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This document identifies a set of indicators within Massachusetts’ four key turnaround practices, which are based on research on Massachusetts schools that have experienced rapid improvements in student outcomes.[[1]](#footnote-1) The four key turnaround practices are:

1. Leadership, shared responsibility, and professional collaboration
2. Intentional practices for improving instruction
3. Student-specific supports and instruction to all students
4. School climate and culture

The indicators within these turnaround practices are described in a continuum of implementation, and data from the Level 4 and Level 5 school monitoring site visits (interviews, focus groups, document review, and classroom observations) will inform the status of implementation for each of these turnaround practices.

# Introduction

Table 1 lists the four key turnaround practices. The four turnaround practices are based on research on Massachusetts schools that have experienced rapid improvements in student outcomes.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Table 1. Key Turnaround Practices

|  |
| --- |
| Key Turnaround Practice |
| 1. Leadership, shared responsibility, and professional collaboration |
| 1. Intentional practices for improving instruction |
| 1. Student-specific supports and instruction to all students |
| 1. School climate and culture |

These turnaround practices and related indicators are used to monitor the progress of Level 4 and Level 5 schools implementing key turnaround practices. Each indicator is described on a four-point continuum of implementation (no evidence, developing, providing, or sustaining).[[3]](#footnote-3) The sustaining point on each indicator continuum aligns with the findings from research on Massachusetts Level 4 schools that have experienced rapid improvement in student outcomes. Massachusetts schools that achieved dramatic academic and nonacademic improvements during their first three years of turnaround have actively used the authorities afforded to them through Level 4 accountability status, used funding that was directly aligned to their needs, provided targeted instruction to students, and embedded district systems of support and monitoring to maximize the impacts of these fundamental conditions. With those conditions in place, the schools focused their work on each of the turnaround practices.

Background. Each indicator and the points in each indicator’s implementation continuum have been reviewed to ensure alignment and connection with Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education initiatives and supports. Specifically, the indicators and continuum points were cross-walked with the Educator Evaluation Rubrics, the Massachusetts Tiered Systems of Support Rubric, the Wraparound Zone Initiative Implementation Rubric, the Learning Walkthrough guidance, the Conditions for School Effectiveness, The Partnership Project Universal Design for Learning, Academic Tiered Systems of Support, and Behavioral Systems of Support rubrics. Each of these resources supports in-depth implementation of each of these strategies. The turnaround practice indicators purposely do not go into the same depth that a school may need to operationalize one or more of these strategies but,rather, are designed to obtain information about the school’s progress in implementing research-based strategies identified in Level 4 schools that have realized rapid improvements in student outcomes.

# Definitions for Indicator Implementation Continuum

The indicator implementation levels provide an overview of the process of developing, providing, and ultimately sustaining specific practices within each of the turnaround practice areas. Each of the indicators has a unique four-point implementation continuum, specific to the indicator, which generally corresponds to the generic implementation levels described in Table 2.

Table 2. Indicator Implementation Continuum

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limited Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining |
| Necessary organizational practices, structures, and/or processes are nonexistent, evidence is limited, or practices are so infrequent that their impact is negligible. For example, common planning time is not scheduled, or instructional leaders are unaware of research and promising practices. | Organizational practices, structures, and/or processes exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented consistently. For example, the practice may only be implemented by some teachers or with a target group of students or may intermittently be used but is not part of a consistent approach. Processes are inconsistent or operate in silos. For example, data might be collected, but only a few people are looking at or effectively using the information. | Systems are functional, and their structures and processes have been implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication between systems may be lacking or systems do not contribute to systemic decision making. For example, an assessment system is in place and data are tracked, but results are not used in collaboration with other systems, such as teacher effectiveness or instructional guidance. | The organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges. Feedback systems include progress checks to inform timely course corrections. The practice is embedded into the school culture. |

## Turnaround Practice Area Implementation Continuum and Coherent Implementation

Each of the indicators is in support of the overall turnaround practice area. Evidence from the monitoring site visit will inform decisions about the implementation level of a school within each of these indicators. Then, these indicators will be examined within each turnaround practice as a whole, and a holistic implementation designation for each turnaround practice will be provided. The turnaround practice area ratings are *holistic* ratings of the extent to which the indicators within that turnaround practice area are coherently implemented. The turnaround practice area ratings are not a *sum* or *average* of the indicator ratings within that turnaround practice area.

