Empowerment Schools
Clark County School District:
Preliminary Outcomes, 2006 - 2007

July 2, 2007

Lisa A. Pitch, Coordinator - Research & School Improvement
Arlene Lewis, Director - Research & School Improvement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

I. Introduction 4

II. Recent Research 5

III. Empowerment Schools at CCSD 7
- A. Choosing Empowerment Schools 7
- B. Empowerment School Leadership 8
- C. Empowerment School Staff 8

IV. Preliminary Findings 9
- A. Research Design 9
- B. Methodology 10
- C. Data Analysis 10
  - 1. Student Attendance 10
  - 2. Norm Referenced Tests 11
    - a. Mathematics 11
    - b. Reading 12
  - 3. Criterion Referenced Tests (Third to Fourth Grade Change) 12
    - a. Mathematics 12
    - b. Reading 13
  - 4. Criterion Referenced Tests (Fourth to Fifth Grade Change) 14
    - a. Mathematics 14
    - b. Reading 14
  - 5. Percent of Students Non-Proficient 15
  - 6. Parent, Student, and Staff Attitudes 18
  - 7. Teacher Learning Conditions Survey 20
  - 8. Discipline Incidents 21

V. Qualitative Data 23
- A, Adams 23
- B. Antonello 24
- C. Culley 24
- D. Warren 25

VI. Conclusions 26

Executive Summary

In 2006, the Clark County School District (CCSD) implemented an empowerment school concept based on the assumption that positive student outcomes will increase if school site leaders are given greater authority, flexibility in the decision-making process as well as additional dollars. The CCSD empowerment school program was piloted with four elementary schools: Adams, Antonello, Culley, and Rose Warren. In order to become an empowerment school in CCSD, all schools, site leadership, and staff had to meet specific CCSD requirements.

To evaluate the effectiveness of the empowerment school concept in CCSD, a study using a quasi-experimental research design compared student academic outcomes and attitudinal changes of students, staff, and parents in the four empowerment schools to a sample of four matched non-empowerment comparison schools. This report offers the initial results of a CCSD evaluation; in October 2007, a full report of findings from the Empowerment School Study (ESS) team of independent evaluators will be completed and made available for distribution.

The impact of the empowerment school concept on student academic outcomes was measured by student attendance, scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Nevada Criterion Referenced Test (CRT) scores, and discipline incidents. On average, preliminary AYP results and test scores indicate that empowerment schools performed somewhat better the comparison schools in student achievement. **ITBS** scores indicate that mathematics and reading scores increased from third to fourth grade in all schools involved with this study. This change was significantly greater than the matched comparison schools for two of the four empowerment schools in mathematics and one of the four in reading. However, in one matched pair, the empowerment school showed significantly less positive change in both reading and mathematics than the comparison school. **CRT** scores demonstrate that across all grades tested, Culley Elementary made consistent and significantly greater gains from 2006 to 2007 in both reading and mathematics than their comparison school. Although Antonello Elementary also had significantly greater increases in mathematics and reading CRT scores from third to fourth grade, the patterns of change are less consistent for the remainder of the matched pairs. Attendance rates show no significant differences between the average of the empowerment and comparison schools, however the empowerment school group had 41% fewer overall discipline incidents during the 2006-2007 school year than the comparison group.

Attitudinal measures from the annual District Wide Survey (DWS) and Teacher Learning Conditions Survey (TLC) indicate that overall empowerment schools have successfully created a positive, empowering climate for parents, staff, and students. On over 75% of the DWS questions, parents, students, and staff at empowerment schools responded more positively than respondents at the comparison schools. Data from the TLC survey indicate that in the five primary domains measured, the empowerment school attitudes were more positive than the district average, whereas the comparison schools reported more negative perceptions and attitudes than the district average.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the 2006-2007 school year, the Clark County School District (CCSD) piloted an empowerment school program in four elementary schools. The CCSD Empowerment School concept is based on the assumption that positive student outcomes will increase if school site leaders are given greater authority, flexibility in the decision-making process as well as additional dollars. The primary goal of establishing empowerment schools is to give site leaders the tools to create high performing schools that successfully educate the diverse students they serve.

The change to an empowerment school is a holistic and systemic school-wide change, based on what site leadership perceives to be the areas of greatest concern. Those individuals who work most closely with students at each site are the most knowledgeable with regard to the needs of those students. In addition, teachers, parents and community become even more involved to determine strategies that positively affect student outcomes. The empowerment concept can vary from school to school depending on each school's own vision.

Even though there is more discretion for site leaders that leads to variation among empowerment schools, there are some overriding principles that guide the decision making process. CCSD has established a set of leading principles for empowerment schools:[1]

- All students, parents, and educators must be actively engaged in the decision-making and learning processes.
- A strong instructional program is based upon an approved standards-based curriculum that prioritizes learning.
- High expectations for all children and that instruction, as well as the curriculum within the Clark County School District, should be rigorous.
- Each student must understand the relevance of learning in the context of the 21st century world.
- Modeling and reinforcing basic values such as respect, trustworthiness, caring, fairness, citizenship and responsibility are integral parts of the educational process.
- The diversity of the children, staff, and community should be recognized, honored, and celebrated as an asset to the Clark County School District.
- Accountability for student achievement, educational excellence and fiscal responsibility is paramount; therefore, there is a strong commitment to a continuous, on-going improvement process with documented results.

These principles give guidance about district-wide initiatives and priorities that site leaders can build upon. While the "ends" of the district remain consistent, the "means" by which each school can achieve those ends are specifically determined at each empowerment school site.[2]

---

[1] Empowerment School Application

[2] School site leadership is given more authority and flexibility in the decision making process as long as they are meeting students achievement goals (Heyman, 2007).

II. RECENT RESEARCH

The empowerment school concept has received a considerable amount of interest as a means for improving student and school outcomes. Much of the recent research emphasizes that empowerment schools can foster positive change for students and schools.

A. Review of the Literature

Czubaj (1999) characterized the empowerment school model as a system that takes decision-making away from district administrators and give the authority to school staff members, students' families, and community members. Empowerment schools can be traced back to the 1980s when schools borrowed decentralization practices from businesses and employed them in schools as a method of bolstering student achievement. School districts across the country came up with their own methods of managing their schools; the methods varied from downsizing administrative positions to fully implementing an empowerment model in some or all schools within the district (Czubaj, 1999).

