

January 2017

Thank you for your request for **research on third party support in school turnaround efforts**. Ask REL Southwest is part of a collaborative Ask A REL reference desk service provided by the 10 regional educational laboratories (RELs). By design, this service functions much in the same way as a technical reference library, by providing references, referrals, and brief responses in the form of citations for research-based education questions.

Please note that REL Southwest has not done an evaluation of the resources themselves but offers this list to you for your information only.

BACKGROUND

“Successful school turnarounds—characterized by quick, strategic changes in school culture and systems that result in dramatic improvement in student achievement in persistently low-performing schools—are hard work and difficult to achieve and sustain. Further complicating the issue, few states and districts have a clear, robust definition of turnaround success, which would enable states, districts, and schools to:

- Identify successful turnarounds and examine factors that contribute to success, creating lessons useful to other schools.
- Determine as early as possible when a turnaround attempt is off-track in order to respond more quickly and effectively.”¹

Following an established REL Southwest protocol, we conducted a search for research reports, websites, as well as descriptive briefs on third party support in school turnaround efforts. **We searched the references in the response from the most commonly used resources of research, but they are not comprehensive and other relevant references and resources may exist.** The sources included federally funded organizations, additional research institutions, educational databases, and general Internet searches using Google and Bing. See the methods section at the end of this Ask A REL for additional information on how we identified the following sources.

QUESTION

In what ways do outside operators (that is, third-party support) lend support to turnaround efforts in struggling schools?

¹ Lutterloh, C., Cornier, J.P., & Hassel, B. C. “Measuring school turnaround success.” The Center on School Turnaround. WestEd.

http://www.schoolturnaroundsupport.org/sites/default/files/resources/Measuring_School_Turnaround_Success.pdf.

Klute, M., Cherasaro, T., & Aphorp, H. (2016). Summary of research on the association between state interventions in chronically low-performing schools and student achievement. REL 2016-138. Regional Educational Laboratory Central.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED565613>.

From the ERIC abstract: "This report summarizes the research on the association between state interventions in chronically low-performing schools and student achievement. Most of the research focused on one type of state intervention: working with a turnaround partner. Few studies were identified that examined other types of interventions, such as school closure, charter conversion, and school redesign. Most studies were descriptive, which limits the conclusions that can be drawn about the effectiveness of the interventions. Results of studies of turnaround partner interventions were mixed and suggested that student achievement was more likely to improve when particular factors--such as strong leadership, use of data to guide instruction, and a positive school culture characterized by trust and increased expectations for students--were in place in schools. Studies in California examined the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program or its successor, the High Priority School Grant Program. Ten studies examined interventions in states other than California. Studies varied somewhat in the details of the interventions studied, including whether additional funding was provided to support implementation of reforms. Unlike interventions in California, studies in other states did not describe school participation in interventions as voluntary. The following are appended: (1) Literature search procedures; and (2) Characteristics of studies included in the literature review."

Peurach, D. J.; Neumerski, C. M. (2015). Mixing Metaphors: Building Infrastructure for Large Scale School Turnaround, *Journal of Educational Change*, v16 n4 p379-420.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1082546>.

From the ERIC abstract: "The purpose of this analysis is to increase understanding of the possibilities and challenges of building educational infrastructure--the basic, foundational structures, systems, and resources--to support large-scale school turnaround. Building educational infrastructure often exceeds the capacity of schools, districts, and state education agencies and, thus, requires collaborating with "lead turnaround partners" with specialized capabilities for such work. However, there is little research to guide the selection or operation of lead turnaround partners. The analysis uses a descriptive case study of one organization with success operating as a lead turnaround partner (Success for All) to develop a framework to guide the selection of lead turnaround partners, support their operations, and structure further research. While base level achievement gains can be realized within 3 years, the analysis suggests that fully establishing school-level infrastructure is estimated conservatively as a 7 years process, and fully establishing system-level infrastructure has been an on-going, 40 year process. The analysis suggests a strong need to balance the rhetorical urgency of "turnaround" with the understanding that building educational infrastructure to improve large numbers of underperforming schools will likely require massive, sustained technical, financial, policy, and political support."

Tanenbaum, C., Boyle, A., Graczewski, C., James-Burdumy, S., Dragoset, L., Hallgren, K. (2015). State capacity to support school turnaround. NCEE Evaluation Brief. NCEE 2015-4012. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED556118>.