The continuum for this overall designation is similar to the indicator continuum described previously but has an additional level: coherent implementation. When a school is performing at the *sustaining* level across the indicators within a turnaround practice area, and these indicators are working together to support one another, the school will be designated at the *coherent implementation* level for the turnaround practice. A school may be implementing all indicators within a turnaround practice area at the *sustaining* level without yet demonstrating *coherent implementation* of those indicators, where all indicators are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students.

Table 3. Turnaround Practice Area Implementation Continuum

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limited Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining | Coherent Implementation |
| Indicators for this turnaround practice area show limited or no evidence of implementation of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes. | Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that all or most of the organizational practices, structures, and/or processes related to this area exist on paper or are being tried but are not yet fully developed or implemented. | Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that related systems are functional, and their structures and processes are implemented consistently throughout the school; however, either communication or systemic decision making is limited. | Indicators for this turnaround practice area demonstrate that the organizational practices, structures, and processes are functioning effectively, and timely feedback systems are embedded to identify potential problems and challenges. | The organizational practices across all indicators within a turnaround practice are at the sustaining level and are working together to support one another in a way that is meaningful for staff and students. |

# Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration

The school has established a community of practice through leadership, shared responsibility for all students, and professional collaboration.

| Turnaround Practice 1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicators | Limited Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining |
| 1.1 | Use of Autonomy | School leaders  have little to no autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) to make decisions about key elements of the school, such as staffing, length of the school day. | School leaders have some autonomy to make decisions about key elements of the school (e.g., staffing, school schedule) but have not yet used this autonomy or are uncertain how best to use it. | School leaders have the autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) to make decisions about key elements of the school day and have begun to use this autonomy to make changes in the school. | School leaders use the autonomy (e.g., staffing, school schedule) and authority to focus work on implementing their turnaround plan or other improvement efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning at the school. |
| 1.2 | High Expectations and Positive Regard | There is little to no evidence that the school makes high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students a priority. | School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students but do not implement any strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place. | School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students and implement strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place. | School leaders understand the importance of high expectations and positive regard between leadership, staff, and students and implement strategies or activities to ensure that these elements are in fact in place. A majority of staff believe leadership, staff, and students have high expectations and demonstrate positive regard. |
| 1.3 | Vision/ Theory of Action and Buy-In | School leaders have a loosely defined theory of action or vision along with established goals and interim benchmarks to guide dramatic school improvement, but the goals and benchmarks are not used to inform the school’s work. There is little to no sense of urgency or collective responsibility for realizing school improvement. | School leaders have a defined theory of action or vision along with established goals, and interim benchmarks have been communicated to some staff. A common sense of urgency and shared ownership for the success of all students exists among some staff and leaders, but not all staff members share this responsibility. | School leaders have a defined and communicated theory of action or vision along with established goals and interim benchmarks to drive priorities related to turnaround efforts, and these goals and benchmarks are understood and implemented consistently by most staff. A common sense of urgency and purpose for improvement is evident among a majority of staff members, but ownership and responsibility for success of all students may still be centralized at the principal or leadership team level. | School leaders and most staff members understand the theory of action or vision driving the priorities related to turnaround efforts, are familiar with the goals and interim benchmarks used to consistently monitor progress (e.g., at least once a month), and identify and prioritize the next level of work. A common sense of urgency and ownership for the success of all students is shared among most staff, as demonstrated through staff discourse and actions. |
