distinct phases. Exhibit A-5 illustrates how alignment was conceptualized in this analysis.

Exhibit A-5.

### Operationalizing alignment between SDAs and LEA One Plans



Exhibit A-6.

### Rating SST service area-to-LEA One Plan alignment

<b>Aligned</b>	The SST grant activity and its required strategies directly correspond to an LEA One Plan goal, sharing the same primary focus and target population (e.g., students with disabilities, if applicable).
<b>Partially aligned</b>	The SST grant activity shares a core content area with an LEA One Plan goal but differs in scope (e.g., broader or narrower focus); <b>OR</b> , for grant activities focused on students with disabilities, the One Plan goal lacks a specific focus on students with disabilities.
<b>Weakly aligned</b>	The SST grant activity does not align with any relevant LEA One Plan goal, <b>OR</b> no corresponding One Plan goal could be identified.

*Notes.* <sup>a</sup> This applied to grant activities 3-5, 7, 14, and 16-18. For grant activity 15 (IDEA compliance and monitoring), the LEA One Plan was always required to have an explicit SWD focus; if absent, alignment was rated as *weakly aligned*.

The following specific decision rules were also applied during analysis:

- For grant activity 1 (support for OIP implementation), SDA entries were excluded from analysis if they only listed strategies related to root cause analysis, needs identification, or goal setting (1.1-1.3) or if they only listed communication or compliance strategies (1.8, 1.10, 1.14-1.16). For entries involving implementation planning, monitoring, or facilitation (1.4-1.7, 1.11-1.13), all relevant One Plan goals were rated as *aligned* by default; if the SDA entry specified a focus area other than “Improvement/OIP”, only goals related to that area were selected and rated as *aligned*.
- For grant activity 2 (supporting community schools), if the SDA entry reference the One Plan without listing specific goals, all One Plans were rated as *aligned* by default. If specific One Plan goals were

### Phase 1: Assessing SST service area to LEA One Plan alignment

This initial phase focused on comparing the focus of SST grant activities and their required strategies, as documented in SDA entries, with the goals and strategies outlined in LEA One Plans. This phase involved 825 SDA entries across the SDAs and LEA One Plans from 240 LEAs. The primary objective was to determine whether specific LEA One Plan goals directly corresponded to the SST grant activity's primary focus and target population. To assess dimension of alignment, analysts rated each record based on the coherence and consistency between the two documents. Ratings followed a three-point scale: aligned, partially aligned, and weakly aligned. Exhibit A-6 defines these rating categories in more detail.

## Phase 2: Assessing alignment of adult and student measures

The second phase of analyses examined the alignment of expected changes in adult practices (adult measures) and student outcomes (student measures) as defined and tracked in both SDAs and LEA One Plans. This phase drew from the subset of 606 SDA entries that had been rated as either *aligned* or *partially aligned* during the initial review of grant activity alignment. For the analysis of student measure alignment, 231 SDA entries were excluded because they lacked a student measure; the analysis was based on the remaining 375 entries.

To assess these dimensions of alignment, analysts rated each record based on the coherence and consistency between the two documents. Ratings followed the same three-point scale: aligned, partially aligned, and weakly aligned. Exhibit A-7 defines these rating categories for the two dimensions in more detail. Examples of each category are presented in Exhibit A-8 for both adult and student measures.

Exhibit A-7.

### Rating SST service area-to-LEA One Plan alignment

	Adult measures documented in SDAs and LEA One Plans	Student measures documented in SDAs and the LEA One Plans
<b>Aligned</b>	Measures share a core topic area, are at a compatible level (e.g., both are at the system level or classroom level), address a similar function (e.g., both relate to planning or implementation), AND focus on similar target student groups.	Measures share a core topic area, reference the specific metric or assessment tool, AND focus on similar target student groups.
<b>Partially aligned</b>	Measures share the same core topic area but differ in one or more key aspect: level, function, or target student group.	Measures share the same core topic area but differ in one or more key aspect: the specific metric or assessment tool or the target student group.
<b>Weakly aligned</b>	Measures address different core topic areas, OR one measure is missing from either the SDA or the LEA One Plan.	Measures address different core topic areas, OR the measure is missing from the LEA One Plan. <i>Records where the SDA was missing a student measure were excluded from analysis.</i>

Exhibit A-8.

## Examples of alignment between adult measures and student measures, by rating level

Adult measures		Student measures	
SDA	LEA One Plan	SDA	LEA One Plan
<b>Aligned</b>		<b>Aligned</b>	
<i>"100% of Administrators participating in OLi4, will demonstrate an increase in their instructional leadership as measured by progress documented on the BLT and TBT rubrics."</i>	<i>"Every semester, shared leadership, including the use of OIP - fidelity Instrument of DLT, BLTs, TBTs, and SBTs will be monitored by Superintendent, Principal, Curriculum Director, Special Education Director, with an overall improvement of 100% by the end of the plan."</i>	<i>"The school will see student performance improvement on the ELA II end of course exam with a goal of 10% gain in proficiency."</i>	<i>"Student Measure 1: Every Semester, English Language Arts - ELA 2 End of Course Exams of All Students will be monitored by Staff, with an overall improvement of increase 10.00 % by the end of the plan."</i>
<b>Partially aligned</b>		<b>Partially aligned</b>	
<i>"By June 2024, 100% of [staff] will implement the chosen evidence-based strategy to increase student attendance."</i>	<i>"Every semester, attendance - Look-For of High School Staff will be measured, with an overall plan improvement of 5%."</i>	<i>"Student achievement data will show a performance increase in mathematics and ELA."</i>	<i>"Every semester, English Language Arts - building/district diagnostic assessments of all students and students with disabilities will be monitored by principal, curriculum director, special education director, with an annual improvement of increase [of] one year typical growth each year."</i>
<b>Weakly aligned</b>		<b>Weakly aligned</b>	
<i>"The score on the TFI - completed by the...PBIS team - will increase by 3 points from the baseline determined in October of 2023, to the end of the 23- 24 school year."</i>	<i>"Principal, curriculum director will monitor professional development - completion of task for all staff each semester resulting in an overall improvement of increase 100% by the end of the plan."</i>	<i>"Students with disabilities will receive services in their least restrictive environment."</i>	<i>"Students with Disabilities will be monitored for reading/literacy - district formative assessments every quarter by intervention specialists with an annual improvement of increase 3% and an overall improvement of increase 9% by the end of the plan."</i>

### Extant data

The evaluation includes several types of extant data, including student achievement in math and English language arts; course credit completion rates; chronic absenteeism; graduation

rates; college, career, and military readiness; and school and district characteristics (see Exhibit A-9). The evaluation team downloaded these data for the 2022–23 and 2023–24 school years for all LEAs and schools from the Department website. Publicly available data sets from the National Center on Education Statistics’ Common Core of Data provided information about school and district characteristics, such as school size and urbanicity.

