HOUSTON EDUCATION Leadership Partners
Proven Success Priceless Results

ARA SYSTEM™ / SCHOOL CONDITIONS DIAGNOSTIC

Wright Elementary

Four Paths of Influence + Eight Integrated ARA Conditions

Gilmour ISD | Source administration: Fall 2025 | Teachers: n = 22 | School leaders: n = 3

THE CENTRAL MESSAGE

Wright reports positive teacher commitment, trust, and instructional practices. The areas most worth exploring are student behavior and instructional interruptions, teacher participation and individualized support, and staff perceptions of family-related conditions. These are hypotheses for leadership inquiry, not established causes or predictions.

Executive action snapshot

PRESERVE	EXAMINE	FOCUS NEXT
Teacher commitment (4.30), trust (4.11), collective efficacy (4.06), classroom instruction (4.21), mathematics (4.10), and ELA/reading (4.22).	Disciplinary climate (3.39); parent-child communication (3.23); family social/intellectual capital (3.25); participation in decisions (3.55).	Test behavior-response routines; examine how teacher input shapes decisions; seek direct family perspectives before designing supports.

The Four Paths source is the authoritative quantitative record. ARA retains every original variable and interprets selected items through eight research-informed condition lenses. No separate numerical eight-condition scores are created.

How to read the scales

CONDITION STRENGTH · TEACHER MEAN	PERCEPTION GAP · |LEADER − TEACHER|
GREEN · 4.00–5.00 | Strong presence	ALIGNED · 0.00–0.20 | Similar ratings
YELLOW · 3.50–3.99 | Monitor	WATCH · 0.21–0.49 | Examine differences
ORANGE · 3.00–3.49 | Examine	DISCUSS · 0.50–0.99 | Discuss differences
RED · below 3.00 | Examine closely	CRITICAL · 1.00+ | Substantial difference

Both sets of bands are ARA descriptive interpretation aids, not validated cutoffs or tests of statistical significance. Scores of 3.0 correspond to "a considerable extent," not an absence of the condition. A positive L − T gap means leaders rated the item higher. A negative gap means teachers rated it higher. With only three leaders, gaps require particular caution.

1 Four Paths: complete variable profile

Every established Four Paths variable below is shown using the teacher mean, leader mean, and signed difference from the original Wright report. Color bands apply to existing survey measures, not newly invented ARA scales.

Rational Path

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L − T	STRENGTH	GAP
Academic Press	3.92	4.47	+0.55	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Disciplinary Climate	3.39	2.83	-0.56	ORANGE · Examine	DISCUSS
Teachers' Use of Instructional Time	4.41	4.72	+0.31	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Classroom Instruction	4.21	4.45	+0.24	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH

Wright's Rational Path contains two notable features. Classroom Instruction (4.21) and Teachers' Use of Instructional Time (4.41) are positively rated, while Disciplinary Climate (3.39) is comparatively lower. Academic Press (3.92) sits between those patterns. The source item on students

rarely getting into conflicts is 2.95 for teachers and 1.33 for leaders; the item on students rarely getting into fights is 3.05 and 1.33. Those specific items make behavior-related experiences more informative than a general statement that classrooms lack order.

A useful counterpoint is that teachers also rate students being on task at 4.50 and classrooms free from distractions at 4.00. This suggests a question about when and where behavior difficulties occur, not a basis for saying instruction routinely breaks down. Leaders rate the two fighting/conflict items lower than teachers, while rating instructional time higher.

PRESERVE Protect goal-directed instruction, monitoring of learning, and on-task classroom routines.

INVESTIGATE Compare behavior patterns, referral practices, and disruption experiences by setting and time of day.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Identify one or two inconsistent behavior-response processes, then gather staff feedback on whether supports work as intended.