Today, the empowerment school model or site based administration is adopted in various districts across the United States including Kalispell School District in Montana, Poway School District in California, Winona School District in Minnesota, Commack Union Free School District in New York, New York City Public Schhols, Everett Area School District in Pennsylvania, and Oakland Unified School District in California. The empowerment school model has also been implemented in various countries around the world including Norway, Finland, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, United Kingdom, France, Greece, Turkey, Columbia, Brazil, Nicaragua, Israel, and Canada. However, research has shown mixed results on the effectiveness of empowerment schools (Clark County School District, Department of Research and School Improvement, 2006).

In a qualitative study of three schools, Elmore (1995) found that in two of the schools, teachers did not change their teaching practices when the school was restructured. He found that while many teachers felt constrained by their current school structure, they often did not know how they would change their teaching if the structure were changed. However, Gaziel (2001) examined four schools in Israel over a four-year period to determine whether the Accelerated Schools Program had a positive effect on several factors including parental and staff attitudes and dropout rates. Results revealed that principals and teachers noted positive top-down changes in power structures, dropout rates decreased, teachers felt more empowered, parental involvement, student performance, and parental satisfaction increased, the school atmosphere became more positive. King, Orazem and Gunnarsson (2003) found that when decentralization is treated as a local choice rather than mandated from the central government, students' achievements see the greatest gain from autonomy. Theorists have identified factors that are critical for implementing empowered schools for maximum positive school outcomes.

For example, Gottlieb (2002) asserted that empowered schools must have faculty committees that make critical decisions on curriculum and instruction, trust among staff, strong leadership committed to collaboration, family and community involvement, an instructional program based on research and local and state standards, regular and effective professional development, and use of data for reforms. Rodriguez and Hovde (2002) believed that principals of empowerment schools must be provided with training, professional development, and technical support. Derouet (2000) asserted that empowered schools must recruit and train principals, strategically place courses and teach skills and methods into the empowerment plan; and have a grounded social philosophy that encourages the program. Similarly, Epp and MacNeil (1997) believe that commitment to an empowerment model, both from teachers and principals, and expectations of change and candor in conflict resolution is essential for shared governance to work.

The recent literature on the empowerment school process suggests implementing the empowerment concept at school sites can increase positive student, teacher and school wide outcomes. The sections below are a preliminary examination of CCSD specific outcomes after the implementation of the empowerment concept at four schools.

III. EMPOWERMENT SCHOOLS AT CCSD

In the 2006, four elementary schools were chosen to be empowerment schools. In order to become an empowerment school in the Clark County School District, all schools, site leadership, and staff had to meet specific CCSD requirements. Schools were chosen by the Central Design Team based on this eligibility. Once schools were chosen, there was an application process for site leadership and teachers. In all cases, current administrators and staff re-applied at the new empowerment school. Currently, empowerment schools consist about evenly of both newly hired staff and staff that reapplied and held positions at the schools previously.

CCSD supported empowerment schools with additional support and resources that were targeted for increasing student achievement. Schools also partnered with community members for added support. Additional annual support and resources for each school included[3]:

- Smaller Class Size--Student to teacher ratio of maximum 25:1 in core classes not otherwise governed by CCSD class size reduction requirements
- 29 minutes extra per teacher, per day
- 5 additional days per school year, per teacher
- $150,000 discretionary dollars
- 5% increase in principal pay
- 2% incentive pay for all licensed staff if specific achievement targets are met, as outlined in the Accountability Document
- $50,000 for 3 years + additional support from a Community Partner will be sought

A. Choosing Empowerment Schools

The Central Design Team examined several key variables in order to target schools that were achieving at or below average, and that mirrored CCSD's demographic profile. Key variables included:[4]

- Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) designations (overall, ELA and mathematics)
- At-Risk rating
- Achievement growth ranking
- Criterion Referenced Tests (CRTs)
- High School Proficiency Exams (HSPEs) (HS only)
- Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) verbal and math scores (HS only)
- Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) verbal and mathematics scores (HS only)
- Advanced Placement (AP) scores (HS only)
- American College Test (ACT) composite scores (HS only)
- Dropout percentage (HS only)
- Diploma rate (HS only)

Additionally, other variables considered by the Central Design Team included:

- Number of years of experience of the principal
- School calendars
- School demographics

[3] June 2007. Clark County School District: *Keys – Draft 8*.
[4] *Ibid, Draft 8.*

B. Empowerment School Leadership

One of the keys to creating strong empowerment schools is to choose "entrepreneurial, competent, and cutting-edge principals" to apply at each school.[5] The CCSD selected candidates based on their vision of what an empowerment school should be, and the method by which they believe a school should transition to an empowerment school. Only principals with the skills, knowledge, and qualities conducive to leading a CCSD empowerment school were considered.

C. Empowerment School Staff

Since Empowerment Schools start with an entirely new staff (principal, teachers and support staff), the staff of each school converted to "empowerment" was required to resign from their current assignment and then be re-interviewed and re-selected or relocated to another school. In addition, teachers are expected to meet specific performance requirements[6].

[5] *Ibid, Draft 8.*
[6] *Ibid, Draft 8.*

IV. PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

This preliminary report examines the effects of empowerment schools on student and school outcomes from available data at four CCSD schools. In October 2007, a full report of findings from the Empowerment School Study (ESS) team will be completed and made available for distribution.[7]

A. Research Design

The primary focus is to see if student achievement growth in empowerment schools differs from the growth of students who are not in empowerment schools. A quasi-experimental design which compared the academic and attitudinal changes of students in the four empowerment schools (treatment schools) are compared to the academic and attitudinal changes of students in four schools that are not empowerment schools (comparison schools). The comparison schools were selected using a matched sampling approach, using academic performance and demographic variables so that each empowerment school has a closely matched comparison school.