Exhibit A-9.

### 2022–23 and 2023–24 extant data used in the evaluation

Type of data	Grade levels	Brief description
School and district characteristics (2023–24 only)	All grades	School and district urbanicity (rural, town, suburban, urban), number of students enrolled, racial composition, percentage of students economically disadvantaged, English learners, and students with disabilities)
Ohio state test in English language arts	Elementary (3–8)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in English language arts
Ohio state test in math	Elementary (3–8)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in math
End-of-course test in Algebra I	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in Algebra I
End-of-course test in US Government	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in US Government
End-of-course test in US History	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in US History
End-of-course test in Biology	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in Biology
End-of-course test in English II	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in English II
End-of-course test in Geometry	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in Geometry
End-of-course test in Math I	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in Math I
End-of-course test in Math II	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students proficient/advanced in Math II
Algebra I/Integrated Math I credit completion rate	By the end of Grade 8	School-level percentages of students earning at least one high school credit in Algebra I or Integrated Math I by the end of Grade 8

Type of data	Grade levels	Brief description
ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, World Language, or Fine Arts credit completion rate	By the end of Grade 8	School-level percentages of students earning at least one high school credit in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, World Language, or Fine Arts by the end of Grade 8
Fine Arts, Career Exploration, or World Languages completion rate	By the end of Grade 8	School-level percentages of students earning at least three middle school credits in Fine Arts, Career Exploration, or World Languages by the end of Grade 8
Algebra I completion rate	By the end of Grade 9	School-level percentages of students earning at least one high school credit in Algebra I by the end of Grade 9
ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, World Language, or Fine Arts credit completion rate	By the end of Grade 9	School-level percentages of students earning five or more high school credits in ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, World Language, or Fine Arts by the end of Grade 9
Algebra II completion rate	By the end of Grade 11	School-level percentages of students earning at least one high school credit in Algebra II by the end of Grade 11
Chronic absenteeism	All grades	School-level percentages of students chronically absent
Attendance rate	All-grades	School-level average student attendance rates
Four-year graduation rates	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students graduating high school within four years of beginning Grade 9
Five-year graduation rates	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students graduating high school within five years of beginning Grade 9
College, career, workforce, and military readiness rates	Secondary (9–12)	School-level percentages of students in the four-year graduation cohort who completed a pathway and are prepared for college or career success

### ***Approach to analyzing extant data***

The evaluation team conducted two sets of descriptive, outcome-related analyses. The first analysis examined trends in school-level averages using publicly available outcome data from the Ohio Report Card for the 2021–22 through 2023–24 school years. It focused on reading and math proficiency in grades 3–8, proficiency in High School English II, Algebra I, and Geometry, 4-year graduation rates, and chronic absenteeism, comparing schools receiving SST services with all schools statewide. The second assessed whether CSI, TSI, and ATSI schools within LEAs receiving SST services are on track to achieve the goals outlined in LEA One Plans, focusing on the percentage of schools meeting targets for outcomes with publicly available data from the Ohio Report Card and disaggregating goal attainment by the specific outcomes targeted. Additional details on the second analysis are provided below.

---

## Assessing One Plan goal attainment

Drawing from the LEA One Plans, the evaluation team compiled a dataset of 695 goals, including variables such as the targeted outcome of each goal, the expected amount of improvement, and the intended completion date. Goals were excluded from the analysis if they lacked any of these key elements or referenced outcomes not available in publicly reported Ohio Report Card data. Since this analysis is based on whether schools are meeting goals outlined in LEA One Plans, some goals were applied to multiple schools within the same LEA. Goals were excluded if schools were missing outcome data for one of the school years. After removing goals with insufficient information and making additional adjustments based on LEA- and school-level information, 365 goals were retained for analysis.

Due to limited data availability, the analysis of LEA One Plan goals required several assumptions. Because most goals targeted outcomes beyond the 2023–24 school year, progress was assessed based on whether improvement in a single year appeared sufficient to stay on track to meet the goal in a future year, assuming steady progress over time. For example, if a goal aimed to reduce chronic absenteeism by 2 percentage points by 2024–25 (starting from 2022–23), a one-point reduction per year was considered adequate progress.

To evaluate goals targeting gains on Ohio State Tests, the analysis examined whether schools demonstrated improvement on every applicable assessment administered at the school. For example, if an LEA set a goal to improve ELA proficiency by 3 percentage points in one year, a K-12 school within that LEA was required to show a 3-point gain in average ELA proficiency on each grade-level assessment and on High School English II to be considered as making sufficient progress toward the LEA goal. This approach was necessary due to limitations in the available school-level data, which did not allow for aggregation of proficient students across grades. Similarly, for goals targeting improvements across “all tested subjects”, schools were expected to demonstrate enough gains on all applicable ELA, math, science, and social science assessments. Although this method imposed a higher threshold than evaluating overall gains in the total percentage of proficient students, it was determined to be the most appropriate solution given the data constraints.

Goals that targeted specific student groups were not disaggregated in the analysis. Among the 333 analyzable goals, 297 targeted “All Students”. Of the remaining goals, 15 referenced students in CSI, TSI, or ATSI schools, and 9 targeted more than one student group. Only 12 goals focused on a single student group, limiting the feasibility of subgroup-specific analysis.



# Supporting Details for Key Findings

This appendix includes figures that support the main report's findings and are presented in the order mentioned in the report.

Exhibit B-1.

## Reported number of hours of direct SST services, overall and by SST region, 2023–24

	N	Min Hours	25th Percentile	Median Hours	75th Percentile	Max Hours
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>279</b>
SST Region 1	22	8	18	31	42	210
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	20	2	15	31	76	189
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	15	12	15	38	70	116
SST Region 6	17	2	9	18	32	116
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	20	3	10	20	43	144
SST Region 9	14	8	15	37	56	279
SST Region 10	11	2	18	35	74	154
SST Region 11	16	3	5	10	23	105
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	17	6	12	23	47	147
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	10	2	8	13	30	63
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures.