From the ERIC abstract. "One objective of the U.S. Department of Education's (ED) School Improvement Grants (SIG) and Race to the Top (RTT) program is to help states enhance their capacity to support the turnaround of low-performing schools. This capacity may be important, given how difficult it is to produce substantial and sustained achievement gains in low-performing schools. There is limited existing research on the extent to which states have the capacity to support school turnaround and are pursuing strategies to enhance that capacity. This brief documents states' capacity to support school turnaround as of spring 2012 and spring 2013. It examines capacity issues for all states and for those that reported both prioritizing turnaround and having significant gaps in expertise to support it. Key findings, based on interviews with administrators from 49 states and the District of Columbia, include the following: (1) More than 80 percent of states made turning around low-performing schools a high priority, but at least 50 percent found it very difficult to turn around low-performing schools; (2) 38 states (76 percent) reported significant gaps in expertise for supporting school turnaround in 2012, and that number increased to 40 (80 percent) in 2013; (3) More than 85 percent of states reported using strategies to enhance their capacity to support school turnaround, with the use of intermediaries decreasing over time and the use of organizational or administrative structures increasing over time; and (4) States that reported both prioritizing school turnaround and having significant gaps in expertise to support it were no more likely to report using intermediaries than other states but all 21 of these states reported having at least one organizational or administrative structure compared with 86 percent (25 of 29) of all other states. Appended are: (1) Race to the Top and School Improvement Grant Intervention Models as Described by the U.S. Department of Education SIG Guidance (2012); (2) State Interview Questions Used for Analyses in this Brief; and (3) Analysis of State Capacity to Support School Turnaround by RTT Status."

Trujillo, T. & Renée, M. (2015). Irrational exuberance for market-based reform: How federal turnaround policies thwart democratic schooling. *Teachers College Record*, v117 n6. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1056826>.

From the ERIC abstract. "Background: In 2009, the Obama Administration announced its intention to rapidly "turn around" 5,000 of the nation's lowest-performing schools. To do so, it relied on the School Improvement Grant (SIG) program to provide temporary funding for states and schools, and to mandate drastic, school-level reforms. Most of these reforms require massive administrative and teacher layoffs, especially under the "turnaround option." In the public debate about the SIG program, reforms such as turnarounds have been described as new and innovative. In reality, the nation has significant experience with them, particularly over the past 40 years. Turnaround-style reforms are not only based on unwarranted claims; they ignore contrary research evidence about the potential of mass firings to improve organizational performance. Purpose: This paper considers the tensions with democratic education inherent in the

federal SIG program's market-based school reforms. It examines the evolution of and intent behind the 2009 federal SIG program. From there, it considers the lessons of forty years of research on educational effectiveness and high-stakes accountability. It builds on this evidence, as well as the growing literature on communities' engagement in reform, in its analysis of the school turnaround research and practice. The paper culminates in a set of recommendations that are intended to re-center the purposes of public education for low-income students, students of color, and local communities in developing more equitable, democratic school turnarounds. Research Design: This article synthesizes forty years of research on school and district effectiveness, high-stakes accountability, and community engagement in school reform to evaluate the federal School Improvement Grant program's potential to cultivate democratic, equitable public schools. It also reviews the small, but rapidly growing literature on school turnarounds, paying particular attention to the ways in which this new field reproduces or departs from earlier literature that examined reform models that are analogous to the current SIG-funded school turnarounds. Conclusions: Based on the provisional lessons that are emerging from current SIG-inspired turnarounds, from research on earlier efforts to improve school and district effectiveness, and from pockets of promising community-based practices that are developing at local and national levels, we propose five steps that federal, state, and local policymakers can take toward fostering more equitable, democratic turnaround processes. First, increase current federal and state spending for public education, particularly as it is allocated for more democratic turnarounds. Second, focus turnaround policies on improving the quality of teaching and learning rather than on technical-structural changes. Third, engage a broad cross-section of schools' communities--teachers, students, parents, and community organizations--in planning and implementing turnaround strategies that are tailored to each school and district context. Fourth, incorporate multiple indicators of effectiveness--apart from test scores--that reflect the range of purposes for schools. Fifth, support ongoing, systematic research, evaluation, and dissemination examining all aspects of turnaround processes in schools and districts.”