Table 1: Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools, September, 2006

School Type	Enroll	American Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Hispanic	Black	White	IEP	LEP	FRL
Empowerment/**Adams**	557	1.1%	8.8%	46.3%	8.8%	35.0%	14.2%	26.2%	46.1%
Comparison School #4	756	0.5%	7.8%	69.3%	7.9%	14.4%	10.1%	45.2%	73.0%
Empowerment/**Antonello**	766	0.4%	8.4%	25.1%	18.7%	47.5%	14.6%	9.8%	29.0%
Comparison School #3	772	0.8%	10.5%	24.6%	18.7%	45.5%	12.8%	8.0%	30.8%
Empowerment/**Culley**	916	0.4%	4.6%	54.9%	17.4%	22.7%	10.8%	31.8%	100.0%
Comparison School #2	964	0.6%	3.9%	68.2%	13.2%	14.1%	9.6%	49.9%	100.0%
Empowerment/**Warren**	671	1.9%	3.6%	66.0%	7.0%	21.5%	10.9%	42.6%	76.2%
Comparison[8] School #1	865	1.3%	3.4%	66.6%	5.7%	23.1%	8.9%	36.0%	74.6%

While the overall goal is to improve student academic achievement, there are several other secondary outcomes expected to occur when a school becomes an empowerment school. These secondary outcomes of parent, staff, and student involvement and attitudes, should increase as the overall goal of increasing student achievement occurs. Several outcome measures that the research literature supports as indicators of effective, high performing empowerment schools are examined:

- Student Math and Reading test scores (Iowa Test of Basic Skills; Criterion Reference Test)
- Student attendance
- Student discipline
- Parent, student, and staff attitudes/beliefs about their school

These outcomes will be measured using several data analysis techniques.

[7] The research team is comprised of members from the *UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment*, and the *Center for Outreach in School Leadership Development*, UNLV.

B. Methodology

To examine if there are differences between empowerment schools and comparison schools in several areas, difference in means are assessed with *t*-tests. The *t*-test is a method used to compute the probability that there is a statistical difference in the mean between two groups, in this case between empowerment schools and comparison schools. These analyses test the hypothesis (H_1) that there is a true difference in means between empowerment schools and control schools on some indicators above. The null hypothesis is that there is not a statistically significant difference in means between empowerment schools and comparison schools (H_0).

The *p*-level reported with a *t*-test represents the probability of error when determining if there is a difference in means. The *p*-level reported is the probability of error associated with rejecting the hypothesis of no difference between the two groups of schools (empowerment and comparison) when, in fact, the hypothesis is true.

In this report, the *t*-test will be used to test for statistical differences in means between empowerment schools and comparison schools for:

- Changes in third, fourth and fifth grade mathematics and reading CRT's from 2006 to 2007
- Changes in third and fourth grade mathematics and reading ITBS from 2006 to 2007
- Changes in average daily attendance rate from 2006 to 2007

Other analysis will be used when examining qualitative and anecdotal data. Content analysis and descriptive findings are used to explore:

- Changes in parent's perceptions about their child's school from 2006 to 2007
- Changes in student's perceptions about their school from 2006 to 2007
- Changes in CCSD staff's perceptions about their school from 2006 to 2007
- School created documents relating to the empowerment school process
- Teacher Learning Conditions

C. Data Analysis

1. Student Attendance

As local site leadership, parent, student, and staff input play a greater role in the decision making process, each of these groups become more involved with the school as a whole. These local groups feel more empowered as their input becomes more valuable in the decision making process as a whole. As involvement increases, it is hypothesized that student attendance will increase concurrently. The tables below show the attendance rates at each empowerment school and its comparison school.

Table 2 shows the change in attendance rate from the cumulative seventh school month in 2006 to the cumulative seventh school month in 2007. The top four rows show that there are minor and statistically insignificant changes in attendance rates for each empowerment school and its corresponding comparison school. The last row of the

table shows that when combining results of all empowerment schools and comparing them to the combined results of comparison schools, there was no statistically significant change in attendance rates between both groups.

Table 2: Change in Attendance Rates - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	0.3%	0.5%	No
Antonello and Comparison School #3	0.0%	1.5%	No
Culley and Comparison School #2	-1.6%	-2.3%	No
Warren and Comparison School #1	0.1%	1.5%	No
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	-0.3%	0.3%	No

2. Norm Referenced Tests – Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS)

The tables below show the change in ITBS mean test for empowerment schools compared to changes in comparison schools. Both mathematics and reading scores were used in the analyses.

a. Mathematics. In table three, both Adams Elementary school and Culley Elementary had larger positive changes in the ITBS mean mathematics score than their respective comparative schools. In each of these cases, the gains made in empowerment schools in ITBS mathematics are statistically significantly greater than in their comparative counterparts.

In the comparison between Antonello Elementary and Warren Elementary empowerment schools, both show positive increases in mathematics mean scores on the ITBS, but neither were significantly greater than their respective comparison school. In fact, the comparison school matched to Warren Elementary performed statistically significantly more positive in mathematics performance on the ITBS that did Warren Elementary.

Table 3: Change in Mean MATHEMATICS ITBS Scores, Grade 3 to Grade 4 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

MATHEMATICS ITBS Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	**18.7***	14.6	**Yes**
Antonello and Comparison School #3	15.8	17.1	No
Culley and Comparison School #2	**19.6***	10.8	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	10.7	**24.1***	**Yes**
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	16.3	16.8	No

*This change was statistically significant at $p<.05$

b. Reading. In table four, Culley Elementary had larger positive changes in reading scores than its respective comparative school. Culley Elementary gains made in reading are positively statistically significantly greater than its comparison school.

In the comparison between Adams Elementary, Antonello Elementary and Warren Elementary empowerment schools, all show positive increases in reading mean scores on the ITBS, but none were statistically significantly greater than their respective comparison school. In fact, the comparison school matched to Warren Elementary performed statistically significantly more positive in reading performance on the ITBS that did Warren Elementary.