Exhibit B-2.

**Percentage of surveyed LEA and building administrators who reported receiving SST services, by service type, overall and by SST region, 2023–24**

	N	Individualized support	Group training	Networking and peer support	Online resources
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>33%</b>
SST Region 1	26	77%	69%	42%	38%
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	28	61%	39%	14%	7%
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	21	90%	76%	29%	33%
SST Region 6	18	94%	72%	33%	39%
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	25	72%	60%	56%	44%
SST Region 9	19	84%	42%	53%	37%
SST Region 10	14	93%	43%	64%	21%
SST Region 11	24	63%	54%	29%	33%
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	18	100%	72%	56%	50%
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	10	70%	70%	30%	20%
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures.

Exhibit B-3.

**Percentage of surveyed LEA and building administrators who reported receiving SST services, by topic, overall and by SST region, 2023–24**

	N	Absenteeism	Climate and culture	Early childhood	English learners	Literacy	School improvement processes	Students with disabilities	Workforce and graduation pathways
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>28%</b>
SST Region 1	26	38%	54%	8%	4%	54%	88%	46%	31%
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	28	54%	50%	7%	11%	64%	82%	43%	39%
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	21	71%	67%	14%	5%	86%	81%	62%	29%
SST Region 6	18	33%	22%	17%	0%	28%	61%	39%	33%
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	25	56%	56%	28%	20%	64%	76%	32%	24%
SST Region 9	19	63%	79%	26%	16%	68%	95%	42%	37%
SST Region 10	14	21%	36%	7%	14%	57%	71%	36%	7%
SST Region 11	24	33%	29%	8%	17%	29%	71%	38%	21%
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	18	56%	61%	11%	11%	72%	89%	67%	22%
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	10	70%	30%	20%	10%	60%	90%	90%	30%
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures.

Exhibit B-4.

### Average SST quality rating, overall and by SST region, 2023–24

	N	Fit	Timeliness	Responsiveness
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.41</b>
SST Region 1	21	3.45	3.49	3.64
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	21	2.98	3.06	3.18
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	15	3.45	3.60	3.50
SST Region 6	17	3.28	3.37	3.35
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	20	3.45	3.54	3.50
SST Region 9	14	3.32	3.43	3.55
SST Region 10	13	3.44	3.51	3.46
SST Region 11	15	3.12	3.20	3.12
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	17	3.50	3.41	3.46
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	—	—	—	—
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures. Composite scales for each construct were created by averaging the scores from the relevant individual survey items. Items were rated on a 4-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree.

Exhibit B-5.

**Percentage of surveyed LEA and building administrators, by topic and learning outcome, overall and by SST region, 2023–24**

	Absenteeism				Climate and culture				Early childhood				English learners			
	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>5%</b>
SST Region 1	—	—	—	—	13	85%	15%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	10	40%	40%	20%	10	70%	30%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	13	62%	38%	0%	11	73%	27%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	10	90%	10%	0%	10	90%	10%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 9	—	—	—	—	11	82%	18%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 11	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	—	—	—	—	10	80%	20%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Literacy			School improvement processes			Students with disabilities			Workforce and graduation pathways						
	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn	N	Learned and changed practice	Learned but did not change practice	Did not learn
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>2%</b>
SST Region 1	13	92%	8%	0%	20	100%	0%	0%	12	58%	42%	0%	—	—	—	—
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	14	79%	21%	0%	17	65%	29%	6%	10	40%	60%	0%	—	—	—	—
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	15	73%	27%	0%	14	86%	14%	0%	12	75%	25%	0%	—	—	—	—
SST Region 6	—	—	—	—	11	55%	36%	9%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	11	91%	9%	0%	15	93%	7%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 9	—	—	—	—	13	69%	31%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 11	—	—	—	—	13	69%	31%	0%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	12	75%	25%	0%	15	93%	7%	0%	12	75%	25%	0%	—	—	—	—
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures.

Exhibit B-6.

**Percentage of surveyed LEA and building administrators who reported perceived improvements, by topic, overall and by SST region, 2023–24**

	N	Achievement gap closure for student subgroups	Chronic absenteeism	College and career readiness	Conditions for learning and school climate	Early literacy	ELs' English language proficiency
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>31%</b>
SST Region 1	17	71%	63%	67%	93%	64%	36%
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	21	55%	50%	81%	57%	83%	36%
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	14	71%	57%	55%	62%	67%	36%
SST Region 6	16	56%	20%	31%	47%	31%	0%
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	19	58%	58%	69%	95%	64%	60%
SST Region 9	14	77%	57%	—	86%	—	27%
SST Region 10	11	55%	36%	—	70%	40%	—
SST Region 11	15	53%	71%	53%	79%	67%	23%
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	16	73%	57%	50%	79%	54%	38%
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	N	Graduation rate	Student achievement in ELA	Student achievement in math	Student achievement in other subjects	Student discipline
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>57%</b>
SST Region 1	17	50%	71%	53%	63%	60%
SST Region 2	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 3	21	75%	80%	40%	47%	55%
SST Region 4	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 5	14	67%	93%	71%	71%	57%
SST Region 6	16	27%	50%	44%	44%	31%
SST Region 7	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 8	19	88%	61%	56%	59%	72%
SST Region 9	14		62%	46%	55%	54%
SST Region 10	11	80%	55%	36%	45%	70%
SST Region 11	15	67%	60%	27%	53%	54%
SST Region 12	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 13	16	77%	75%	53%	67%	71%
SST Region 14	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 15	—	—	—	—	—	—
SST Region 16	—	—	—	—	—	—

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA and building administrator surveys, fall 2024.

Note. — Data not reported due to low response counts (fewer than 10 survey respondents in the region). All SST regions are, however, included in the statewide figures.



## Detailed LEA Administrator Survey Results

This appendix presents the results of the LEA administrator survey protocol, organized by survey item. Each figure includes the wording of the survey question and a corresponding table summarizing participant responses. To protect participant privacy, open-response answers are excluded from this appendix.

Exhibit C-1.

### Years of experience, by role

1. First, we'd like to know a little about your professional experience. Please indicate the number of years that you have served in the following roles, including the current school year (2024–25).

	Number of years (Mean)	Number of years (Standard Dev.)	<i>n</i>
Served in any educational leadership role for an LEA or a community school	18.89	9.54	128
Served in your current educational leadership role for an LEA or a community school	7.47	6.34	127
Served in your current LEA in any capacity	12.73	9.16	126

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents were instructed to enter whole numbers only.

