Appendix B: Construct Matrix, Study of School Turnaround

EQ=evaluation questions; SA=state administrator; DA=district administrators; DA-ELL=district ELL coordinator; P=school principal; T=teachers;T-ELL=ELL teachers; TFG=teacher focus group; TS=teacher survey; SS=other school staff (e.g., school improvement team); EP=state and local external providers; P/C= parents, community organizations; S=students; F=fiscal data; DS=document sources; SO=School Observation, UR=union representatives

Note: Analytic categories that represent qualities of actions or policies do not include check marks for data collection instruments. This is because these qualities will be measured analytically by synthesizing data across multiple data collection instruments.

Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-ELL)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/ Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
I. STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF SIG																	
IA State Contextual Influences																	
1 Past reform efforts (targets, approach)	7	□														□	
2 Fiscal environment (high/low spending state; distribution; relative cuts)	7	□													□	□	
3 Implementation of other federal programs (degree of administrative and fiscal coordination, RTT, state systems of support)	7	□									□					□	
4 Other relevant state policies (right to work, charter restriction, authority to intervene due to low performance, non-NCLB state accountability system)	7	□														□	
5 Other state categorical programs	7	□													□	□	
6 Stakeholder relations and political conflict (strength of state teacher union)	7	□															
7 Size of state (enrollment, number of districts)	7															□	

	Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/ Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
																Extant Data		
	8	Number of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, restructuring	7															□	
IB		State SIG Policies																	
	1	Definition of SIG schools (criteria, rationale, number)	1															□	
	2	Selection of participating districts (process, criteria, rationale, number)	1	□														□	
	3	Characteristics of selected districts (demographics, urbanicity, perf levels)	1	(extant data)														□	
	4	Specific SIG guidance/TA (type, target, intensity)	1	□			□						□			□		□	
	5	State perspectives on case study districts	1	□															
	6	State approval/criteria for external providers	1,5	□									□					□	
IC		Qualities of State Approach*			□														
	1	Clarity																	
	2	Specificity/ prescriptiveness																	
	3	Degree of targeting																	
II.		DISTRICT IMPLEMENTATION OF SIG																	
IIA		District Contextual Influences																	
	1	Past reform efforts	7		□	□	□											□	
	2	Current district reform strategy, goals and priorities	7		□	□	□											□	
	3	District performance indicators (AYP status)	7																□	
	4	Local fiscal environment (high or low spending; presence of federal and other external funding sources)	7		□												□		

Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/ Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
															Extant Data		
5 Centralization of budgetary and instructional decision-making, and personnel	7		□		□												
6 Pool/suppliers of available teachers and administrators	7		□											2		□	
7 Stability of district leadership	7		□														
8 Stability of professional workforce (district-wide; variation across schools)	7		□											4			
9 Personnel policies (tenure, evaluation policies, incentives and compensation)	7		□													□	
10 PD policies	7		□	□												□	
11 Local data systems, prof networks, and other mechanisms for information sharing and knowledge development (comprehensiveness, accessibility, timeliness)	7		□													□	
12 Union, management, board politics (level of support)	7		□											□		□	
13 Availability of external professional resources (univ. professional associations, external providers)	7									□				□		□	
14 Availability of other instructional resources (e.g., museums, after school and youth development orgs)	7		□													□	

	Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/ Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Extant Data		
																Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
15	Demographic make-up of student population, including distribution across schools (ELL, ethnicity, high poverty, low-performing)	7		☐	☐										☐		☐	
IIB	Actions and Strategies for SIG Schools																	
1	Selection of models/CMOs/EMOs (criteria, rationale- general [including closure], rationale- case study schools, input, accessibility)	1		☐		☐					☐				☐			
2	Distribution of funds across SIG schools (Tier I, II, III, concentration on certain schools)	6		☐	☐												☐	
3	Restrictions on school use of SIG funds	6		☐	☐	☐										☐		
4	Strategies to sustain funding and improvement	6		☐		☐										☐		
5	Staffing and HR policies specific to SIG schools (divergence from other schools) (transfer, recruitment, compensation/incentives, evaluation, placement)	3		☐	☐	☐								☐			☐	
6	Additional flexibility for SIG schools (nature, rationale)	2,3,4,5		☐		☐		☐										
7	Technical Assistance to SIG schools (Content, target [who], providers, intensity)	3,5		☐	☐	☐		☐				☐			☐		☐	
8	Additional PD resources, opps, requirements for SIG schools	3,5		☐	☐	☐		☐									☐	
9	Mechanism for monitoring and enforcement	1,4		☐								☐					☐	