Table 4: Change in Mean READING ITBS Scores, Grade 3 to Grade 4 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

READING ITBS Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	19.3	16.6	No
Antonello and Comparison School #3	18.3	17.3	No
Culley and Comparison School #2	**17.5***	10.5	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	12.5	**17.9***	**Yes**
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	17.1	15.5	No

*This change was statistically significant at p<.05

3. Criterion Referenced Tests – THIRD to FOURTH GRADE CHANGE

The tables below show the change from third to fourth grade CRT mean test scores from 2006 to 2007 for empowerment schools compared to changes from 2006 to 2007 in CRT mean test scores in comparison schools. Both mathematics and reading scores were used in the analyses. While CRT's from one grade are not vertically aligned to CRT's at another grade, these analyses can show if empowerment schools had larger statistically significant changes than comparison schools. The changes noted in these analyses are not interpreted to be growth.

a. Mathematics. In table five, both Antonello Elementary school and Culley Elementary had larger positive changes in CRT mathematics scores than their respective comparative schools. In each of these cases, the changes made in the CRT mathematic mean score are statistically significantly greater than their comparison school counterpart.

In the comparison between Adams Elementary and its comparison school, Adams shows an increase in mathematics mean score on the CRT, but it was not statistically significantly greater than its respective comparison school. Warren Elementary showed a decrease in the mean CRT mathematics test score.

Table 5: Change in Mean MATHEMATICS CRT Scores, Grade 3 to Grade 4 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

MATHEMATICS CRT Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	17.9	29.4	No
Antonello and Comparison School #3	**41.3***	24.3	**Yes**
Culley and Comparison School #2	**76.1***	26.6	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	-15.2	**58.1***	**Yes**
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	32.5	35.2	No

*This change was statistically significant at p<.05

b. Reading. In table six, both Antonello Elementary school and Culley Elementary had larger positive changes in their CRT mean reading score than their respective comparative schools. In each of these cases, the changes made in reading are statistically significantly greater than their comparison school counterparts.

In the comparison between Adams Elementary and its comparison school, Adams shows an increase in its CRT mean reading score, but it was not statistically significantly greater than its respective comparison school. Warren Elementary showed an increase in its mean CRT reading score, but it was not as great as the increase as its comparison school counterpart.

Overall, the difference in change scores made by Empowerment schools compared to their comparison school counterparts in grade three and four CRT reading scores was statistically significant.

Table 6: Change in Mean READING CRT Scores, Grade 3 to Grade 4 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

READING CRT Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	8.0	10.7	No
Antonello and Comparison School #3	**18.5***	-5.0	**Yes**
Culley and Comparison School #2	**53.3***	15.9	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	8.2	18.4	No
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	**22.0***	10.1	**Yes**

*This change was statistically significant at p<.05

4. Criterion Referenced Tests – FOURTH to FIFTH GRADE CHANGE

The tables below show the change from fourth to fifth grade CRT mean test scores from 2006 to 2007 for empowerment schools compared to changes from 2006 to 2007 in CRT mean test scores in comparison schools. Both mathematics and reading scores were used in the analyses. While CRT's from one grade are not vertically aligned to CRT's at another grade, these analyses can show if empowerment schools had larger statistically significant changes than comparison schools. The changes noted in these analyses are not interpreted to be growth.

a. Mathematics. In table seven, Culley Elementary had larger positive changes in CRT mathematics scores than its respective comparative schools. For Culley, the change made in the CRT mathematic mean score is statistically significantly greater than its comparison school counterpart.

In the comparison between Antonello Elementary and its comparison school, Antonello shows an increase in mathematics mean score on the CRT, but it was not statistically significantly greater than its respective comparison school. Adams Elementary also showed an increase, but not as large as it's comparison school counterpart. However, the differences in change between Adams Elementary and its comparison school were not statistically significant. Warren Elementary showed a decrease in the mean CRT mathematics test score, while its comparison school counterpart also showed a negative change.

Table 7: Change in Mean MATHEMATICS CRT Scores, Grade 4 to Grade 5 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

MATHEMATICS CRT Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	11.8	14.2	No
Antonello and Comparison School #3	4.1	-2.4	No
Culley and Comparison School #2	**32.3***	12.8	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	-12.5	-7.0	No
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	9.7	3.9	No

*This change was statistically significant at p<.05

b. Reading. In table eight, Antonello Elementary school, Culley Elementary and Warren Elementary had larger positive changes in their CRT mean reading score than their respective comparative schools. However, only the difference in change made by Culley Elementary is statistically significantly greater than its comparison school counterpart.

Adams Elementary showed a decrease in the mean CRT reading test score, while its comparison school counterpart showed an increase. This difference in change scores was statistically significant.

Overall, the difference in change scores made by Empowerment schools compared to their comparison school counterparts in fourth and fifth grade reading was statistically significant.

Table 8: Change in Mean READING CRT Scores, Grade 4 to Grade 5 2006 to 2007 - Empowerment Schools with Matched Comparison Schools

READING CRT Matched School Comparisons	Empowerment School change	Comparison School Change	Statistical Significance
Adams and Comparison School #4	-6.4	**10.0***	**Yes**
Antonello and Comparison School #3	1.6	-7.6	No
Culley and Comparison School #2	**31.3***	8.0	**Yes**
Warren and Comparison School #1	2.9	-7.0	No
Aggregated School Comparison			
All Empowerment Schools and Comparison Schools	**7.7***	0.2	**Yes**

*This change was statistically significant at p<.05

5. Percent of Students Non-Proficient

These tables represent the empowerment schools and their respective comparison schools. The number of students column represents the number of students continuously enrolled since count day that participated in the CRT testing. Each subgroup and program group is listed. The Safe Harbor column represents the percent reduction of non-proficient students between 05-06 and 06-07. This column also represents the reduction in non-proficient students as reported in the 2007 AYP report as it demonstrates the performance difference between the previous school year and the current year. The difference column represents the comparison between each empowerment school and its comparison school, factoring in the differences in numbers of students.

