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ROLE OF LEADING INDICATORS TO IMPROVE THE ODDS OF TURNAROUND SUCCESS
Audacious national goal: turn around 5,000 persistently low-achieving schools

The problem: low success rates across sectors

- Even in wealthy, non-education sectors:
  - Start-ups succeed only 20-25 percent of the time.
  - Previously-successful entrepreneurs succeed only 34 percent of the time.
  - Bad-to-great turnaround and “major change” efforts succeed about 30 percent of the time.
PAYOFF OF FASTER “RETRY” RATE

5 Year Cumulative Success Rate: Percent of schools turned around by Year 5

100% 83% 58% 30%

Retry Rate: Number of years until retry when change fails

Notes: 1. Assumes 30 percent of schools fixed with each round of effort. 2. For two-year Retry Rate, Year 5 Cumulative Success Rate is average of years 4 and 6.
Rapid Retry – Why Settle for Less?

Assuming a generous 30 percent success rate of turnaround efforts in 5,000 schools:

- Moving from 5- to 2-year retry rate nearly doubles the number of failing schools turned around within five years.
- The country could achieve success in 2,500 to 4,000+ of those 5,000 schools in five years, rather than the likely 500 to 1,500.
To consider rapid retry, we need to identify and track leading indicators that predict later success in turnaround schools.

- Leading indicators are the early signs that leaders inside and outside education use regularly to determine whether an initiative is on the right track or destined to fail.

- In school turnarounds, leading indicators can provide early evidence about whether a school is on track—and if not, how to redirect to increase the odds of success.
CROSS-SECTOR RESEARCH FINDINGS
Cross-sector research suggests that leading indicators should be:

- Based on known “success factors” in similar settings.
- **Constantly evolving** to predict success at each stage.
- **Tailored** to specific circumstances and settings.
- Based on **specific timetables**.
Cross-sector research suggests five *success factors* for successful turnarounds:

1. Leaders exhibit *turnaround competencies*.
2. Leaders take specific *turnaround actions*.
3. Leaders make a *turnaround plan* to achieve early wins and longer term goals.
4. Schools create the *preconditions for learning gains*.
5. Schools *achieve early wins* related to high-priority goals.
**Turnaround Leader Actions**

1. Focus on a few early wins
2. Get the right staff, right the remainder
3. Lead a turnaround campaign
4. Break organization norms
5. Drive decisions with open-air data
6. Push rapid-fire experimentation
### Selecting School-Level Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Factor</th>
<th>Leading Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders exhibit turnaround competencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Driving for results</td>
<td>· School leader’s overall rating on each competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Influencing for results</td>
<td>· Leader’s rating within each cluster of related competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Engaging in problem solving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Showing confidence to lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders take specific turnaround actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Focusing on a limited set of high-priority short-term goals</td>
<td>· Ratings on the degree to which the leader engages in each action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Signaling the magnitude and urgency of dramatic change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Discarding failed rules and routines and deploying new tactics for early wins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Releasing or redeploying staff not fully committed to the turnaround; bringing in new staff who can help organize and drive change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Influencing stakeholders to support turnaround actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Quickly trying new tactics and discarding failed ones, investing in what works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Driving decisions by openly reporting staff results and sharing results in open-air sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leaders make a turnaround plan to achieve early wins and later goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Plan is based on review of data, addresses implementation of turnaround success actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Plan includes goals (early-win and later) and detailed steps for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Leader and all staff take steps according to plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools achieve preconditions for learning gains</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Improved instructional quality</td>
<td>· Distribution of teacher quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Increased participation in school</td>
<td>· Percentage of students taught by highly effective teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Improved school culture</td>
<td>· Number of instructional minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Students in AP/IB/dual-enrollment classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Student and teacher attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Truants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Student turnover rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools achieve early wins related to high-priority goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Dropout rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Participation on State assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Discipline incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Student waiting list (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Student, teacher and parent satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· State test results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Benchmark test results and short-cycle assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Other indicators based on school-specific, early-win goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monitoring School-Level Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Factor</th>
<th>Leading Indicator</th>
<th>Data Collection by...</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leaders exhibit turnaround competencies | • School leader’s overall rating on each competency  
• Leader’s rating in each cluster of competencies | • Local educational agency (LEA) (for example, competency assessments such as interviews and 360-degree reviews) | • At placement prior to Year 1  
• December/January in Year 1  
• Annually thereafter |
| Leaders take turnaround success actions | • Ratings on the degree to which the leader engages in each action  
• Teacher turnover rates | • LEA (for example, school visits and interviews)  
• LEA (including both voluntary and involuntary turnover) | • Quarterly |
| Leaders make turnaround plans to achieve early-win and later goals | • Existence of a plan including turnaround success actions  
• Level of clarity and detail in goals, steps and timing for all staff  
• Ratings of timeliness of actions to implement steps in plan  
• Existence of systems to regularly collect, analyze and use data | • LEA/State education agency (SEA) (for example, existence and content of plan; school visits, interviews and surveys to assess follow-through) | • Written plan by school opening  
• Action quarterly in Year 1; semiannually thereafter |
| Schools achieve preconditions for learning gains | • Distribution of teacher quality (SIG)  
• Percentage of students taught by highly effective teachers  
• Number of instructional minutes (SIG)  
• Students in AP/IB/dual-enrollment classes (SIG)  
• Student and teacher attendance (SIG)  
• Truants (SIG)  
• Student turnover rates  
• Dropout rate (SIG)  
• Participation on state assessments (SIG)  
• Discipline incidents (SIG)  
• Student waiting list (if applicable)  
• Student, teacher and parent satisfaction | • SEA (teacher ratings on LEA evaluation system; student enrollment data)  
• LEA/SEA | • Annually  
• Quarterly  
• Annually  
• Quarterly |
| Schools achieve early wins related to high-priority goals | • Benchmark test results  
• Short-cycle assessments  
• Other indicators based on school-specific goals  
• State test results | • SEA | • Weekly, biweekly, monthly  
• Quarterly  
• Annually |
STATE SHARING ON USE OF LEADING INDICATORS
LEADING INDICATORS IN RHODE ISLAND
- Rhode Island Transformation Office and approach to school reform planning and monitoring
- Process for selecting leading indicators
- Snapshot of indicator tracking tools: School Reform Plan templates
- Alignment of State educational agency (SEA) technical assistance to support local educational agency (LEA) tracking
Leading Indicators in Tennessee’s Achievement School District
TENNESSEE ACHIEVEMENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Context of the Achievement School District (ASD) as a school turnaround LEA
- Design and function of the ASD accountability framework
- Design and function of ASD School Review process
Discussion
Selecting & Using Leading Indicators

1. What set of leading indicators does your State currently monitor/require districts to monitor?

2. Are there leading indicators arising from cross-sector research, or in use in Rhode Island or Tennessee that your State does not currently monitor? What are advantages of or barriers to including them?

3. Does your State have a plan to intervene (or support district interventions) in turnaround schools that are not on track?
UPCOMING EVENTS

- Save the date
  - February 21, 2013 at 3pm EST
  - Webinar on goal-setting and trajectories for school turnaround success

- Follow-up working group call
  - Focused on developing and using leading indicators of turnaround success
    - Interest from participants?
    - Priority topics?
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  [http://educationnext.org/the-big-uturn/](http://educationnext.org/the-big-uturn/)
Questions?
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