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Aladjem, D. K., Birman, B. F., Orland, M., Harr-Robins, J., Heredia, A., Parrish, T. B., & Ruffini, S. J. (2010). *Achieving dramatic school improvement: An exploratory study*. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Policy and Program Studies Service, U.S. Department of Education; Washington, D.C.; 197 pages.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED526783>.

From the ERIC abstract: “This exploratory study describes approaches to improving schools through retrospective, in-depth qualitative case studies. To select schools to be examined, the authors sought to identify Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools demonstrating two distinctive patterns of improved student achievement between 2000 and 2005, rapid-improvement (i.e., schools that made quick and dramatic improvements in student achievement over a one or two year time period) as well as slow-and-steady (i.e., schools that made noteworthy student achievement improvements but over a four or five year timeframe). This process led the authors to study 11 schools. This report provides examples of how some schools appear to be achieving noteworthy gains in

student outcomes; while achieving these gains appears to be relatively rare, there also appears to be multiple ways to do so. This study points to the dynamic settings in which many low-performing schools operate and the need for ongoing investigation of how schools can achieve impressive results and sustain them in constantly changing environments. Researchers, policymakers, and practitioners in recent years have paid much attention to the scientific search for "what works" to improve schools and turn them around. This study's findings draw attention to the fact that turning schools around is not just about adopting a set of effective or promising practices. It is about recognizing that "one best system" does not exist--that no single approach can guarantee improvement in a particular school. It is also about implementing practices well, while at the same time navigating and adapting to a constantly changing landscape. Appended are: (1) Detailed Methodology; (2) Data Collection Instruments; and (3) Site Abstracts. (Contains 56 exhibits and 32 footnotes.)" NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Baroody, K. (2011). Turning around the nation's lowest-performing schools: Five steps districts can take to improve their chances of success. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED535862>.

From the ERIC abstract: "Across the country, states and school districts are focusing on turning around the nation's lowest-performing schools. Unprecedented federal Race to the Top and School Improvement Grant funding accompanied by a more prescriptive approach for using the funds has raised the profile of turnaround efforts. This focus on school turnaround, while welcome, is not new. State, district, and school leaders have been trying for years to turn around persistently low-performing schools. But while some schools have made significant gains in student achievement, results overall are decidedly mixed. One of the overarching reasons for the uneven results is that districts generally have failed to recognize that persistently low-performing schools face unique challenges that require aggressive, customized, and sustained interventions. Education Resource Strategies, Inc., or ERS, has identified five steps that districts can take in designing and implementing their school improvement programs that will increase the probability that their efforts will achieve lasting improvement: (1) Understand what each school needs; (2) Quantify what each school gets and how it is used; (3) Invest in the most important changes first; (4) Customize the strategy to the school; and (5) Change the district, not just the schools. There is no silver bullet—no single solution for how to turn a failing school around. But by taking these five steps district leaders can improve their probability for sustainable and scalable success. But by taking these five steps district leaders can improve their probability for sustainable and scalable success. (Contains 26 endnotes.)"

Calkins, A., Guenther, W., Belfiore, G., & Lash, D. (2007). The turnaround challenge: Why America's best opportunity to dramatically improve student achievement lies in our worst-performing schools. Boston, MA: Mass Insight Education & Research Institute. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED538309>.

From the ERIC abstract: "Despite steadily increasing urgency about the nation's lowest-performing schools--those in the bottom five percent--efforts to turn these schools around have largely failed. Marginal change has led to marginal (or no) improvement.

These schools, the systems supporting them, and the management of the change process require fundamental rethinking, not incremental change. These schools fail because the challenges they face are substantial; because they themselves are dysfunctional; and because the system of which they are a part is not responsive to the needs of the high-poverty student populations they tend to serve. Effective turnaround at scale calls for bold, comprehensive action from the state, working together with districts and outside partners. Research suggests that a coherent, comprehensive state turnaround initiative would incorporate three key elements: Changing Conditions, Building Capacity, and Clustering for Support. This Executive Summary provides an overview of "The Turnaround Challenge," a much larger report produced by the Boston-based Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, in conjunction with a broad range of national partners. [For the full report, "The Turnaround Challenge: Why America's Best Opportunity to Dramatically Improve Student Achievement Lies in Our Worst-Performing Schools," see ED538298. For "The Turnaround Challenge: Why America's Best Opportunity to Dramatically Improve Student Achievement Lies in Our Worst-Performing Schools. Supplement to the Main Report," see ED538300.]” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

David, J. L., & Talbert, J. E. (2012). Turning around a high-poverty school district: Learning from Sanger Unified’s success. Palo Alto, CA: Bay Area Research Group, and Stanford, CA: Center for Research on the Context of Teaching.
<http://www.web.stanford.edu/group/suse-crc/cgi-bin/drupal/sites/default/files/Sanger%20Turnaround%2010-14-12.pdf>.