Exhibit C-2.

### Receipt of SST services in 2023–24

2. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your LEA receive assistance from a State Support Team (SST)?

Option	Responses
Yes	123 (96%)
No	5 (4%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 (*n* = 128).

Note. Respondents who indicated that their LEA did not receive assistance from an SST during the 2023–24 school year were automatically skipped to the end of the survey. As a result, they did not receive any of the subsequent items related to SST services.

Exhibit C-3.

### Topics of SST services received, 2023–24

3. During the prior school year (2023–24), on which topics did your LEA and/or the schools in your LEA receive services from your SST?

Topics	Select all that apply
Absenteeism	62 (50%)
Climate and culture	62 (50%)
Early childhood	31 (25%)
English learners	17 (14%)
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	104 (85%)
Students with Disabilities	74 (60%)
Literacy	83 (67%)
Workforce and graduation pathways	44 (36%)
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	9 (7%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 123$ ).

Note. Respondents were instructed to select all topics for which their LEA received SST services.

Exhibit C-4.

### Types of SST services received, by topic, 2023–24

4. During the prior school year (2023–24), what types of training, technical assistance, or support did your LEA and/or the schools in your LEA receive from your SST for the following topics?

Topics	Online resources	Group training	Individualized support	Networking and peer support	<i>n</i>
Absenteeism	17 (27%)	19 (31%)	44 (71%)	20 (32%)	62
Climate and culture	11 (18%)	23 (37%)	43 (69%)	14 (23%)	62
Early childhood	12 (39%)	19 (61%)	22 (71%)	20 (65%)	31
English learners	6 (35%)	5 (29%)	8 (47%)	8 (47%)	17
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	28 (27%)	55 (53%)	80 (77%)	41 (39%)	104

Topics	Online resources	Group training	Individualized support	Networking and peer support	n
Students with Disabilities	26 (35%)	44 (59%)	52 (70%)	33 (45%)	74
Literacy	25 (30%)	44 (53%)	64 (77%)	33 (40%)	83
Workforce and graduation pathways	16 (36%)	21 (48%)	30 (68%)	19 (43%)	44
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	9 (100%)	1 (11%)	9

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select all types of services for which their LEA received SST support.

Exhibit C-5.

### SST services related to school improvement and Ohio’s Improvement Process, 2023–24

5. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your LEA or the schools in your LEA receive services from your SST to enable you to better implement activities related to school improvement and Ohio’s Improvement Process (OIP)?

Activities	Yes	No
Conducting root cause analyses	55 (71%)	22 (29%)
Completing the school’s One Needs Assessment	61 (79%)	16 (21%)
Identifying and selecting evidence-based strategies	42 (55%)	35 (45%)
Analyzing and sharing data related to adult practices and strategies	37 (48%)	40 (52%)
Analyzing and monitoring disaggregated student performance data	47 (61%)	30 (39%)
Developing the school’s One Plan	64 (83%)	13 (17%)
Developing SMART goals	49 (64%)	28 (36%)
Monitoring the implementation of improvement strategies	60 (78%)	17 (22%)
Evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies	36 (47%)	41 (53%)
Facilitating effective communication to and from district-leadership teams [or community school sponsors], building leadership teams, and teacher building teams	39 (51%)	38 (49%)
Engaging community members in the school improvement process	12 (16%)	65 (84%)
Identifying and removing barriers to successful implementation of improvement strategies	33 (43%)	44 (57%)
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	1 (1%)	76 (99%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 (n = 77).

Note. Respondents who selected “online resources”, “group training”, “individualized support”, or “networking and peer support” for “school improvement, Ohio’s improvement process, and ED STEPS” in question 4 were directed to question 5. Those who did not select any of these options did not receive question 5.

Exhibit C-6.

## Audience for SST services, by topic, 2023–24

6. For each topic your LEA or the schools in your LEA received services from your SST during the prior school year (2023–24), please indicate the audience of support.

Topics	District leadership	Building leadership	Teachers	Other
Conducting root cause analyses	31 (40%)	29 (38%)	14 (18%)	1 (1%)
Completing schools' One Needs Assessment	38 (49%)	32 (42%)	13 (17%)	2 (3%)
Identifying and selecting evidence-based strategies	32 (42%)	26 (34%)	21 (27%)	0 (0%)
Analyzing and sharing data related to adult practices and strategies	27 (35%)	23 (30%)	15 (19%)	0 (0%)
Analyzing and monitoring disaggregated student performance data	26 (34%)	24 (31%)	11 (14%)	0 (0%)
Developing schools' One Plan	37 (48%)	28 (36%)	12 (16%)	2 (3%)
Developing SMART goals	28 (36%)	20 (26%)	9 (12%)	0 (0%)
Monitoring the implementation of improvement strategies	35 (45%)	30 (39%)	14 (18%)	1 (1%)
Evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies	27 (35%)	24 (31%)	15 (19%)	0 (0%)
Facilitating effective communication to and from district-leadership teams [or community school sponsors], building leadership teams, and teacher building teams	27 (35%)	25 (32%)	18 (23%)	2 (3%)
Engaging community members in the school improvement process	8 (10%)	7 (9%)	5 (6%)	1 (1%)
Identifying and removing barriers to successful implementation of improvement strategies	24 (31%)	17 (22%)	14 (18%)	1 (1%)
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 77$ ).

Note. Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 5 and were instructed to select all audiences of support for which their LEA received SST services.

Exhibit C-7.

### Perceived amount of time and usefulness of SST services, 2023–24

7. Below is a list of the topics for which you indicated your LEA received services from your SST on during the prior school year (2023–24). For each topics, how would you rate the amount of time received? How useful were the services your LEA received?

Topics	Did you receive enough service on each topic?			Did you learn from the services and change practices?			n
	Not enough	Just enough	Too much	Did not learn	Learned, but did not change practices	Learned, and changed practices	
Absenteeism	7 (17%)	35 (83%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	7 (17%)	31 (74%)	42
Climate and culture	3 (7%)	38 (93%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (34%)	27 (66%)	41
Early childhood	3 (11%)	24 (89%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	4 (15%)	21 (78%)	27
English learners	0 (0%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (47%)	8 (53%)	15
Literacy	5 (6%)	71 (89%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	16 (20%)	63 (78%)	81*
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	3 (5%)	62 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	13 (20%)	51 (78%)	65
Students with disabilities	5 (8%)	55 (90%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	9 (15%)	49 (82%)	60**
Workforce and graduation pathways	5 (13%)	34 (85%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	11 (28%)	28 (70%)	40
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	9

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. \* N=80 for "Did you receive enough service on each topic?"; N=81 for "Did you learn from the services and change practices?"