Table 9: Adams and Comparison School #4 (AYP Preliminary Report *6-15-07*)

		Adams		Comparison #4		
ELA	**Population**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Difference**
	School	300.0	0.0%	319.5	12.6%	-14.4%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	3.0	0.0%	0.0	n/a	n/a
	Asian / Pacific Islander	33.0	0.0%	17.5	n/a	n/a
	Hispanic / Latino	136.5	0.0%	236.0	14.1%	-16.4%
	Black / African American	28.5	0.0%	26.5	0.0%	0.0%
	White / Caucasian	99.0	17.9%	39.5	48.2%	-58.5%
	IEP	48.5	8.8%	29.5	0.0%	11.5%
	LEP	90.0	0.0%	182.0	8.2%	-8.9%
	FRL	116.5	20.5%	226.5	13.0%	12.0%
Math	School	298.0	9.1%	317.0	0.0%	10.2%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	3.0	0.0%	0.0	n/a	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	33.0	0.0%	17.0	n/a	0.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	136.0	0.0%	235.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Black / African American	28.0	0.0%	26.0	0.0%	0.0%
	White / Caucasian	98.0	58.2%	39.0	59.3%	-2.7%
	IEP	48.0	9.3%	28.0	0.0%	12.1%
	LEP	90.0	0.0%	181.0	7.4%	-8.0%
	FRL	115.0	13.2%	224.0	0.0%	15.3%

Table 10: Antonello and Comparison School #3 (AYP Preliminary Report *6-15-07*)

		Antonello		Comparison #3		
ELA	**Population**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Difference**
	School	391.5	34.6%	427.5	6.5%	34.0%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	2.0	0.0%	6.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	33.0	72.8%	59.5	21.1%	73.6%
	Hispanic / Latino	113.0	27.7%	123.0	0.0%	30.5%
	Black / African American	70.0	38.3%	81.0	0.0%	42.2%
	White / Caucasian	173.5	47.5%	158.0	19.6%	38.8%
	IEP	51.0	28.3%	52.5	0.0%	32.6%
	LEP	53.0	15.6%	46.0	20.7%	-6.4%
	FRL	122.0	32.8%	102.5	10.2%	29.1%
Math	School	389.0	33.3%	424.0	-112.00%	28.6%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	2.0	0.0%	6.0	0.00%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	33.0	81.4%	60.0	50.90%	75.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	112.0	33.0%	122.0	0.00%	36.0%
	Black / African American	69.0	38.5%	80.0	18.30%	30.7%
	White / Caucasian	173.0	31.0%	156.0	13.50%	23.7%
	IEP	50.0	44.9%	52.0	0.00%	49.7%
	LEP	53.0	18.9%	46.0	15.70%	9.9%
	FRL	121.0	19.6%	101.0	0.00%	22.0%

Table 11: Culley and Comparison School #2 (AYP Preliminary Report *6-15-07*)

		Culley		**Comparison #2**		
ELA	**Population**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Difference**
	School	342.5	30.7%	343.0	12.5%	23.2%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	2.0	0.0%	3.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	16.0	0.0%	16.5	0.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	205.0	33.9%	250.0	13.3%	26.8%
	Black / African American	55.5	27.3%	29.5	31.2%	-5.7%
	White / Caucasian	64.0	39.5%	44.0	0.0%	43.6%
	IEP	26.0	18.2%	36.5	6.4%	18.8%
	LEP	145.0	28.5%	205.0	11.3%	22.7%
	FRL	342.5	30.9%	339.0	12.2%	23.7%
Math	School	341.0	44.5%	334.0	11.5%	39.7%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	2.0	0.0%	3.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	16.0	0.0%	16.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	204.0	44.4%	245.0	12.7%	39.5%
	Black / African American	55.0	40.1%	27.0	13.9%	37.8%
	White / Caucasian	64.0	58.6%	43.0	0.0%	62.8%
	IEP	26.0	15.2%	36.0	23.5%	-10.9%
	LEP	145.0	44.6%	203.0	8.6%	42.8%
	FRL	341.0	44.6%	333.0	11.0%	40.2%

Table 12: Warren and Comparison School #1 (AYP Preliminary Report *6-15-07*)

		Warren		Comparison #1		
ELA	**Population**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Number of Students**	**Safe Harbor**	**Difference**
	School	311.5	14.7%	369.0	20.4%	-7.2%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	1.0	0.0%	2.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	10.5	0.0%	16.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	224.0	17.0%	248.5	12.7%	7.5%
	Black / African American	23.5	0.0%	16.0	0.0%	0.0%
	White / Caucasian	52.5	0.0%	86.5	35.0%	-53.9%
	IEP	33.0	35.5%	31.5	20.9%	27.9%
	LEP	159.0	16.6%	190.5	20.5%	-4.9%
	FRL	196.5	18.0%	248.0	15.4%	5.9%
Math	School	308.0	0.0%	368.0	25.5%	-34.2%
	American Indian / Alaskan Native	1.0	0.0%	2.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	10.0	0.0%	16.0	0.0%	0.0%
	Hispanic / Latino	222.0	0.0%	248.0	22.7%	-29.4%
	Black / African American	23.0	0.0%	16.0	0.0%	0.0%
	White / Caucasian	52.0	0.0%	86.0	25.5%	-34.2%
	IEP	33.0	23.1%	31.0	34.8%	-17.9%
	LEP	157.0	0.0%	190.0	15.7%	-18.6%
	FRL	194.0	0.0%	247.0	22.2%	-28.5%

The following table represents the percent decrease of non-proficient students of the empowerment schools compared to the comparison schools. On average, the empowerment schools outperformed the comparison schools. It is important to note that differences exist between each empowerment school and its comparison and differences exist between subgroup and program group performance in each school.

Table 13: Empowerment and Comparison Schools Average Growth (AYP Preliminary Report *6-15-07*)

		Adams Comparison 4	Antonello Comparison 3	Culley Comparison 2	Warren Comparison 1	Overall
ELA	Population	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference	Average
	School	-14.4%	34.0%	23.2%	-7.2%	8.9%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	n/a	73.6%	0.0%	0.0%	24.5%
	Hispanic / Latino	-16.4%	30.5%	26.8%	7.5%	12.1%
	Black / African American	0.0%	42.2%	-5.7%	0.0%	9.1%
	White / Caucasian	-58.5%	38.8%	43.6%	-53.9%	-7.5%
	IEP	11.5%	32.6%	18.8%	27.9%	22.7%
	LEP	-8.9%	-6.4%	22.7%	-4.9%	0.6%
	FRL	12.0%	29.1%	23.7%	5.9%	17.7%
MATH	School	10.2%	28.6%	39.7%	-34.2%	11.1%
	Asian / Pacific Islander	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	0.0%	18.7%
	Hispanic / Latino	0.0%	36.0%	39.5%	-29.4%	11.5%
	Black / African American	0.0%	30.7%	37.8%	0.0%	17.1%
	White / Caucasian	-2.7%	23.7%	62.8%	-34.2%	12.4%
	IEP	12.1%	49.7%	-10.9%	-17.9%	8.2%
	LEP	-8.0%	9.9%	42.8%	-18.6%	6.5%
	FRL	15.3%	22.0%	40.2%	-28.5%	12.3%

6. Parent, Student and Staff Attitudes

The Clark County School District administers a district-wide survey annually to all parents, staff and students. The intent of this survey is to examine each group's attitudes about various district and school wide issues. The responses are analyzed by whole district, region, school, and department. Approximately 30 questions are asked every year, with 26 questions being consistent from year to year. Those questions form the basis for the descriptive analysis below.