Report excerpt: “Stories of turnaround schools are rare. Stories of turnaround school districts are even rarer, particularly those with a track record that is still strong after eight years. The Sanger Unified School District created an engine for continuous improvement. Other districts have some of the individual elements of Sanger’s comprehensive reform but few if any have accomplished the sweeping changes in district culture that undergird and sustain their improvement strategies. How did Sanger manage to produce these results? Will they last? What can others learn from Sanger’s evolution? With funding from S. H. Cowell Foundation in San Francisco, we have had the opportunity to investigate Sanger’s successes and its struggles and document the path that led them from dire straits to one of the most talked about districts in the state. Our goal is to capture what it is about Sanger’s approach that is so different from typical improvement efforts and to suggest the kinds of lessons that have relevance for district reform across the nation.” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Honig, M. I., Copland, M. A., Rainey, L., Lorton, J. A., & Newton, M. (2010). Central office transformation for district-wide teaching and learning improvement. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
Retrieved on February 18, 2015, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED517767>.

From the ERIC abstract: “This report summarizes main results from a national study of how leaders in urban school district central offices fundamentally transformed their work and relationships with schools to support districtwide teaching and learning improvement. All three study districts had been posting gains in student achievement and credited their progress, in part, to efforts to radically change their work at the central

office level. The authors aimed to understand more specifically what these central offices were doing. The study breaks new ground in educational research by uncovering the daily work practices and activities of central office administrators as they sought not just to make the central office more efficient but also to transform the central office into a support system to help all schools improve the quality of teaching and learning. The findings reveal that leaders in these systems, first and foremost, understood what decades of experience and research have shown: that districts generally do not see districtwide improvements in teaching and learning without substantial engagement by their central offices in helping all schools build their capacity for improvement. Central offices and the people who work in them are not simply part of the background noise in school improvement. Rather, school district central office administrators exercise essential leadership, in partnership with school leaders, to build capacity throughout public educational systems for teaching and learning improvements. The districts in this study were attempting to heed those lessons by engaging in an approach to central office change the authors call "central office transformation." Central office transformation is a far cry from central-office-administration-as-usual. This approach to reform: (1) Focuses centrally and meaningfully on teaching and learning improvement; (2) Engages the entire central office in reform; (3) Calls on central office administrators to fundamentally remake their work practices and their relationships with schools to support teaching and learning improvements for all schools; and (4) Constitutes an important focus for reform in its own right. (Contains 3 tables, 6 figures and 23 footnotes.) [This paper was written with the assistance of Elizabeth Matson, Liza Pappas, and Bethany Rogers.] NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Knudson, J., Shambaugh, L., & O'Day, J. (2011). Beyond the school: Exploring a systemic approach to school turnaround. Policy and practice brief. Palo Alto, CA: California Collaborative for District Reform. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED526853>.

From the ERIC abstract: "Educators have long grappled with the challenge presented by chronically underperforming schools. Environments that consistently fail to prepare students for higher levels of education threaten opportunities for high school graduation, postsecondary education, and career success. The U.S. Department of Education reinforced the urgency of reversing sustained poor performance in early 2009 when it identified intensive supports and effective interventions in lowest-achieving schools as one of its four pillars of education reform. However, federal and state policies have often situated the cause--and thus the remedies--for persistent low performance at the school level. This brief uses the experience of eight California school districts--all members of the California Collaborative on District Reform--to suggest a more systemic approach to school turnaround. The authors explore the district perspective on school turnaround by describing several broad themes that emerged across the eight districts in the California Collaborative on District Reform. They also profile three of these districts to illustrate specific strategies that can create a coherent district-wide approach to turnaround. Building on these district perspectives, they explore considerations for turnaround efforts in the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). (Contains 10 endnotes.) [Additional funding for this paper was provided by the Dirk and Charlene Kabcenell Foundation.]" NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Kutash, J., Nico, E., Gorin, E., Rahmatullah, S., & Tallant, K. (2010). The school turnaround field guide. Boston, MA: FSG Social Impact Advisors.
<http://wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/The-School-Turnaround-Field-Guide.pdf>.

