In this section, we present the details of the longitudinal sample of NAS schools.

**THE POPULATION OF NEW AMERICAN SCHOOLS FOR THE LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION**

The original sample of schools consisted of those schools initiating implementation of NAS designs in eight jurisdictions that NAS named as its partners during scale-up in either 1995–1996 or 1996–1997.\(^1\) These eight jurisdictions included:

- Cincinnati;
- Dade;
- Kentucky;
- Memphis;
- Philadelphia;
- Pittsburgh;
- San Antonio; and
- Washington state.

\(^1\)At the time we decided on the longitudinal sample of schools, Maryland and San Diego were not far enough along in their implementation to warrant inclusion in RAND’s planned data collection efforts. Since then, several of the design teams report that they are implementing in Maryland and San Diego.
The choice of these jurisdictions reflected RAND’s desire to obtain a sample including all the designs that were participating in the scale-up phase and the judgment that the costs of working in the additional jurisdictions would not yield commensurate benefits. While jurisdictions and their support of the NAS reform will no doubt continue to change over time, these jurisdictions reflect a range of support for implementation—from relatively supportive to no support at all (see Bodilly, 1998).

THE 1998 FINAL ANALYSIS SAMPLE

Our aim was to collect data on all the NAS schools that were to be implementing within the partner jurisdictions. NAS believed that as of early fall 1996, there were 256 schools implementing NAS designs across these eight jurisdictions. However, based on conversations with design teams, jurisdictions, and the schools, the sample was reduced to 184 schools for several reasons:

- There were 51 Roots & Wings schools in Dade that were low-performing and on the verge of serious sanctions, so the district promised these schools that they would not be burdened with researchers.

- An additional 21 schools declined to participate because they did not want to be burdened with research, were not implementing, or dropped the design.

Thus, for our surveys of teachers and principals, the target sample was 184 schools (see Table B.1). To some extent, limiting our sample to schools that were implementing and were not on the verge of serious sanctions biases our sample in a positive direction in terms of expected implementation.

Of the 184 schools in our 1997 sample, we completed interviews with 155 principals. Based on our interviews with principals in the spring of 1997, most of these schools reported they were indeed implement-
Table B.1
1997 Target Sample for RAND’s Longitudinal Sample: Principal Interviews and Teacher Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>CON</th>
<th>EL</th>
<th>MRSH</th>
<th>NARE</th>
<th>RW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ing a design. Yet, some were not. Figure B.1 shows that 25 of the 155 schools (about 15 percent) reported that they were in an exploratory year or a planning year with implementation expected in the future. About 85 percent (130/155) of the schools for which we had teacher, principal, and district data reported implementing a NAS design to some extent.

Because our interest is in understanding the specific activities that are occurring within the 130 schools that were implementing a NAS design to some extent (the non-white areas of Figure B.1), we limited our analysis sample to these 130 schools.

In the spring of 1998, all 184 schools were once again surveyed. The completed sample size of implementing schools consisted of 142

---

2The first question we asked principals was about the status of the school’s partnership with a NAS design. Principals could respond that they were in an exploratory year (that is, the school has not committed to a design yet); in a planning year (the school has partnered with a design team and is planning for implementation next school year); in initial implementation for part of the school (i.e., a subset of the staff is implementing); continuing implementation for part of the school; in initial implementation for the whole school (i.e., all or most of the staff are working with the design); or continuing implementation for the whole school.

3These were schools that had complete principal data, at least five teachers responding to the teacher surveys, and complete district data.
schools. However, the overlap between the 1997 and 1998 samples was incomplete. For purposes of this analysis, which is partly longitudinal in nature, we limited the analysis sample to schools that met two criteria:

- Schools were implementing in both 1997 and 1998; and
- Schools had complete data (i.e., from teachers and principals) in both years.

Of the 130 schools implementing in 1997 for which we had complete data, seven had either dropped the design or had reverted to planning and another 17 had missing or incomplete data. Thus, 106 schools met both criteria. Figure B.2 shows the derivation of the sample.
Of these 106 schools, there were two schools in Pittsburgh that we later discovered were not implementing and had dropped the design. In fact, throughout RAND’s monitoring of the schools in Pittsburgh, there were severe budget crises. RAND’s site visits and principal phone interviews consistently revealed that NAS implementation in Pittsburgh was not taking place (also see Bodilly, 1998). As a result, these two schools (and Pittsburgh) were excluded from the analyses reported here; our final sample for the analysis consisted of 104 schools across seven jurisdictions.