

Relationship between State Annual School Monitoring Indicators and Outcomes in Massachusetts Low-Performing Schools

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has developed state systems of monitoring and support for low-performing schools that include measuring schools on a Turnaround Practices and Indicators (TP&I) rubric focused on four turnaround practice areas. This study examined the relationship of ratings on a four-point scale for 26 indicators with two school outcomes—school-level mean student growth percentile (in English language arts and math) and school chronic absenteeism rate—while controlling for school demographic characteristics. The results of the study will inform DESE’s continuous improvement efforts and improve its ability to focus on indicators with ratings that are strongly related to positive school outcomes.

Key findings

Ratings for 13 of the 26 indicators within the TP&I rubric had significant and strong relationships with higher student growth percentile scores and lower chronic absenteeism rate, after school demographic characteristics were controlled for. No significant relationships were found in an undesirable direction.

Selected Massachusetts turnaround practice indicators that have statistically significant and strong relationships with school outcomes, 2014/15–2018/19

Turnaround practice area and indicator	School mean student growth percentile		
	English language arts	Math	Chronic absenteeism
1. Leadership, Shared Responsibility, and Professional Collaboration			
1.2 High Expectations and Positive Regard			■
1.5 Trusting Relationships			■
2. Intentional Practices for Improving Instruction			
2.1 Instructional Expectations		■	
2.2 Instructional Schedule	■		
2.5 Student Assessment Data Use (for schoolwide decision-making)	■		
2.6 Student Assessment Data Use (for classroom instruction)	■	■	
2.7 Structures for Instructional Improvement	■	■	
3. Student-Specific Supports and Instruction to All Students			
3.1 General Academic Interventions and Enrichment	■		■
3.2 Teacher Training to Identify Student Needs	■		
3.5 Academic Interventions for English Language Learners	■		
3.6 Academic Interventions for Students with Disabilities	■		
4. School Climate and Culture			
4.1 Schoolwide Behavior Plan	■		■
4.2 Adult–Student Relationships		■	■

Note: Blocks (■) indicate a significant and strong (effect size of at least .25) relationship between the indicator and the outcome at the $p < .05$ level. All the significant relationships are in the desired direction. Blank cells represent findings that were not statistically significant or that were statistically significant but not practically meaningful. Analyses were based on 229 year-specific observations from 91 schools.

Source: Authors’ analysis of data for 2014/15–2018/19 from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.