From the executive summary: “Despite the tremendous level of activity in the school turnaround field over the past two years, the effort is still in its early stages. The field is growing quickly, but remains highly fragmented. Interventions are moving forward rapidly, but reformers have little knowledge of what is working and how to scale what works. This report aims to increase education reformers’ awareness of turnaround issues, to prompt those in the field to think about how to most effectively do turnaround work, and to encourage members of the field to work in concert with each other. If the U.S. is to transform thousands of its chronically underperforming schools, multiple actors must work together to identify and spread effective practices, create the policies and conditions for success, build capacity, and ensure the sustainability of turnaround work at scale.” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Lazarín, Melissa. "Charting New Territory: Tapping Charter Schools to Turn around the Nation's Dropout Factories." *Center for American Progress* (2011).
<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=ED536075>.

From the ERIC abstract: “Only a quarter of the class of 2008 graduated from Alain Locke Senior High School in Los Angeles after four years. This was unsurprising since nearly 60 percent of the class had left Locke by the end of their sophomore year. A majority of Locke teachers--frustrated with the school's mediocrity--petitioned to allow charter management organization Green Dot Public Schools to transform the school. Locke reopened its doors in the fall with new landscaping, new teachers, a series of new small schools within the school, and new expectations. Two years into the transformation, a record 73 percent of sophomore students were still there at the end of the year. Green Dot Public Schools's transformation of Locke is one of the most notable examples of a charter management organization, or CMO, turning around a chronically underperforming traditional public school. And the Obama administration would like to see more of it. This policy paper explores the role of charter schools in turning around the nation's lowest-performing high schools. Based on conversations with charter school operators, school district staff, researchers, and education reform experts, it examines how some pioneering cities--Los Angeles and Philadelphia in particular--are partnering with local charter operators to turn around some of their dropout factories and improve college readiness and graduation rates. The paper explores barriers and opportunities for collaboration between charter management organizations and districts to turn around high schools. It finds that the extent to which districts have access to CMOs in their area, the degree of expertise that CMOs have in targeting secondary schools, and factors affecting the charter sector's growth all have some influence on the likelihood of success from these partnerships. (Contains 91 endnotes.) [For related report, "Review of Charting New Territory," see ED523958.]” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Mass Insight Education and Research Institute. (2010). School turnaround models: Emerging turnaround strategies and results. [PowerPoint slide presentation]. http://www.doe.virginia.gov/support/school_improvement/title1/1003_g/models/mass_insight_school_turnaround_models_emerging_strategies.pdf.

From the presentation: “This report represents an extension of Mass Insight’s research on school turnaround. It focuses on emerging examples of effective school turnaround from the field, both at the district and partner levels.

This report highlights promising turnaround models from the field...examples represent diverse approaches...models serve as a resource for those entering the field and should inform policy in this area.”

Murphy, P., & Oujidani, M. (2011). State capacity for school improvement: A first look at agency resources. Center on Reinventing Public Education. University of Virginia Bothell. http://www.schoolturnaroundsupport.org/sites/default/files/resources/pub_states_stat_ecap_Aug11_0_0.pdf.

From the introduction: “The current emphasis on school performance and accountability is expected to continue.¹ As a consequence, the number of low-performing schools will increase as academic achievement targets become more stringent. In response, the federal government has begun to look to state education agencies (SEAs) to play a more direct role in turning around schools in need of improvement. This increased emphasis, however, takes place at a time when public resources are becoming increasingly constrained.” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Murphy, P., & Rainey L. (2012). "Modernizing the State Education Agency: Different Paths toward Performance Management." *Center on Reinventing Public Education*. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535609>.