| 1.4 | Monitoring Implementation and School Progress | School leaders rarely prioritize improvement initiatives for implementation nor are there processes or protocols in place for systemic implementation. | School leaders prioritize improvement initiatives for implementation; however, processes and protocols for systemic implementation are emerging or not well defined. | School leaders prioritize improvement initiatives; processes and protocols for systemic implementation are well defined. A majority of staff members are aware of the priorities, and some monitoring of these initiatives takes place. | School leaders are actively engaged in monitoring implementation of turnaround efforts, use this information to prioritize initiatives and strategies, communicate progress and challenges and seek input from staff, and continuously and systematically monitor progress. |
| 1.5[[4]](#footnote-4) | Trusting Relationships | Relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are not guided by trust; teachers feel coaching and instructional support is judgmental, and evidence of collaboration among staff is limited. | Some relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are guided by trust, and some teachers feel instructional support is nonjudgmental, but this is inconsistent throughout the school. Some groups of teachers may collaborate with colleagues to share strategies, such as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions. However, this is not consistent among all staff. | Most relationships between teachers and instructional supports (e.g., coaches) are guided by trust, and most teachers feel that instructional support is nonjudgmental. There is evidence that most staff at least occasionally use collegial relationships to share strategies in such work as developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions. | Most staff members share a relational, trust-focused culture with each other and their instructional supports (e.g., coaches) that is solution oriented and focused on improvement as exemplified by frequent collaboration in developing standards-based units, examining student work, analyzing student performance, and planning appropriate interventions. Educators regularly share their strengths and struggles, in the spirit of helping each other continually improve their practice. |
| 1.6 | Use of Time for Professional Development and Collaboration | The schedule includes little or no time for professional development or collaboration between teachers. | The schedule does not include adequate time for professional development opportunities, collaboration time for teachers is limited, and/or the available time is not used effectively to improve teaching and learning. | The schedule includes adequate time for professional development opportunities and collaboration for most teachers. Use of time is generally used well to improve teaching and learning. | The schedule includes adequate time for professional development opportunities and collaboration for most teachers. There is a process in place for evaluating the schedule based on collected data to maximize opportunities for teacher professional development and ensure it helps all educators continually improve their practice (e.g., targeted coaching, peer observations) and collaboration time. |
| 1.7 | Communication With Staff | Structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are informal, are not well defined, or do not exist. | Formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are defined but may not be used to effectively build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. | Formal structures and opportunities for fostering staff input into school decisions and initiatives are in place and are used effectively to build relationships and two-way communication across staff and school teams. However, there are some barriers to communication between administrators and staff. | Formal structures are in place to build effective staff relationships balanced with transparency and open, two-way communication across staff and school teams and between administrators and staff. |
| 1.8[[5]](#footnote-5) | Sustainability | There is little to no evidence that school leadership prioritizes building staff capacity to sustain improvement efforts. | School leadership is aware of the importance of planning for sustainability. However, there is little to no evidence that improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership. | School leadership implements specific strategies (e.g., succession plan, distributed leadership, new funding streams) for ensuring improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership. | School leadership implements strategies (e.g., succession plan, distributed leadership, new funding streams) for ensuring improvement efforts will be sustained over time or under new leadership. Majority of staff believe and can describe specific strategies that will enable the school to continue to improve, even with changes in staff or school leadership. |

# 

# Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction

The school employs intentional practices for improving teacher-specific and student-responsive instruction.