| | | | | Data Collection Activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | Extant Data | | |
	Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/ Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
	10 Facilities/working conditions- improvements	1,6																□
IIC	Qualities of District Approaches*																	
	1 Coherence																	
	2 Divergence from prior practice			□														
	3 Targeting			□											□			
	4 Clarity																	
	5 Accessibility and timeliness of information					□												
	6 Specificity/ prescriptiveness			□														
	7 Relative emphasis on pressure vs. support			□														
	8 Alignment with federal and state policies			□														
III.	SCHOOL IMPLEMENTATION OF SIG																	
IIIA	School Contextual Influences										□							
	1 History of past reforms/interventions	7				□	□	□	□		□	□					□	
	2 Current reforms still in place	7			□	□	□					□					□	
	3 AYP status in federal and state accountability systems	7				□											□	
	4 Fiscal resources (from any source including constraints on use)	7				□										□		
	5 Community resources (CBOs, recreational resources, economics/employment)	7		□		□	□	□	□								□	
	6 Level of budgetary discretion	7				□										□		

	#	Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
																	Extant Data		
	7	Prior stability and capacity of pre-SIG professional personnel (Leadership stability, average # of yrs in school, turnover rates, % emergency certificates, % novice teachers, % teachers out of field, vacancy rates [hard-to-staff schools])	7		□	□	□	□	□	□				□				□	
	8	Available pool of new personnel	7		□		□	□	□	□									
	9	Governance structure	7				□	□	□	□	□		□					□	
	10	Existing supports for students (wraparound services, after school, etc.)	7					□	□	□		□			□			□	
	11	Student demographics and stability (grade configuration, % high poverty; ethnicity; ELL concentration; student mobility; foster care, homeless, juvenile justice, gangs)	7				□	□	□	□								□	
	12	Existing school culture						□	□	□	□	□							□
IIIB		Actions and Strategies										□							
	1	Assessment of needs and prior practice (participants, data use, results)	1,2,3,			□	□	□	□	□		□	□						
	2	Uses of SIG funds and other resources	6				□		□				□	□			□		
	3	Strategies to improve staff capacity				□	□	□	□	□		□	□	□					
	a	Changes in personnel	3					□	□	□									

		Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-...)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Fiscal Data (F)	Docs (DS)	School Obs. (SO)
																	Extant Data	
	b	Replacement (who [admin, teachers, support]; criteria and rationale; how many [%], where replaced staff went; characteristics of new staff}	3					☐											
	c	Additional positions or staff	3					☐		☐									
	d	Placement of staff (incl. ELL teachers)	3					☐	☐	☐									
	e	Evaluation (criteria, process, frequency)	3				☐												
	f	Incentives for increasing motivation and teacher engagement	3,7				☐	☐	☐										
	g	Professional learning opports. (incl. ELL teachers)	3				☐	☐	☐	☐									
4		Leadership actions (vision, monitoring instruction, data use, evaluation [criteria and process])	2,3,4				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐					
5		Leaders (who provides and how distributed)	3,4				☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐						
6		Strategies to improve instructional practices for at-risk students				☐	☐	☐	☐	☐		☐	☐	☐		☐			
	a	Changes to curriculum (content area, incorp. ELD, scope and sequence, etc.)	2,7				☐	☐		☐					☐				
	b	Pedagogical approach (direct instruction vs. constructivism; differentiated instruction)	2,7				☐	☐		☐					☐				
	c	Assessment practices	2,7				☐								☐			☐	

		Key Constructs and Indicators	EQs	State Admin (SA)	District Admin (DA)	District ELL Coordinator (DA-)	Principal (P)	Teachers (T)	ELL Teachers (T-ELL)	Teacher Focus Group (TFG)	Teacher Survey (TS)	School Staff (SS)	External Providers (EP)	Parents/Community (P/C)	Students (S)	Union Rep (UR)	Extant Data Fiscal Data (F)	Extant Data Docs (DS)	Extant Data School Obs. (SO)
	d	Data use (content, indicators)	2,7				□	□		□	□								
	e	Instructional time	2,7				□	□		□					□			□	
7		Strategies for stakeholder involvement (parent engagement, community)	2			□	□		□	□	□	□	□	□					
8		Strategies to improve school climate (discipline policies, supports for at-risk students)	2,4,7				□	□	□	□		□	□	□	□				□
IIIC		Qualities of School Actions and Approaches*																	
	1	Coherence					□				□			□					
	2	Breadth												□					
	3	Divergence from prior practice					□							□					
	4	Alignment									□								
	5	Buy-in						□		□	□			□					
	6	Depth					□	□						□					
	7	Theory of action					□												

* Indicators of the analytical qualities will be developed from multiple data sources and therefore are not mapped to the specific data collection activities