\*\* N=61 for "Did you receive enough service on each topic?"; N=60 for "Did you learn from the services and change practices?"

Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select one response per topic for each panel.

Exhibit C-8.

### Most useful SST services

8. Reflecting on the prior school year (2023–24), what were the most useful services your LEA received from your SST? Please list and describe up to three specific services. For each service, specify the topic, whether it was one-time or ongoing, and why you found it useful.

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. To protect participant privacy, open-ended responses to this item are not reported.

Exhibit C-9.

### SST services perceived as not useful, 2023–24

9. Reflecting on the prior school year (2023–24), were there any services from your SST that were not helpful?

Option	Responses
Yes	4 (4%)
No	90 (96%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 94$ ).

Exhibit C-10.

### Details on services perceived as not useful, 2023–24

10. Please list and describe up to three specific services. For each service, specify the topic, whether it was one-time or ongoing, and why you found it not useful.

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Only respondents who responded “Yes” in question 9 were shown question 10. To protect participant privacy, open-ended responses to this item are not reported.

Exhibit C-11.

### Format of SST services, 2023–24

11. In the prior school year (2023–24), were there professional development activities, technical assistance, or services provided from the SST in-person, entirely virtual, or hybrid?

	In-person	Entirely virtual	Hybrid	Did Not Receive Support	$n$
Professional development	51 (54%)	2 (2%)	36 (38%)	5 (5%)	94
Technical assistance	37 (39%)	5 (5%)	40 (42%)	13 (14%)	95
Other services	22 (31%)	1 (1%)	37 (51%)	12 (17%)	72

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Exhibit C-12.

### Days of direct SST services provided, by format, 2023–24

12. In the prior school year (2023–24), approximately how many days did personnel from the SST provide direct services (in person or remotely) to you or other LEA-level staff?

Days	In-person ( $n, \%$ )	Remote ( $n, \%$ )
1	0 (0%)	4 (7%)
2	8 (9%)	5 (9%)
3	9 (10%)	5 (9%)
4	7 (8%)	9 (16%)

Days	In-person (n, %)	Remote (n, %)
5	6 (7%)	6 (11%)
6	8 (9%)	7 (12%)
7	1 (1%)	1 (2%)
8	6 (7%)	3 (5%)
9	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
10	9 (10%)	10 (18%)
11	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
12	8 (9%)	2 (4%)
15	5 (6%)	2 (4%)
20	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
<b>More than 20</b>	<b>22 (24%)</b>	<b>1 (2%)</b>

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 (n = 90 for the number of in-person days; 57 for the number of remote days).

Note. Respondents were instructed not to include emails, document review, or other asynchronous electronic interactions when reporting the number of days of direct services.

Exhibit C-13

### Typical duration of SST services provided, 2023–24

13. In the prior school year (2023–24), what was the typical duration of direct services provided by the SST (in-person or remotely) to you or other LEA-level staff?

Option	Responses
1-2 hours	46 (49%)
3-4 hours	30 (32%)
5-6 hours	10 (11%)
7-8 hours	5 (5%)
<b>More than 8 hours</b>	<b>3 (3%)</b>

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024 (n = 94).

Note. Respondents were instructed not to include emails, document review, or other asynchronous electronic interactions when reporting the number of days of direct services.

Exhibit C-14.

## Perceptions of quality of SST services, 2023–24

14. Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about the SST that works with your LEA.

Members of the SST...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>n</i>
Understand the issues faced by my LEA	1 (1%)	7 (8%)	46 (50%)	38 (41%)	92
Pay attention to the needs and performance of my LEA	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	41 (45%)	45 (49%)	91
Have expertise and skills that are relevant for my school	2 (2%)	8 (9%)	42 (46%)	39 (43%)	91
Have established good rapport with the faculty and staff of my LEA	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	40 (44%)	46 (51%)	91
Listen to my opinions and those of my staff	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	40 (45%)	46 (52%)	89
Express genuine concern about the challenges my LEA faces	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	39 (43%)	47 (52%)	90
Follow up on our requests to ensure they have been resolved	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	37 (41%)	50 (55%)	91
Check in regularly to see if additional support is needed	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	42 (46%)	44 (48%)	91
Provide input that staff in our LEA value	0 (0%)	9 (10%)	45 (49%)	37 (41%)	91
Respond promptly to our LEA's requests for information or assistance	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	37 (41%)	50 (55%)	91
Ensure that deadlines for providing services are consistently met	1 (1%)	7 (8%)	46 (50%)	38 (41%)	92
Communicate in a clear and professional way	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	41 (45%)	45 (49%)	91

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit C-15.

### Perceptions of SST expertise, by topic area, 2023–24

15. For each topic, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the members of your SST have the relevant expertise and skills.

Topics	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>n</i>
Absenteeism	0 (0%)	3 (8%)	17 (44%)	19 (49%)	39
Climate and culture	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	17 (44%)	21 (54%)	39
Early childhood	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	12 (46%)	13 (50%)	26
English learners	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	14
Literacy	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	22 (29%)	52 (68%)	77
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	22 (35%)	38 (60%)	63
SWDs	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	25 (43%)	31 (53%)	58
Workforce and graduation pathways	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	18 (45%)	20 (50%)	40
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	10

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit C-16.

### Perceived improvements in student outcomes, 2023–24

16. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your LEA experience improvements in the following areas related to student outcomes? Select “not sure” for an area for which you do not have sufficient data or information.

	Yes	No	Not Sure
Student achievement in reading/English language arts	57 (65%)	16 (18%)	15 (17%)
Student achievement in mathematics	35 (40%)	35 (40%)	18 (20%)
Student achievement in other subject(s)	38 (44%)	17 (20%)	31 (36%)
Early literacy	47 (56%)	23 (27%)	14 (17%)
College and career readiness (e.g., completion of accelerated coursework or industry credentials)	44 (51%)	13 (15%)	30 (34%)
Graduation rate	47 (54%)	18 (21%)	22 (25%)

	Yes	No	Not Sure
Achievement gap closure for student subgroups	52 (60%)	20 (23%)	15 (17%)
Chronic absenteeism	42 (48%)	34 (39%)	12 (14%)
Conditions for learning and school climate	57 (66%)	10 (11%)	20 (23%)
ELs' English language proficiency	17 (20%)	23 (27%)	44 (52%)
Student discipline	41 (48%)	26 (30%)	19 (22%)
Other (Please specify.)	4 (10%)	5 (12%)	33 (79%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.  
 Note. Respondents were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit C-17.