Emotional Path

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Teacher Trust in Others	4.11	4.59	+0.48	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**WATCH**
Teacher Collective Efficacy	4.06	4.80	+0.74	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
Teacher Commitment	4.30	4.67	+0.37	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**WATCH**

The Emotional Path is a clear reported strength. Teacher Commitment is 4.30, Trust in Others is 4.11, and Collective Efficacy is 4.06. Teachers rate colleagues' support at 4.27 and trust in school leaders' support at 4.23. These findings suggest a substantial relational foundation for inquiry and improvement; they do not establish that every teacher or team shares the same experience.

The relatively lower trust-related item is perceived support from students' families (3.68), which connects to the Family Path. Leaders also rate collective efficacy higher than teachers (4.80 versus 4.06; +0.74). That difference deserves discussion, particularly because the three leader responses may not represent a stable estimate of leader perspectives.

PRESERVE Protect supportive professional relationships, commitment to students, and mutual assistance.

INVESTIGATE Ask where trust or efficacy may vary across teams and how staff experience support from families.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Use trusted teacher teams to examine one practical problem without treating positive survey averages as permission to overlook dissenting voices.

Organizational Path

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Safe and Orderly Environment	3.85	4.47	+0.62	**YELLOW** · Monitor	**DISCUSS**
Collaborative Cultures and Structures	3.92	4.08	+0.16	**YELLOW** · Monitor	**ALIGNED**
Organization of Planning and Instructional Time	3.96	3.84	-0.12	**YELLOW** · Monitor	**ALIGNED**

Organizational measures are largely in the yellow descriptive range: Safe and Orderly Environment (3.85), Collaborative Cultures and Structures (3.92), and Organization of Planning and Instructional Time (3.96). These aggregates may conceal specific variations. Teachers rate common planning opportunities at 4.27 and shared instructional strategies at 4.27, but rate "very few disruptions to student instructional time" at 3.41. Leaders rate that disruption item 1.67, producing an unusually large negative gap (−1.74).

Collaboration also has distinct facets. The item on challenging one another's educational beliefs is rated 3.59 by teachers and 2.00 by leaders. Yet sharing strategies that work is rated 4.27 and 4.67. Collegial exchange may be occurring without consistent challenge or debate; this possibility should be tested in actual team practices.

PRESERVE Preserve scheduled common planning, instructional sharing, and areas of effective collaboration.

INVESTIGATE Determine what disrupts instruction and whether collaboration includes substantive professional disagreement.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Examine how protected planning time is used and what principal actions reduce recurring interruptions.

Family Path

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Parent Expectations for Children's Success	3.75	4.40	+0.65	**YELLOW** · Monitor	**DISCUSS**
Parents' Social and Intellectual Capital	3.25	4.13	+0.88	**ORANGE** · Examine	**DISCUSS**
Parent-Child Communication	3.23	4.13	+0.90	**ORANGE** · Examine	**DISCUSS**

Within Wright's variable profile, Parent Social and Intellectual Capital (3.25) and Forms of Communication between Parents and Children (3.23) are among the lower teacher-rated measures. Leaders rate both 4.13, creating positive gaps of +0.88 and +0.90. Parent Expectations for Children's Success is higher at 3.75 (leaders 4.40). These variables describe school staff perceptions of family practices; the families themselves were not surveyed.

Context matters: the source comparison-group teacher means for Parents' Social and Intellectual Capital and Parent-Child Communication are 2.84 and 2.97, below Wright's 3.25 and 3.23. Thus, calling Wright families deficient would not follow from these data. The more useful question is where the school can learn directly from families about communication preferences, access, and home-learning supports.

PRESERVE Protect existing family relationships and school-home communication channels that families find helpful.

INVESTIGATE Ask families directly which school communications and learning supports are most useful and accessible.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Co-design one realistic home-learning or communication improvement, then check uptake and family feedback.

2 Instructional detail: math and ELA/reading

The original report also gives separate mathematics and ELA/reading scales. The item tables below retain their full reported numerical detail because they reveal instructional patterns beyond the overall Four Paths table.