| Turnaround Practice 2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicators | Limited Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining |
| 2.1 | Instructional Expectations | Expectations for teachers’ classroom practices are not articulated by school leaders. | Expectations for teachers’ classroom practices are communicated, but the expectations may not be specific, are not understood by most staff, and/or may not be actively monitored by school leaders. | Specific or precise expectations for teachers’ classroom practices are consistently communicated, understood by most staff and faculty, and monitored throughout the school year. | Specific or precise expectations for high-quality instruction are communicated and understood by most staff, monitored by school leaders, and consistently implemented by most teachers. |
| 2.2 | Instructional Schedule | Existing instructional schedules lack consistency or do not include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time for students. | Existing instructional schedules include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time. However, instructional support staff are not coordinated and aligned across grade levels and content areas to provide students with differentiated access to high-quality core instruction. | Existing instructional schedules include uninterrupted blocks of schoolwide learning time. Content instruction and instructional support staff are coordinated or systematically organized and aligned across grade levels and content areas. | Instructional schedules are developed in collaboration with teachers and ensure that instructional support staff are coordinated and aligned across grade levels and content areas to provide students with differentiated access to high-quality core instruction. There is an effective process in place for evaluating the schedule based on collected data related to the quality of instruction and student needs across grade levels and content areas. |
| 2.3 | Identifying and Addressing Student Academic Needs | No formal data collection process is in place for identifying individual students’ academic needs. Specific protocols for using data and identifying actions to address student academic needs are not in place. | Formal strategies and processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities) are in place, with protocols for using data and identifying actions to address individual students’ academic needs. However, the protocols may not be consistently used or followed. | Formal strategies and processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities) and protocols for using data and identifying actions to address individual students’ academic needs are in place and consistently used, but communication among all staff about action steps is limited. | Formal teaming and collaboration strategies, processes (e.g., instructional leadership team, collaborative planning, professional learning communities), and protocols are consistently used to address individual students’ academic needs by: (1) using data, (2) identifying actions to address student learning needs, and (3) regularly communicating action steps among all staff and teams to build and sustain a professional culture of learning. |
| 2.4 | Classroom Observation Data Use | Instructional leaders rarely or never conduct class observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs). Evidence that specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction is being provided to individual teachers is limited or nonexistent. | Instructional leaders conduct occasional or routine classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs), primarily as a function of the principal role and with little to no timely feedback focused on strengthening teachers’ instructional practices. Observation and feedback may be focused only on a few grades or subject areas. | Instructional leaders conduct regular classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs) to gauge the quality of instructional practices and provide specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction. However, this information or data do not inform instructional conversations or the provision of targeted and individualized supports (e.g., coaching) for teachers, as needed. | Instructional leaders conduct weekly or daily classroom observations (e.g., learning walkthroughs) focused on strengthening teachers’ instructional practices and provide specific and actionable feedback on the quality and effectiveness of instruction to individual teachers and teacher teams. These data inform instructional conversations and the provision of targeted and individualized supports (e.g., coaching) for teachers, as needed. |
| 2.5 | Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision making) | Building and teacher leaders use limited to no student assessment data to make decisions related to schoolwide practices. | Building and teacher leaders consider only student results on state assessments when making decisions regarding schoolwide practices. | Building and teacher leaders occasionally consider student results on benchmark and common assessments in addition to state assessments when making decisions regarding schoolwide practices. | Building and teacher leaders consistently use student results on benchmark and common assessments and state assessments to make decisions regarding schoolwide practices. |
| 2.6 | Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction) | There is little or emerging awareness of best practices for analyzing student performance data to inform instruction and assessing progress toward intended student outcomes, or the effect of these practices is negligible. | Some teachers are aware of the importance of using a variety of assessment data to inform instruction and for employing research-based instructional strategies to determine progress toward intended student outcomes. However, not all staff consistently use this practice. | Most teachers are aware of their roles and responsibilities for using a variety of assessment data to inform instruction and for employing research-based instructional strategies to determine progress toward intended student outcomes. However, there are some barriers to using data effectively to improve instruction. | Most teachers work individually and collaboratively to use a variety of assessment data (e.g., common assessment data, student work) to determine progress toward intended student and school outcomes, determine appropriate action steps, and monitor the results of those actions. |
| 2.7 | Structures for Instructional Improvement | Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data, research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation and to ensure rigor and relevance are limited, do not exist, or are having negligible impact. | Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data, research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation to ensure rigor and relevance are in place but may be poorly defined, inefficient, or ineffective. | Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support the use of assessment data to guide and select research-based instructional strategies and differentiation are clearly defined but are not always used consistently throughout the school. | Structures, practices, and use of resources (e.g., collaborative meeting time, coaching, supports for implementing the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks) to support data-driven instruction, the use of research-based instructional strategies, and differentiation are in place and consistently implemented, resulting in rigorous instruction, reflective of the shifts in cognitive demand for the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, that meets the needs of each student. |

# 

# Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students

The school is able to provide student-specific supports and interventions informed by data and the identification of student-specific needs.