## Perceived influence of SST services on improvements in student outcomes, 2023–24

17. Below is a list of the areas for which you indicated your LEA experienced improvements. For each area, to what extent do you believe that SST services influenced these improvements?

	No Influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	<i>n</i>
Student achievement in reading/English language arts	1 (2%)	19 (33%)	22 (39%)	15 (26%)	57
Student achievement in mathematics	1 (3%)	12 (34%)	13 (37%)	9 (26%)	35
Student achievement in other subject(s)	1 (3%)	14 (37%)	17 (45%)	6 (16%)	38
Early literacy	3 (6%)	12 (26%)	18 (38%)	14 (30%)	47
College and career readiness (e.g., completion of accelerated coursework or industry credentials)	6 (14%)	15 (34%)	15 (34%)	8 (18%)	44
Graduation rate	3 (6%)	17 (36%)	17 (36%)	10 (21%)	47
Achievement gap closure for student subgroups	2 (4%)	18 (35%)	22 (42%)	10 (19%)	52
Chronic absenteeism	4 (10%)	10 (24%)	16 (38%)	12 (29%)	42
Conditions for learning and school climate	5 (9%)	12 (21%)	28 (49%)	12 (21%)	57
ELs' English language proficiency	2 (13%)	6 (38%)	5 (31%)	3 (19%)	16
Student discipline	6 (15%)	12 (29%)	17 (41%)	6 (15%)	41
Other (Please specify.)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	0 (0%)	3

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, LEA administrator survey, fall 2024.  
 Note. Respondents only saw the areas they selected in question 16 and were instructed to select one response per row.



# Detailed Building Administrator Survey Results

This appendix presents the results of the building administrator survey protocol, organized by survey item. Each figure includes the wording of the survey question and a corresponding table summarizing participant responses. To protect participant privacy, open-response answers are excluded from this appendix.

Exhibit D-1.

## Years of experience, by role

1. First, we'd like to know a little about your professional experience. Please indicate the number of years that you have served in the following roles, including the current school year (2024–25).

	Number of years (Mean)	Number of years (Standard Dev.)	<i>n</i>
Served as a school leader	11.96	7.74	152
Served as the principal at your current school	5.11	3.79	149
Served at your current school in any capacity	8.17	6.56	147

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents were instructed to enter whole numbers only.

Exhibit D-2.

## Receipt of SST services in 2023–24

2. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your school receive assistance from a State Support Team (SST)?

Option	Responses
Yes	144 (94%)
No	9 (6%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 153$ ).

Note. Respondents who indicated that their school did not receive assistance from an SST during the 2023–24 school year were automatically skipped to the end of the survey. As a result, they did not receive any of the subsequent items related to SST services.

Exhibit D-3.

## Topics of SST services received, 2023–24

### 3. During the prior school year (2023–24), on which topics did your school receive services from your SST?

Topics	Select all that apply
Absenteeism	70 (49%)
Climate and culture	67 (47%)
Early childhood	9 (6%)
English learners	12 (8%)
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	110 (76%)
Students with Disabilities	62 (43%)
Literacy	69 (48%)
Workforce and graduation pathways	35 (24%)
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	28 (19%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 144$ ).

Note. Respondents were instructed to select all topics for which their school received SST services.

Exhibit D-4.

## Types of SST services received, by topic, 2023–24

### 4. During the prior school year (2023–24), what types of training, technical assistance, or support did your school receive from your SST for the following topics?

Topics	Online resources	Group training	Individualized support	Networking and peer support	<i>n</i>
Absenteeism	16 (23%)	20 (29%)	43 (61%)	13 (19%)	70
Climate and culture	13 (19%)	28 (42%)	39 (58%)	21 (31%)	67
Early childhood	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	9
English learners	2 (17%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	5 (42%)	12
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	24 (22%)	48 (44%)	75 (68%)	32 (29%)	110

Topics	Online resources	Group training	Individualized support	Networking and peer support	n
Students with Disabilities	13 (21%)	24 (39%)	39 (63%)	17 (27%)	62
Literacy	18 (26%)	34 (49%)	39 (57%)	23 (33%)	69
Workforce and graduation pathways	3 (9%)	9 (26%)	24 (69%)	8 (23%)	35
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	9 (32%)	13 (46%)	20 (71%)	11 (39%)	28

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select all types of services for which their school received SST support.

Exhibit D-5.

### SST services related to school improvement and Ohio’s Improvement Process, 2023–24

**5. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your school receive services from your SST to enable you to better implement activities related to school improvement and Ohio’s Improvement Process**

Activities	Yes	No
Conducting root cause analyses	40 (70%)	17 (30%)
Completing the school’s One Needs Assessment	46 (81%)	11 (19%)
Identifying and selecting evidence-based strategies	43 (75%)	14 (25%)
Analyzing and sharing data related to adult practices and strategies	28 (49%)	29 (51%)
Analyzing and monitoring disaggregated student performance data	22 (39%)	35 (61%)
Developing the school’s One Plan	44 (77%)	13 (23%)
Developing SMART goals	29 (51%)	28 (49%)
Monitoring the implementation of improvement strategies	31 (54%)	26 (46%)
Evaluating the effectiveness of improvement strategies	30 (53%)	27 (47%)
Facilitating effective communication to and from district-leadership teams [or community school sponsors], building leadership teams, and teacher building teams	29 (51%)	28 (49%)
Engaging community members in the school improvement process	8 (14%)	49 (86%)
Identifying and removing barriers to successful implementation of improvement strategies	26 (46%)	31 (54%)
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	2 (4%)	55 (96%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 (n = 57).

Note. Respondents who selected “online resources”, “group training”, “individualized support”, or “networking and peer support” for “school improvement, Ohio’s improvement process, and ED STEPS” in question 4 were directed to question 5. Those who did not select any of these options did not receive question 5.

Exhibit D-6.