Mathematics instruction

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Mathematics instruction | overall	4.10	4.67	+0.57	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
build on students' prior knowledge	4.06	4.67	+0.61	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
emphasize students' conceptual understanding	4.00	4.67	+0.67	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
regularly engage students in reasoning/problem-solving with mathematics	4.00	4.67	+0.67	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
frequently have their students apply math to real-world situations	4.17	4.67	+0.50	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
provide support structures for students as they learn new math concepts	4.06	4.67	+0.61	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
encourage peer interaction to deepen students' understanding of math concepts	4.29	4.67	+0.38	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**WATCH**

Mathematics Instruction is 4.10 for teachers and 4.67 for leaders. All six teacher items are 4.00 or above. Peer interaction to deepen mathematics understanding (4.29) and applying mathematics to real-world situations (4.17) are both positively rated. The evidence supports preserving these practices, rather than labeling mathematics as an area of weakness. Leaders rate each mathematics item 4.67, a pattern that may reflect the small leader group or limited differentiation in their ratings.

PRESERVE Preserve perceived strengths in conceptual understanding, reasoning, scaffolding, and peer discussion.

INVESTIGATE Compare this positive self-report pattern with student work and classroom observations.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Choose a specific mathematical instructional practice worth sharing across teams; do not infer student achievement from survey ratings alone.

ELA/reading instruction

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
ELA/reading instruction | overall	4.22	4.53	+0.31	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**WATCH**
plan lessons around specific learning goals	4.26	4.33	+0.07	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**ALIGNED**
use structured, explicit instruction	4.11	4.67	+0.56	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
teach students specific language skills and knowledge	4.17	4.67	+0.50	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**DISCUSS**
include a focus on foundational skills (e.g., phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, comprehension	4.26	4.33	+0.07	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**ALIGNED**
clearly communicate language learning expectations to students and parents	4.32	4.67	+0.35	**GREEN** · Strong presence	**WATCH**

ELA/Reading Instruction receives a teacher aggregate of 4.22 and a leader aggregate of 4.53. All five teacher item means fall between 4.11 and 4.32. Teachers report particularly positive ratings for communicating language-learning expectations (4.32) and planning lessons around learning goals (4.26). The source supports describing reading practices positively, while leaving the quality of instruction and student outcomes to be corroborated by other evidence.

PRESERVE Preserve common clarity around learning goals, explicit instruction, and communication of expectations.

INVESTIGATE Check how these reported practices appear in lesson artifacts, student work, and observed classrooms.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Identify the strongest repeatable practices and explore whether they are accessible across grade levels.

3 School Leadership: 24 practices

School Leadership warrants its own extended analysis. Below are all 24 leadership items contained in the supplied Fall 2025 Wright report, not the 30-item September 2026 survey. The source report states that teachers rated perceived leadership practices while leaders rated confidence in enacting practices. Therefore the L − T values show differences in response patterns, not necessarily strictly matched perceptions of identical prompts.