Table 14 shows the difference in the percent of positive responses from the 2005-2006 to the 2006-2007 District Wide Surveys. The results from the four empowerment schools and the four comparison schools were combined to form a within-group average for each question by parents, staff, and students. Green indicates when the empowerment school differences were more positive than the comparison school differences[9].

Table 14: District Wide Survey Results - Overall Comparison of Parent, Staff, and Student Percent Positive Response Change 2005-2006 to 2006-2007

QUESTIONS	PARENT MEAN CHANGE		STAFF MEAN CHANGE		STUDENT MEAN CHANGE	
	Empowerment	Comparison	Empowerment	Comparison	Empowerment	Comparison
Safe at School	(0.4)	(3.1)	(11.3)	(9.6)	2.0	3.8
Clean Environment	2.8	(2.6)	(12.3)	3.0	0.8	(0.2)
Adequate Facilities	1.6	(0.5)	(13.8)	(3.2)	0.6	0.9
Welcome at School	2.5	(1.4)	0.0	0.0	(0.8)	1.2
Shared Decision Making	3.5	1.2	0.8	(8.3)	6.4	(3.2)
Assigned Homework Activities Involve Parents	(3.6)	(0.5)	9.8	6.2	4.3	(6.6)
Staff Accessibility for Parents	4.3	(1.1)	(0.9)	(1.9)	0.0	0.0
Staff Accessibility for Students	0.0	0.0	1.6	(2.1)	8.5	1.5
Region Accessibility	1.8	(0.4)	0.1	(12.9)	0.0	0.0
Fair Treatment of Students	(1.5)	(1.3)	2.3	(0.6)	2.4	(2.2)
Special Needs Programs Availability	(1.0)	(1.5)	(4.0)	(10.0)	2.2	0.6
High Academic Expectations	4.0	(4.7)	2.2	(6.2)	5.0	3.4
Learning Basic Skills - Reading, Writing, Math	(3.5)	(3.5)	7.1	1.3	0.0	(0.4)
Learning Other Subjects	(0.6)	(2.4)	8.0	(5.2)	(0.7)	(0.7)
Academic Progress Communication	(0.5)	(1.2)	(2.1)	8.4	1.9	(2.2)
Attendance & Behavior Communication	0.7	(0.6)	(3.2)	(14.8)	3.9	(1.1)
Transportation Communication	4.6	0.8	8.1	(4.9)	0.0	0.0
Academic Assistance Opportunities	2.1	4.8	3.1	4.3	2.3	0.3
Academic Resources Availability	(3.5)	(0.6)	1.2	(11.7)	2.1	1.7
Student Technology Use	0.5	(3.2)	8.9	6.9	6.8	(2.5)
Student Recognition	(1.5)	(2.6)	3.2	3.2	6.0	(0.7)
Extra Curricular Activities	10.8	1.2	11.8	7.5	11.2	5.3
Responsible Citizenship	1.5	(2.2)	13.5	(8.0)	2.3	2.3
Enthusiasm for Learning	1.9	(2.8)	(1.9)	(5.5)	4.1	(1.3)
Character Development	2.9	1.7	15.3	(6.1)	1.6	0.3
Career Education	(2.4)	0.4	7.7	12.7	6.4	(1.1)

[9] Increases from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007 are indicated by black text. Decreases from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007 are indicated by numbers in red parentheses.

Table 15 shows the percent of positive responses for each question for the empowerment and comparison groups by parents, staff, and students. Green indicates when a higher percentage of parents, staff, or students answered positively at the empowerment schools than at the comparison schools.

Table 15: District Wide Survey Results - Overall Comparison of Parent, Staff, and Student Percent Positive Responses for the 2006-2007 survey.

2006-2007	PARENT Positive Responses		STAFF Positive Responses		STUDENT Positive Responses	
	Empowerment	Comparison	Empowerment	Comparison	Empowerment	Comparison
Safe at School	94.6	88.5	74.5	86.4	89.4	91.2
Clean Environment	96.4	92.1	80.8	88.6	65.5	68.1
Adequate Facilities	94.4	91.1	72.0	73.7	94.8	93.8
Welcome at School	92.6	88.2	0.0	0.0	93.7	94.1
Shared Decision Making	91.0	84.8	84.3	64.6	87.7	83.1
Assigned Homework Activities Involve Parents	92.6	93.7	77.6	67.6	75.4	75.3
Staff Accessibility for Parents	96.6	91.0	99.1	95.5	0.0	0.0
Staff Accessibility for Students	0.0	0.0	100.0	96.9	88.7	85.1
Region Accessibility	92.0	88.7	83.5	63.6	0.0	0.0
Fair Treatment of Students	95.6	93.1	88.2	91.0	85.7	80.0
Special Needs Programs Availability	91.4	90.0	84.9	71.9	94.4	93.6
High Academic Expectations	91.4	84.2	91.8	78.0	91.5	87.4
Learning Basic Skills - Reading, Writing, Math	95.0	94.1	96.4	90.2	97.0	95.9
Learning Other Subjects	96.8	92.2	92.5	80.7	96.4	95.3
Academic Progress Communication	93.9	96.0	94.8	96.5	89.7	86.3
Attendance & Behavior Communication	96.3	96.2	95.3	82.6	87.6	81.6
Transportation Communication	79.7	77.9	90.3	82.9	0.0	0.0
Academic Assistance Opportunities	90.2	85.0	97.4	90.9	94.1	90.7
Academic Resources Availability	92.4	93.2	87.9	78.5	87.1	85.3
Student Technology Use	85.8	84.6	85.9	79.3	82.3	76.1
Student Recognition	88.5	87.9	91.4	88.0	90.8	87.1
Extra Curricular Activities	90.1	82.4	92.2	83.4	91.3	88.9
Responsible Citizenship	96.4	94.0	87.2	75.1	93.4	92.8
Enthusiasm for Learning	97.1	94.3	80.2	73.4	89.3	81.8
Character Development	96.0	95.0	92.8	84.6	90.8	90.9
Career Education	81.7	81.8	78.1	77.8	84.8	79.8