## Perceived amount of time and usefulness of SST services, 2023–24

6. Below is a list of the topics for which you indicated your school received services from your SST on during the prior school year (2023–24). For each topics, how would you rate the amount of time received? How useful were the services your school received?

Topics	Did you receive enough service on each topic?			Did you learn from the services and change practices?			N
	Not enough	Just enough	Too much	Did not learn	Learned, but did not change practices	Learned, and changed practices	
Absenteeism	7 (17%)	35 (83%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	7 (17%)	31 (74%)	63
Climate and culture	3 (7%)	38 (93%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (34%)	27 (66%)	59
Early childhood	3 (11%)	24 (89%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	4 (15%)	21 (78%)	8
English learners	0 (0%)	15 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (47%)	8 (53%)	9
Literacy	5 (6%)	71 (89%)	4 (5%)	2 (2%)	16 (20%)	63 (78%)	97*
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	3 (5%)	62 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	13 (20%)	51 (78%)	55
Students with disabilities	5 (8%)	55 (90%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	9 (15%)	49 (82%)	28**
Workforce and graduation pathways	5 (13%)	34 (85%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	11 (28%)	28 (70%)	23
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	9

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. \* N = 98 for “Did you receive enough service on each topic?”; N = 97 for “Did you learn from the services and change practices?”

\*\* N = 30 for “Did you receive enough service on each topic?”; N = 28 for “Did you learn from the services and change practices?” Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select one response per topic for each panel.

Exhibit D-7.

## Most useful SST services

7. Reflecting on the prior school year (2023–24), what were the most useful services your school received from your SST? Please list and describe up to three specific services. For each service, specify the topic, whether it was one-time or ongoing, and why you found it useful.

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. To protect participant privacy, open-ended responses to this item are not reported.

Exhibit D-8.

**SST services perceived as not useful, 2023–24****8. Reflecting on the prior school year (2023–24), were there any services from your SST that were not helpful?**

Option	Responses
Yes	8 (6%)
No	116 (94%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 124$ ).

Exhibit D-9.

**Details on services perceived as not useful, 2023–24****9. Please list and describe up to three specific services.** For each service, specify the topic, whether it was one-time or ongoing, and why you found it not useful.

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Only respondents who responded “Yes” in question 9 were shown question 10. To protect participant privacy, open-ended responses to this item are not reported.

Exhibit D-10.

**Format of SST services, 2023–24****10. In the prior school year (2023–24), were there professional development activities, technical assistance, or services provided from the SST in-person, entirely virtual, or hybrid?**

	In-person	Entirely virtual	Hybrid	Did Not Receive Support	$n$
Professional development	77 (62%)	2 (2%)	32 (26%)	13 (10%)	124
Technical assistance	50 (42%)	2 (2%)	30 (25%)	36 (31%)	118
Other services	41 (39%)	2 (2%)	30 (29%)	31 (30%)	104

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Exhibit D-11.

## Days of direct SST services provided, by format, 2023–24

11. In the prior school year (2023–24), approximately how many days did personnel from the SST provide direct services (in person or remotely) to you or staff in your school?

Days	In-person (n, %)	Remote (n, %)
1	2 (2%)	3 (7%)
2	8 (7%)	7 (17%)
3	8 (7%)	8 (20%)
4	13 (12%)	4 (10%)
5	9 (8%)	6 (15%)
6	8 (7%)	5 (12%)
7	2 (2%)	1 (2%)
8	6 (5%)	2 (5%)
9	3 (3%)	0 (0%)
10	15 (13%)	2 (5%)
11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
12	7 (6%)	1 (2%)
14	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
15	7 (6%)	1 (2%)
16	2 (2%)	1 (2%)
18	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
20	6 (5%)	0 (0%)
<b>More than 20</b>	12 (11%)	0 (0%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 (n = 112 for the number of in-person days; 41 for the number of remote days).

Note. Respondents were instructed not to include emails, document review, or other asynchronous electronic interactions when reporting the number of days of direct services.

Exhibit D-12.

### Typical duration of SST services provided, 2023–24

12. In the prior school year (2023–24), what was the typical duration of direct services provided by the SST (in-person or remotely) to you or staff in your school?

Option	Responses
1-2 hours	68 (58%)
3-4 hours	22 (19%)
5-6 hours	11 (9%)
7-8 hours	9 (8%)
More than 8 hours	7 (6%)

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024 ( $n = 117$ ).

Note. Respondents were instructed not to include emails, document review, or other asynchronous electronic interactions when reporting the number of days of direct services.

Exhibit D-13.

### Perceptions of quality of SST services, 2023–24

13. Please indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements about the SST that works with your school.

Members of the SST...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>n</i>
Understand the issues faced by my school	5 (4%)	6 (5%)	62 (52%)	46 (39%)	119
Pay attention to the needs and performance of my school	4 (3%)	3 (3%)	66 (56%)	45 (38%)	118
Have expertise and skills that are relevant for my school	6 (5%)	4 (3%)	58 (50%)	49 (42%)	117
Have established good rapport with the faculty and staff of my school	3 (3%)	5 (4%)	51 (44%)	58 (50%)	117
Listen to my opinions and those of my staff	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	57 (49%)	55 (47%)	116
Express genuine concern about the challenges my school faces	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	54 (46%)	60 (51%)	117
Follow up on our requests to ensure they have been resolved	3 (3%)	5 (4%)	57 (48%)	53 (45%)	118
Check in regularly to see if additional support is needed	2 (2%)	8 (7%)	58 (49%)	50 (42%)	118

Members of the SST...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>n</i>
Provide input that staff in our school value	3 (3%)	6 (5%)	64 (55%)	44 (38%)	117
Respond promptly to our school's requests for information or assistance	2 (2%)	6 (5%)	53 (46%)	55 (47%)	116
Ensure that deadlines for providing services are consistently met	5 (4%)	6 (5%)	62 (52%)	46 (39%)	119
Communicate in a clear and professional way	4 (3%)	3 (3%)	66 (56%)	45 (38%)	118

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit D-14.

### Perceptions of SST expertise, by topic area, 2023–24

14. For each topic, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that the members of your SST have the relevant expertise and skills.