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L − T	STRENGTH	GAP
School Leadership | overall	3.84	4.54	+0.70	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Give staff a sense of overall purpose	3.68	4.67	+0.99	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Help clarify the reasons for implementing school improvement initiatives	3.86	4.67	+0.81	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Provide useful assistance to you in setting short-term goals for teaching and learning	3.64	4.67	+1.03	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Demonstrate high expectations for your work with students	4.05	4.67	+0.62	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS
Give you individual support to help you improve your teaching practice	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Encourage you to consider new ideas for your teaching	3.91	4.33	+0.42	YELLOW · Monitor	WATCH
Model a high level of professional practice	3.86	4.67	+0.81	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Promote leadership development among teachers	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Ensure that professional development activities are effective in improving teaching and learning	3.91	4.67	+0.76	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Encourage teachers to discuss educational issues among themselves	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Develop an atmosphere of caring and trust among teachers	3.91	5.00	+1.09	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Encourage collaborative work among teachers	3.86	4.67	+0.81	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Ensure carefully coordinated participation of teachers in decisions about school improvement	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Engage parents in the school's improvement efforts	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Build community support for the school's improvement efforts	3.73	5.00	+1.27	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Help teachers improve instructional programs based on student data	3.73	4.67	+0.94	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Ensure creative use of appropriate technologies to enhance teaching and learning	3.95	4.67	+0.72	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Provide resources to help teachers improve their teaching	3.91	4.67	+0.76	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Regularly observe classroom activities	4.18	5.00	+0.82	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS
Work effectively with teachers following classroom observation, to help them improve their instruction	4.09	4.67	+0.58	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS
Encourage teachers to use data effectively to improve their instruction	4.23	5.00	+0.77	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Buffer teachers from distractions to their instruction	3.77	2.33	-1.44	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Build teachers' sense of internal accountability for all students accomplishing the outcomes valued by our school	4.00	4.67	+0.67	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS
Help teachers meet the demands for external accountability	3.68	4.00	+0.32	YELLOW · Monitor	WATCH

What leadership findings warrant interpretation?

A broad aggregate can mask important contrasts. Teachers rate observation of classroom activities (4.18), coaching after observations (4.09), and encouragement of effective data use (4.23) relatively positively. These suggest a visible instructional leadership presence worth understanding and protecting. At the same time, they rate individualized help improving teaching practice (3.55), coordination of participation in improvement decisions (3.55), support in setting short-term goals (3.64), and encouragement of professional dialogue (3.68) less positively.

Some large reported differences arise where leaders gave very high ratings: developing caring and trust (+1.09), coordinating teacher participation (+1.12), individual support (+1.12), and building community support (+1.27). The reverse case is buffering teachers from instructional distractions: teachers 3.77 and leaders 2.33 (−1.44). These differences help identify questions for discussion. Because the response frames differ and n = 3 for leaders, labeling each as a proven "perception gap" would go beyond the source.

One plausible development focus is the translation of leadership activity into teacher experience: Do teachers know how to access individualized support? Does their input influence school-improvement decisions? What interruptions can leadership realistically prevent? The report does not answer those questions by itself, but it shows why they are worth investigating.

PRESERVE Preserve credible classroom observation, feedback conversations, and the use of evidence in instruction.

INVESTIGATE Study teacher participation and individualized instructional support processes. Treat apparent leader-teacher differences as leads for conversation, not diagnoses.

LEADERSHIP FOCUS Select one decision-making process and one instructional support routine for review with teachers; define visible evidence of follow-through.

4 Eight integrated ARA condition profiles

These eight titles organize research-informed interpretation. They are not new psychometric scales or separately calculated scores. Each table repeats only the existing Four Paths variables or items most relevant to that lens. An item can inform more than one condition, but a single underlying response is never presented as an independent new measurement.

01 Effective and Supportive School Leadership

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
School Leadership | overall	3.84	4.54	+0.70	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Individual help to improve practice	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Observation followed by support	4.09	4.67	+0.58	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS
Coordinate participation in decisions	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL

READING THE EVIDENCE The overall leadership rating (3.84) is supported by relatively positive ratings for post-observation work (4.09), but teachers give lower ratings to individualized support (3.55) and coordinated participation in decisions (3.55). This is evidence of variation across leadership practices, not proof that leadership is ineffective.

BOUNDARY This lens is mainly leadership-practice evidence. The source describes different teacher and leader response frames, and only three leaders participated.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Which leadership routines make individualized support and teacher participation visible, accessible, and responsive?*

02 Relational Trust

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Teacher Trust in Others | overall	4.11	4.59	+0.48	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Colleagues available for support	4.27	4.67	+0.40	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Trust leaders to provide support	4.23	4.67	+0.44	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Can count on support from families	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS

READING THE EVIDENCE Teachers report supportive colleagues (4.27) and confidence in support from school leaders (4.23), while perceived family support is relatively lower (3.68). The trust aggregate (4.11) should be read with these differences in mind.