Overall, on the District Wide Survey, empowerment school's parents, staff and students answered more positively on a greater number of questions than did parents, staff and students at comparison schools. (Parents: 76%; Staff: 76%; Student: 75%).

7. Teacher Learning Conditions Survey

The Nevada Teaching and Learning Conditions Online Survey (TLC) is administered annually (2006, 2007) to all teachers and administrators in the Clark County School District. This survey, jointly supported by the Clark County School District (CCSD) and the Clark County Education Association (CCEA), asks educators to report on their perceptions of factors related to teacher retention and student learning. These factors include the domains of time, facilities and resources, empowerment, leadership, and professional development (retrieved from www.nvtlc.org).

The 2007 survey was administered online from March 26 through April 20, 2007. Overall, in Clark County, 18,602 educators were invited to participate, with 8,959 completing the survey for a response rate of 48.16%[10]. Table 16 depicts the response rate and five domain results for each of the schools involved with the empowerment study. Each domain is representative of a composite of survey questions that describes each area. A response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) was used for each question, thus the scores reported in Table 16 are the averages for each subset of items representing each domain.

Table 16: 2007 Teaching and Learning Conditions Survey Results

	Response Rate	Time	Facilities and Resources	Empowerment	Leadership	Professional Development
Clark County School District	48.16%	3.08	3.69	3.23	3.48	3.51
Empowerment Schools						
Adams	60.00%	3.34	4.09	4.00	3.98	3.84
Antonello	89.47%	4.35	4.58	4.63	4.65	4.50
Culley	88.41%	3.43	3.35	3.94	4.00	3.84
Warren	N/A*	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Empowerment Average	79.29%	3.71	4.01	4.19	4.21	4.06
Comparison Schools						
Comparison #4	76.56%	2.87	3.69	2.36	2.87	3.47
Comparison #3	48.57%	3.40	3.79	3.21	3.15	3.35
Comparison #2	65.67%	3.00	3.77	3.42	3.60	3.85
Comparison #1	46.55%	2.92	3.35	2.65	2.95	3.02
Comparison Average	59.34%	3.05	3.65	2.91	3.14	3.42

**Note.* Warren Empowerment School did not meet the minimum required 35% response rate necessary for school-level data to be reported.

The data in Table 16 indicates that, on average, in all five domains, the empowerment school attitudes were more positive than the district average, whereas the comparison schools reported more negative perceptions and attitudes than the district average. The largest gap between the two groups was in

[10] Statistics and information from the 2007 school reports compiled by the Center for Teaching Quality. For more information regarding the survey, please refer to the website: www.nvtlc.org.

the domain of empowerment. The empowerment domain included questions such as, "Teachers are centrally involved in decision-making about educational issues"; "In this school we take steps to solve problems"; and "Parents and community members have opportunities to contribute to students' success".

The survey also included general questions and items related to mentoring. One of these questions focused on teacher intentions for their future professional plans. The overall CCSD response to this question indicated that 71.15% of staff planned to stay at the same school, 12.77% of staff planned to move to another position in CCSD, and 16.08% planned to leave the district. The results of this question indicated that intentions to continue working at the same school ranged from 36.11% to 72.73% at the comparison schools, with an average of 56.09%. At the empowerment schools, 85.58% of staff indicated intentions to stay at their current school, with responses ranging from 73.91% to 93.94%.

Taken together, the results from the 2007 TLC survey indicate that empowerment schools have successfully created a positive, empowering climate for teaching and learning. Further, these results may indicate that empowerment schools also have a higher than average retention rate of staff.

8. Discipline Incidents

Table 17 illustrates the total number of discipline incidence by type for both the empowerment schools group and comparison schools groups. According to the compiled data, the empowerment schools group had 41% fewer overall discipline incident during the 2006 school year. Green indicates when the empowerment schools outperformed the comparison schools.

Table 17: Number of Discipline Incidents by School Group

Type of Incident	Empowerment Schools Totals	Comparison Schools Totals	Difference
Absence	7	29	22
Alcohol Possession	1	0	(1)
Arson	5	2	(3)
Battery	14	19	5
Cont Infraction	0	4	4
Dress Code	2	11	9
Extortion	2	3	1
Fighting	220	304	84
Fire Alarm Pull	2	3	1
Habitual Disciplinary Expulsions	15	13	(2)
Habitual Ref	1	1	0
Harassment	24	29	5
Immoral Conduct	12	18	6
Informat Only	3	1	(2)
Insubordinate	123	127	4
Intimidation	4	5	1

Type of Incident	Empowerment Schools Totals	Comparison Schools Totals	Difference
No Show - Detention	3	0	(3)
No Show Office	0	3	3
Nuisance Item	13	12	(1)
Possess Controlled Substance	1	0	(1)
Possess Weapons	19	25	6
Se Rem Weapon/Drug	1	0	(1)
Spec Program	0	1	1
Tardies	6	6	0
Theft	21	18	(3)
Threat to Staff	5	4	(1)
Threat to Student	16	40	24
Trespassing	1	3	2
Truancy	8	17	9
Unacceptable Behavior	548	898	350
Unacceptable Language	9	52	43
Vandalism	18	20	2
Verbal Abuse	5	6	1
Verbal Confrontation	2	6	4
Violence to Staff	15	10	(5)
Violence to Student	142	68	(74)
504	1	0	(1)
Other	82	123	41
TOTAL	**1,351**	**1,881**	**530**

V. QUALITATIVE DATA

The section below gives a description of empowerment programs at each of the empowerment schools. Each school has utilized a different approach towards all aspects of school life, including teaching practices, academic programs, school structure, and meeting basic needs.