Topics	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	<i>n</i>
Absenteeism	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	31 (53%)	26 (44%)	59
Climate and culture	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	25 (45%)	30 (54%)	56
Early childhood	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)	8
English learners	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (63%)	3 (38%)	8
Literacy	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	37 (38%)	60 (61%)	98
School improvement, Ohio's improvement process, and ED STEPS	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	24 (47%)	25 (49%)	51
SWDs	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	25 (42%)	32 (54%)	59
Workforce and graduation pathways	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (34%)	19 (66%)	29
Other topic ( <i>Specify</i> )	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (42%)	14 (58%)	24

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents only saw the topics they selected in question 3 and were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit D-15.

### Perceived improvements in educator practices, 2023–24

15. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your school experience improvements in the following areas related to educator practices? Select “not sure” for an area for which you do not have sufficient data or information. Select N/A if the measure is not applicable to your school.

	Yes	No	Not Sure	N/A	<i>n</i>
Staff familiarity with the school’s instructional vision and goals	80 (75%)	0 (0%)	21 (20%)	6 (6%)	107
Opportunities for staff to contribute to school-level instructional decisions	85 (79%)	4 (4%)	11 (10%)	7 (7%)	107
Communication with staff about school improvement efforts	92 (86%)	2 (2%)	11 (10%)	2 (2%)	107
Quality of instructional practices and teaching methods	84 (79%)	6 (6%)	13 (12%)	3 (3%)	106
Collaboration among teachers	84 (79%)	6 (6%)	12 (11%)	4 (4%)	106
Interpersonal relationships among staff	67 (63%)	10 (9%)	22 (21%)	7 (7%)	106
Adult-student connections	72 (68%)	6 (6%)	21 (20%)	7 (7%)	106
Staff communication with families	62 (58%)	11 (10%)	23 (22%)	10 (9%)	106
Strategies used to involve families in school activities	50 (47%)	19 (18%)	24 (23%)	13 (12%)	106
Partnerships with community organizations	54 (51%)	17 (16%)	18 (17%)	17 (16%)	106

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit D-16.

### Perceived influence of SST services on improvements in educator practices, 2023–24

16. Below is a list of the areas for which you indicated your school experienced improvements. For each area, to what extent do you believe that SST services influenced these improvements?

	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	<i>n</i>
Staff familiarity with the school’s instructional vision and goals	6 (8%)	11 (14%)	42 (54%)	19 (24%)	78
Opportunities for staff to contribute to school-level instructional decisions	6 (7%)	19 (23%)	37 (45%)	21 (25%)	83
Communication with staff about school improvement efforts	6 (7%)	14 (16%)	44 (49%)	26 (29%)	90

	No influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	<i>n</i>
Quality of instructional practices and teaching methods	2 (2%)	11 (13%)	39 (47%)	31 (37%)	83
Collaboration among teachers	8 (10%)	16 (19%)	38 (46%)	21 (25%)	83
Interpersonal relationships among staff	9 (14%)	18 (28%)	26 (40%)	12 (18%)	65
Adult-student connections	13 (19%)	17 (24%)	30 (43%)	10 (14%)	70
Staff communication with families	11 (18%)	22 (36%)	20 (33%)	8 (13%)	61
Strategies used to involve families in school activities	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	23 (47%)	10 (20%)	49
Partnerships with community organizations	7 (13%)	11 (21%)	23 (43%)	12 (23%)	53

Source. Ohio SST evaluation, building administrator survey, fall 2024.

Note. Respondents only saw the areas they selected in question 15 and were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit D-17.

## Perceived improvements in student outcomes, 2023–24

17. During the prior school year (2023–24), did your school experience improvements in the following areas related to student outcomes? Select “not sure” for an area for which you do not have sufficient data or information. Select N/A if the measure is not applicable to your school.

	Yes	No	Not Sure	N/A
Student achievement in reading/English language arts	73 (64%)	22 (19%)	14 (12%)	5 (4%)
Student achievement in mathematics	57 (50%)	40 (35%)	11 (10%)	6 (5%)
Student achievement in other subject(s)	63 (55%)	21 (18%)	20 (18%)	10 (9%)
Early literacy	40 (36%)	12 (11%)	14 (13%)	46 (41%)
College and career readiness (e.g., completion of accelerated coursework or industry credentials)	58 (51%)	9 (8%)	16 (14%)	31 (27%)
Graduation rate	61 (54%)	7 (6%)	16 (14%)	30 (26%)
Achievement gap closure for student subgroups	64 (56%)	31 (27%)	13 (11%)	6 (5%)
Chronic absenteeism	57 (50%)	38 (33%)	11 (10%)	8 (7%)
Conditions for learning and school climate	78 (68%)	12 (11%)	15 (13%)	9 (8%)
ELs' English language proficiency	26 (23%)	22 (19%)	24 (21%)	42 (37%)
Student discipline	62 (54%)	25 (22%)	12 (11%)	15 (13%)
Other (Please specify.)	6 (9%)	2 (3%)	10 (15%)	48 (73%)

Note. Respondents were instructed to select one response per row.

Exhibit D-18.

**Perceived influence of SST services on improvements in student outcomes, 2023–24**

18. Below is a list of the areas for which you indicated your school experienced improvements. For each area, to what extent do you believe that SST services influenced these improvements?

	No Influence	Minimal influence	Moderate influence	Significant influence	<i>n</i>
Student achievement in reading/English language arts	3 (4%)	22 (30%)	28 (38%)	20 (27%)	73
Student achievement in mathematics	8 (14%)	16 (28%)	21 (37%)	12 (21%)	57
Student achievement in other subject(s)	4 (6%)	23 (37%)	25 (40%)	11 (17%)	63
Early literacy	2 (5%)	8 (20%)	19 (48%)	11 (28%)	40
College and career readiness (e.g., completion of accelerated coursework or industry credentials)	9 (16%)	21 (36%)	20 (34%)	8 (14%)	58
Graduation rate	6 (10%)	22 (37%)	22 (37%)	10 (17%)	60
Achievement gap closure for student subgroups	3 (5%)	19 (30%)	25 (39%)	17 (27%)	64
Chronic absenteeism	2 (4%)	19 (33%)	20 (35%)	16 (28%)	57
Conditions for learning and school climate	4 (5%)	16 (21%)	36 (46%)	22 (28%)	78
ELs' English language proficiency	2 (8%)	5 (19%)	13 (50%)	6 (23%)	26
Student discipline	3 (4%)	22 (30%)	28 (38%)	20 (27%)	73
Other (Please specify.)	8 (14%)	16 (28%)	21 (37%)	12 (21%)	57

Note. Respondents only saw the areas they selected in question 17 and were instructed to select one response per row.