BOUNDARY Different trust relationships are not interchangeable; the survey does not separately establish psychological safety within grade-level teams.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Where do staff experience reliable support, and where does asking for help remain difficult?*

03 Professional Voice and Autonomy

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Autonomy for collaborative decisions	3.77	4.67	+0.90	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Coordinate teacher input into decisions	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Develop teacher leadership	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Encourage professional dialogue	3.68	4.33	+0.65	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS

READING THE EVIDENCE Teachers rate shared instructional decision autonomy at 3.77 and leadership coordination of teacher participation at 3.55. These provide concrete entry points for examining teacher influence. They should not be converted into an independent voice/autonomy score.

BOUNDARY The instrument has limited direct coverage of individual autonomy, decision authority, or whether teacher input changes decisions.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *How is teacher input solicited, considered, acted upon, and communicated back to participants?*

04 Collegial Collaboration and Support

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Collaborative Cultures | overall	3.92	4.08	+0.16	YELLOW · Monitor	ALIGNED
Colleagues share strategies	4.27	4.67	+0.40	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Challenge one another's beliefs	3.59	2.00	-1.59	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Teachers can rely on colleagues	4.27	4.67	+0.40	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH

READING THE EVIDENCE The collaboration variable is 3.92 and teachers rate sharing strategies at 4.27. Challenging one another's beliefs is less positive (3.59), even as support from colleagues is high (4.27). Collegial relationships may be strong while professional challenge varies.

BOUNDARY The existing variable includes several distinct collaboration activities; the scores do not identify whether each grade-level team functions similarly.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Do meetings create both supportive exchange and respectful testing of instructional assumptions?*

05 Professional Learning and Instructional Support

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Opportunities for professional learning	4.05	4.33	+0.28	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Leadership individual support	3.55	4.67	+1.12	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Professional development effectiveness	3.91	4.67	+0.76	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Post-observation coaching	4.09	4.67	+0.58	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS

READING THE EVIDENCE Professional learning opportunities receive 4.05, while individualized leadership support is 3.55. Post-observation work is 4.09, and ensuring PD improves teaching is 3.91. These differences suggest inquiry about accessibility and usefulness rather than a lack of learning structures.

BOUNDARY The survey does not directly demonstrate PD quality, coaching outcomes, or whether individual teachers receive support they need.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Which staff receive actionable feedback and follow-up, and who may need a different kind of support?*

06 Resources and Protected Instructional Time

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Planning and instructional time | overall	3.96	3.84	-0.12	YELLOW · Monitor	ALIGNED
Common planning time	4.27	4.67	+0.40	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Very few instructional disruptions	3.41	1.67	-1.74	ORANGE · Examine	CRITICAL
Leadership buffers distractions	3.77	2.33	-1.44	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL
Provide instructional resources	3.91	4.67	+0.76	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS

READING THE EVIDENCE Teachers rate common planning opportunities at 4.27 and protected instruction less positively on the disruption item (3.41). Leaders rate disruptions much lower (1.67) and their own buffering practice at 2.33, suggesting particular questions about interruptions and organizational constraints.

BOUNDARY The report has relatively few direct items about resource sufficiency, workload, administrative burden, or equitable access. Time and resources cannot be collapsed into one score.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Which interruptions are preventable, and which administrative routines consume time teachers need for instruction or planning?*

07 Safety and Student Behavior Support

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Safe and Orderly Environment | overall	3.85	4.47	+0.62	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Disciplinary Climate | overall	3.39	2.83	-0.56	ORANGE · Examine	DISCUSS
Students rarely involved in conflicts	2.95	1.33	-1.62	RED · Examine closely	CRITICAL
Safe and orderly learning environment	4.18	5.00	+0.82	GREEN · Strong presence	DISCUSS

READING THE EVIDENCE Overall safety and order are rated 3.85, but disciplinary climate is 3.39 and the conflict item is 2.95. Leaders rate the conflict item 1.33. Together these scores warrant questions about behavior response and how safety differs from day-to-day classroom disruption.