Adams

In order to increase students and teacher's opportunity to learn for the 2006-2007 school year, Kirk Adams extended school day by 10 minutes, provided an additional 29 minutes for all staff for collaboration, an additional 5 days for staff development and parent involvement, hired intervention specialists to assist teachers in providing focused interventions for struggling students, created elective classes every Friday for content integration and student motivation, enhanced technology school-wide, and upgraded their library collection and environment.

Adams also provides before and after school programs include individualized tutoring, ELLIS language program, Mad Science, Schoolhouse Chess, chorus, art club, tutoring from local high school students, middle school students, and community volunteers. In an effort to continue school-wide success, Adams has proposed full-day kindergarten, adding an additional 34 minutes to the school day, early release time on Fridays for staff collaboration and focused staff development, and additional staff for extra support for struggling students for the 2007-2008 school year.

Kirk Adams is a fully-inclusive response to intervention (RTI) elementary school which ensures that students receive scientifically based instruction before special education referrals can be made. In an effort to increase all students' performance Adams supports general education teachers with four self-contained special education teachers, two resource special education teachers, 13 specialist and support teachers, and 20 support staff. All grade levels collaborate weekly on lesson planning, assessments, parent communication, grading, and homework. Common scheduling across grade levels ensures student sharing and inclusion.

All students are leveled for reading and language arts instruction in grades 1-3. Student progress is monitored and instruction is provided at the level of the student with the help of special education teachers, instructional assistants, LIT, and ELL efforts. Student progress is monitored and instruction is provided at the level of the student.

Antonello
Antonello has developed lead teams to function as the governing body for the school. Members of the lead teams, consisting of two teachers per grade level, a specialist, and a special education representative, are responsible for student achievement and collaboration regarding their assigned group. These teams consist of two teachers per grade level, one specialist, and one special education representative.

The empowerment teacher team, composed of intervention specialists and administration, has also been created to provide interventions and data collection for individual student. This team collects and disseminates school-wide data, provides teacher mentoring and training, and implement Reflective Practice and University Partnership Programs. Expert groups consist of representatives from all academic areas, school climate, diversity, technology, and science who become experts in their chosen fields and act as resources for fellow teachers.

In an effort to improve instructional practices, teachers at Antonello observe peers and discuss best practices, implement research-based programs, and implement a tiered reading model for reading instruction. Students are grouped according to ability level, special education students are placed in inclusive classrooms with individualized instruction, and all students' progress is monitored weekly. Additional time is set aside for structured teacher planning time for all grade levels and, the parent-teacher conference scheduled has been extended to accommodate student-led conferences.

Additional interventions to increase student achievement include: extended day programs offered in six-week sessions twice a year, specialized computer-based reading interventions, extended day science exploration, Saturday tutoring, and extended day instruction for students to choose an elective to develop a variety of high interest skills. In addition to the aforementioned interventions, Antonello also offers extended day kindergarten instruction with an overlapping day for kindergarten teachers to collaborate, which also provides forty minutes per day of additional instruction.

Cully
Paul Cully Elementary School has created a partnership with MGM/Mirage which provides the school with additional funds and resources. The school has created the Paul Culley Neighborhood Association, after-school empowerment clubs, before-school tutoring, parenting classes, computer classes for parents, and a job fair for parents. Five additional teacher days have been added for staff development along with added minutes to the school day, before and after school tutoring opportunities, and a literacy lab. A science lab and math lab have been proposed for the 2007-2008 school year.

Cully has partnered with Corps of Compassion to provide free bread to families once a week, implemented student award assemblies and community connection nights, and planted a garden with the help from MGM/Mirage. In an effort to further facilitate family involvement in education, Cully has developed a Family Leadership Institute, ensures all correspondence in English and Spanish, and holds a Student of the Month luncheon.

Warren

Warren has set up learning communities, which allows teachers to work together collaboratively with the same group of students over several years. Teachers are also able to form stronger relationships with students and families and to have better understanding of students' academic and social-emotional needs.

Warren has worked with CCSD to develop a progress report format that supports students being partners in self-assessment and goal setting. Examples include the use of growth model throughout the curriculum, portfolios, performance-based assessment, and peer assessment.

Warren is making use of community-based partners to facilitate the education and advancement of their students. Examples include the purchase of a school-wide independent reading program; organization members volunteering time to tutor students; community-based field trips; and the use of community and district personnel to provide presentations connecting their area of expertise to the classroom. Leadership trainings, a parent center, classroom supplies, and books were among other fully-funded entities during the 2006-2007 school year.

Warren initiated teachers engaging in self-assessment as part of the evaluation process. Time has been set aside for teachers to meet in order to reflect on practice, receive professional development specific to their needs, and examine student progress. Teams meet with university faculty, attend conferences and classes, utilize consultants in the field, and, used funding toward the purchase of professional literature as part of their professional development activities.

Warren is practicing full inclusion with self-contained classrooms. In preparation for the 2007-2008 school year, Warren is creating model classrooms taught by lead teachers to be used for demonstration purposes in the fall.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In general, educational initiatives in their first year of implementation are in a process of change and adjustment. This is especially true of initiatives that are based on systemic or holistic change. Empowerment schools at the Clark County School District have completed one year in the empowerment process, and in some cases, have already partially accomplished the objective of increasing student achievement and increasing positive parent, student, and staff attitudes towards schools. Empowerment schools have, on average, moved more students out of non-proficiency status than have schools that were in the comparison group. Additionally, in some academic areas of the CRT's and ITBS, empowerment schools are making larger positive change.

It is important to note that while all four schools were designated empowerment schools, each school has a very different vision of the best means by which to increase student achievement. These strategies factor in the diversity of the student demographics, economic status, and background. Each empowerment school will have a different approach to its top priorities, and will move at an appropriate pace in order to accomplish goals. It is expected that as schools move into their second and third years of empowerment, more information will be generate that can be used to determine the effect that empowerment status has on students and schools.