| Turnaround Practice 3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicators | No Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining |
| 3.1 | General Academic Interventions and Enrichment | Structured academic interventions and enrichment opportunities (e.g., tiered system of support) are not in place. Or, if interventions and enrichment are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices. | Specific, research-based interventions and enrichment experiences are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (e.g., tiered system of support) or available to all students. | Specific, research-based interventions and enrichment experiences are defined and planned and regularly provided, although student participation is not systematic (e.g., tiered system of support), or interventions are not comprehensive (e.g., available for both English language arts and mathematics). Barriers may include scheduling conflicts or other structural challenges. | All students experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These best practices and enrichment opportunities are implemented systematically during regularly scheduled school time and for all core content areas through a robust tiered system of support. |
| 3.2 | Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs (Academic and Nonacademic) | Staff members are provided with little to no training or support on how to identify and address student needs. | Some staff members are provided with training and support regarding how to identify and address at least one area of student need. However, training is not provided to all appropriate staff members or is not provided for all areas of student need (e.g., both academic and nonacademic). | Most staff members are provided with training and support to ensure that they can identify both academic and nonacademic student needs. However, staff do not receive training or support on how to respond appropriately to those cues, or staff fail to consistently respond to those cues despite training. | Most staff members are provided with training and support to ensure that they: (1) identify cues when students need additional assistance (both academic and nonacademic) and (2) respond appropriately to those cues. |
| 3.3 | Determining Schoolwide Student Supports (Academic Interventions and Enrichment) | Specific student academic intervention and enrichment needs are neither identified nor diagnosed. | Specific student academic intervention and enrichment needs are diagnosed and identified annually or once a semester. | Student academic performance is reviewed regularly throughout the school year to monitor progress and to identify emerging needs; however, students are not reassigned to interventions as needed throughout the school year. | Student learning and academic performance is regularly reviewed (at least once a month) throughout the school year, using a wide array of ongoing assessments to identify student-specific and schoolwide emerging needs. Students are reassigned to interventions, enrichment, and supports, as needed, throughout the school year. |
| 3.4 | Multitiered System of Support (Academic and Nonacademic) | No system is in place to guide how to identify students in need of support or the necessary interventions and supports for those students. Leaders have not defined entry and exit criteria to identify struggling students in interventions. Students are assigned to interventions, using a wide range of information and processes that are not consistent across the school. | Leaders have defined but not clearly communicated entry and exit criteria for identified struggling students. Students are assigned to interventions with a limited application of the entry criteria, and student progress is not consistently or systemically monitored during the school year. The system meets one of the following three conditions: (1) Staff members follow consistent rules and procedures that identify when students are in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; or (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports. | Leaders and teachers understand and use systems with criteria and protocols for identifying students for interventions and enrichment. Students are assigned to interventions, but this system meets only two of the following three conditions: (1) Staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when identifying students in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; or (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports. | Leaders and teachers actively use established systems with criteria and protocols for identifying students for interventions and enrichment. This system meets all of the following conditions: (1) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when identifying students in need of additional assistance; (2) a team of appropriate staff and stakeholders makes decisions about needed interventions and supports; and (3) staff members follow consistent rules and procedures when monitoring the delivery and effectiveness of interventions and supports. |
| 3.5[[6]](#footnote-6) | Academic Interventions for English Language Learners | Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are not in place. Or, if interventions are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices. | Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (due to staffing, scheduling, or other barriers) or designed to meet students’ specific needs. | Specific, research-based interventions for English language learners are defined and planned and regularly provided. However, student participation is not always systematic, and supports are not always aligned for students’ specific needs. | All English language learners experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These supports are implemented systematically in the school. |
| 3.6[[7]](#footnote-7) | Academic Interventions for Students With Disabilities | Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are not in place. Or, if interventions are provided, they are not based on research or promising practices. | Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are defined and planned but may not be consistently or systematically implemented (due to staffing, scheduling, or other barriers) or designed to meet students’ specific needs. | Specific, research-based interventions for students with disabilities are defined and planned and regularly provided. However, student participation is not always systematic, and supports are not always aligned for students’ specific needs. | All students with disabilities experience research-based academic interventions appropriate for their specific needs. These supports are implemented systematically in the school. |

# Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture

The school provides a safe, orderly, and respectful environment for students and a collegial, collaborative, and professional culture among teachers.

| Turnaround Practice 4. School Climate and Culture | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Indicators | Limited Evidence | Developing | Providing | Sustaining |
| 4.1 | Schoolwide Behavior Plan | No schoolwide behavior plan guides the consistent implementation of behavior management procedures. Or, if there is a behavior plan, it is not implemented consistently. | The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, but there is not a clear system or set of structures for positive behavioral supports that is aligned to those expectations. In addition, there is limited evidence that any staff implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan. | The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, and a system and set of structures for positive behavioral supports are aligned to those expectations. However, either there is no evidence that any staff implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan, or there is evidence that only some staff members implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan. | The schoolwide behavior plan includes a defined set of behavioral expectations, and the system and set of structures for positive behavioral supports are aligned to those expectations. In addition, most staff members implement the procedures outlined in the schoolwide behavior plan. Leaders monitor implementation using data. |
| 4.2 | Adult–Student Relationships | Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) to support the development of strong, supportive relationships between adults and students are not in place or are inadequate. | Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) to support the development of strong relationships are defined but may not be used consistently or may not be available to all students. | Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) are in place to support relationships among students and adults and deliver social-emotional supports. | Structures (e.g., structured advisories, mentor programs) are in place to support relationships among students and adults and deliver social-emotional supports. These supports are monitored actively to determine whether they are meeting the needs of the school. |
| 4.3 | Expanded Learning | Students have limited to no opportunities to participate in expanded learning programs. | Opportunities for students to participate in expanded learning programs exist but may not be well defined, or awareness of and participation in the programs may be limited. | Structured opportunities for students to participate in expanded learning programs are in place and are well defined. | All students have access to expanded learning opportunities that are well defined and well supported. High-need students are targeted for participation in these programs. |
| 4.4 | Wraparound Services and External Partners | There is little or emerging leadership and staff awareness of strategies to increase the capacity of families to support education in the home through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). | Leaders and staff are aware of the needs of families to support education through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). However, there is no system to provide these services consistently. | Leaders and staff are aware of the needs of families to support education through wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals) and provide these resources to families, as needed. | Leaders and staff share individual and mutual responsibility for building the capacity of families to support education through a systemic system of wraparound services (e.g., health, housing referrals). Leaders and staff assess the needs of students and families throughout the school year. |
| 4.5[[8]](#footnote-8) | Family and Community Engagement | There is little to no evidence that the school makes family and community engagement a priority. | The school makes family and community engagement a priority, but only one or two of five conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members;  (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and/or (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed. | The school makes family engagement a priority, but only three or four of five conditions are met: (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities; (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports; (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and/or (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed. | The school makes family and community engagement a priority and all of the following five conditions are met:  (1) One or more staff members coordinate family and community engagement activities;  (2) regular social events are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members; (3) regular activities are planned throughout the year to engage families and community members in planning for and collaborating in the implementation of academic and nonacademic supports;  (4) staff members routinely reach out to families to communicate information about their children’s progress and needs; and (5) communications with families are made available in multiple languages, as needed. |

1. See: Lane, B., Unger, C., & Souvanna, P. (2014). *Turnaround practices in action: A three-year analysis of school and district practices, systems, policies and use of resources contributing to successful turnaround efforts in Massachusetts Level 4 schools*. Malden, MA: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/2014PracticesReport.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See: Lane, B., Unger, C., & Souvanna, P. (2014). *Turnaround practices in action: A three-year analysis of school and district practices, systems, policies and use of resources contributing to successful turnaround efforts in Massachusetts Level 4 schools*. Malden, MA: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/apa/sss/turnaround/2014PracticesReport.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The indicators draw from *Implementation Continuum for School Turnaround and Transformation* from American Institutes for Research, which serves as a self-guided implementation monitoring tool for schools. See: Barbour, C., Karageorge, T., Bates, R., Meyer, C., Burdette, J., Newell, K., et al. (2014). *Implementation continuum for school turnaround and transformation.* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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