BOUNDARY The surveys do not separately establish the quality, consistency, or fairness of student behavior-support services; behavioral incidents should be checked against other records.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Where do staff experience behavior-related problems, and what response practices help or hinder them?*

08 Shared Purpose and Instructional Coherence

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE / ITEM	TEACHER	LEADER	L – T	STRENGTH	GAP
Academic Press | overall	3.92	4.47	+0.55	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Teacher Commitment | overall	4.30	4.67	+0.37	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Leadership communicates purpose	3.68	4.67	+0.99	YELLOW · Monitor	DISCUSS
Classroom Instruction | overall	4.21	4.45	+0.24	GREEN · Strong presence	WATCH
Challenging educational beliefs	3.59	2.00	-1.59	YELLOW · Monitor	CRITICAL

READING THE EVIDENCE Teachers rate commitment highly (4.30), academic press at 3.92, and classroom instruction at 4.21. Leadership communication of overall purpose is 3.68. This pattern suggests that teacher commitment and reported instructional activity can coexist with questions about shared purpose or professional dialogue.

BOUNDARY These items do not constitute a validated coherence measure. Commitment, academic expectations, and alignment of instructional practice are related but distinct constructs.

LEADERSHIP QUESTION *Can teams articulate common learning priorities and show how they influence assessment, instruction, and improvement decisions?*

5 What these patterns mean together

A school with strengths and specific tensions

Wright's results do not support a generalized "school in trouble" narrative. Teacher commitment, trust, and instructional ratings are positive. At the same time, there are specific questions about behavior-related experiences, interruptions, teacher participation, and school perceptions of families. Those questions arise within a school that also reports meaningful assets.

School conditions and leadership practices are connected, not identical

A positive rating of leadership trust cannot substitute for evidence of teacher influence in decisions. A strong instructional-time mean should not obscure the low item about avoiding interruptions. A broadly positive family-expectations score should not erase questions about home-learning communication. ARA adds value by presenting these relationships transparently, not by claiming to diagnose their causes.

The Family Path must remain visible

Although Family Path findings are not automatically folded into one of the eight ARA profiles, they are central to Wright's interpretation. Their most important next step is listening to families directly. Teachers' and leaders' views can identify issues to explore, but they cannot stand in for family accounts of opportunities, resources, and barriers.

6 Leadership priorities and a practical 90-day agenda

These proposed priorities are discussion prompts, not mandated interventions. Select no more than two or three after reviewing existing campus evidence and meeting with staff. Each priority should include an accountable owner, observable implementation steps, and feedback that can test whether the response is useful.

01 Consistent response to behavior and interruptions

FOUR PATHS EVIDENCE. Disciplinary Climate 3.39; student conflict 2.95; very few disruptions 3.41 (leaders 1.67).

FIRST INVESTIGATE. Review referral/response practices and the types of interruptions occurring during instruction. Listen across grade levels and roles.

POSSIBLE LEADERSHIP RESPONSE. Clarify one response protocol or interruption-reduction routine. Track implementation and ask teachers whether timely support improved.

02 Teacher participation and individualized instructional support

FOUR PATHS EVIDENCE. Teacher participation in decisions 3.55; individual support 3.55; collaborative autonomy 3.77.

FIRST INVESTIGATE. Map how instructional decisions are made, how input is used, and what support teachers can request.

POSSIBLE LEADERSHIP RESPONSE. Trial a clearer input-to-decision feedback loop and a defined instructional-support follow-up routine.

03 Family-informed partnership for learning

FOUR PATHS EVIDENCE. Parent social/intellectual capital 3.25; parent-child communication 3.23; school staff reports only.

FIRST INVESTIGATE. Gather direct family perspectives through accessible listening methods; use the source comparison-group context.

POSSIBLE LEADERSHIP RESPONSE. Co-design one manageable home-learning or communication support, then collect family feedback and participation evidence.

90-day implementation rhythm

DAYS 1–30 | CONFIRM	DAYS 31–60 | TEST	DAYS 61–90 | REVIEW
Read results with the leadership team; examine source items and existing records; obtain teacher and family perspectives as appropriate.	Select a small intervention with clear ownership; communicate the purpose and provide visible support to staff.	Check implementation evidence, review feedback, refine the approach; consider a comparable follow-up pulse if feasible.

Questions for the principal and leadership team

- Which of Wright's reported strengths are most important to preserve as other routines change?
- How do the behavior-related survey responses align with incident data and the daily experiences of teachers and students?
- Where is teacher participation in decisions meaningful, and where is the process less clear?
- Which leadership practices are visible to staff, and which require clearer access, follow-through, or feedback?
- What do families themselves say about home-learning communication and the supports they would value?

7 Sources, safeguards, and interpretive limits

Authoritative numerical source: “FOUR PATHS Survey Results,” Wright El in Gilmour ISD, Fall 2025, 13 pages. This report transcribes the original published teacher and school leader means for 15 Four Paths variables, the separate instructional item tables, and the 24 reported School Leadership items. Teacher sample: 22; leader sample: 3. Source comparison group: 1,324 teachers and 195 leaders. The original campus report should accompany this ARA interpretation.

The Four Paths survey instrument and published variable definitions have not been modified. ARA color bands are descriptive interpretation aids; they are not psychometrically established thresholds. Teacher-leader differences are computed from the two displayed means and are not significance tests. For the School Leadership section, the source footnote explicitly reports different teacher and leader response frames; those differences demand more caution than a fully parallel item comparison.

The source contains a few aggregate values that do not reconcile with a simple average of the displayed item means, notably Teachers’ Use of Instructional Time. This report reproduces the original published aggregate without silently re-scoring it. ARA does not infer teacher attrition, causal effects, student achievement changes, or school improvement over time from one survey administration.

This is a mock-campus example for refining Leadership Partners’ ARA reporting method. Condition profiles are conceptual interpretations of existing data, not new validated condition scales. Reporting and action planning should protect respondent confidentiality, particularly where the leadership group is small.

Appendix | Campus means in comparison context

The original Four Paths report also provides all-teacher comparison means (n = 1,324). The following reference values help distinguish what is relatively lower within Wright from what is lower than the supplied comparison group. This is descriptive context, not a matched-control comparison, percentile, or measure of school impact.

ORIGINAL FOUR PATHS VARIABLE	WRIGHT TEACHERS	ALL TEACHERS	DIFFERENCE
Academic Press	3.92	3.55	+0.37
Disciplinary Climate	3.39	3.53	-0.14
Teachers' Use of Instructional Time	4.41	4.40	+0.01
Classroom Instruction	4.21	3.91	+0.30
Teacher Trust in Others	4.11	3.64	+0.47
Teacher Collective Efficacy	4.06	3.73	+0.33
Teacher Commitment	4.30	3.97	+0.33
Safe and Orderly Environment	3.85	3.92	-0.07
Collaborative Cultures and Structures	3.92	3.73	+0.19
Organization of Planning and Instructional Time	3.96	3.73	+0.23
Parent Expectations for Children's Success	3.75	3.22	+0.53
Parents' Social and Intellectual Capital	3.25	2.84	+0.41
Parent-Child Communication	3.23	2.97	+0.26
Mathematics Instruction	4.10	4.05	+0.05
ELA/Reading Instruction	4.22	4.18	+0.04

The two family-related variables highlighted earlier illustrate why context matters: Wright teachers rated Parents’ Social and Intellectual Capital 3.25 versus 2.84 for the comparison group (+0.41), and Parent-Child Communication 3.23 versus 2.97 (+0.26). These values do not remove local questions about family partnership, but they challenge a simplistic deficit interpretation.