From the ERIC abstract: “This project examines how eight state education agencies engaged the charge of improving their lowest-performing schools. The states examined are among the most active and intentional in this regard. In many ways, they are at the leading edge of what could eventually become 50 different experiments in performance management. By focusing on states at the forefront of the turnaround effort, the authors hope to identify promising paths that SEAs can follow as they shift the focus of their departments away from ensuring compliance and toward managing for improved performance. This report begins by briefly discussing prior research on the role of state agencies in supporting struggling schools. It then identifies the logic of school reform that guides their processes. Importantly, all of the states examined here start from nearly the same point, a federally defined set of steps by which they are bound, and they share certain elements of change. For example, they all used data to guide their work, restructured their organizations, and embraced the principles of transparency and clarity in communicating their intentions. They established a sense of urgency to build momentum for reform, leveraged the threat of federal requirements, and relied upon strong leadership, though in differing manners and to differing degrees. Finally, the report examines the overall strategic visions that guide SEAs’ efforts to improve

schools. These visions represent the greatest variation in terms of how SEAs approach school improvement. Undergirding these strategies are very different theories of action and expectations about the role of local education agencies (LEAs). It is too early to identify one strategic approach that is best in all situations. Each was implemented only recently and is embedded in a particular set of circumstances. Interestingly, they all share a common implicit assumption that enough administrative, teaching, and school leadership talent--either in terms of individuals or organizations--can be developed or recruited to support the reform effort. While the overall prognosis is uncertain as to the best transformation path, it is clear that any approach relies on recruiting enough talent to drive the effort. New Jersey Department of Education Organizational Charts 2010 and 2011 are appended. (Contains 2 figures, 2 tables and 36 footnotes.)” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Player, D., Hitt, D. H., & Robinson, W. (2014). District readiness to support school turnaround: A user’s guide to inform the work of state education agencies and districts. Center on School Turnaround at WestEd.
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED559742>.

From the ERIC abstract: “This guide, from Center on School Turnaround partner, the University of Virginia’s Partnership for Leaders in Education, provides SEAs and districts (LEAs) with guidance about how to assess the district’s readiness to support school turnaround initiatives. Often, school turnaround efforts focus only on the school’s structure and leadership. Rarely do policymakers or practitioners think about school turnaround as a system-level issue requiring fundamental changes in district level practice to establish the conditions for school turnaround to succeed.” NOTE: This source was not peer reviewed.

Relevant organizations

- Center on School Turnaround—<http://centeronschoolturnaround.org/>.
From the website: “The Center on School Turnaround (Center) is part of a federal network of 22 Comprehensive Centers. There are 15 Regional Comprehensive Centers, serving individual states or clusters of states, and 7 national Content Centers. The centers are charged with building the capacity of state educational agencies (SEAs) to assist districts and schools in meeting student achievement goals.”
- The Education Commission of the States (ECS) From the ECS State Policy Database: Student Achievement—Closing the Achievement Gap—
<http://www.ecs.org/>.
From the website: “This database is made possible by your state’s fiscal support of the Education Commission of the States (ECS). Most entries are legislative, although rules/regulations and executive orders that make substantive changes are included. Every effort is made to collect the latest available version of policies; in some instances, recent changes might not be reflected. For expediency purposes minimal attention has been paid to style (capitalization, punctuation) and format.”

- The Education Trust—<http://www.edtrust.org>.
From the website: “The Education Trust promotes high academic achievement for all students at all levels—pre-kindergarten through college. Our goal is to close the gaps in opportunity and achievement that consign far too many young people—especially those from low-income families or who are black, Latino, or American Indian—to lives on the margins of the American mainstream.”
- Minority Student Achievement Network—<http://msan.wceruw.org>.
From the website: “The Minority Student Achievement Network (MSAN) is a national coalition of school districts that have come together to study achievement gaps that exist in their districts between students of color and their white peers. Since 1999 MSAN has worked to discover strategies to change school practices that keep these achievement gaps in place. Our member districts work collaboratively to conduct and publish research, analyze policies, and examine practices that affect the academic performance of students of color.”
- The Promising Practices Network—<http://www.promisingpractices.net>.
From the website: “The Promising Practices Network (PPN) website is a unique resource that offers credible, research-based information on what works to improve the lives of children and families. Sometimes referred to as a “best practices” site or a “model program” site, PPN is both of those things and much more. In addition to providing summaries of effective programs in our programs that work section, PPN also features Issue Briefs that summarize the current research on various topics, as well as Expert Perspectives, where child policy experts answer our visitors’ most pressing questions on a variety of topics. PPN also links to additional research information in all areas related to child well-being, including their physical and mental health, academic success, and economic security. To promote successful implementation of best practices and model programs, PPN also screens and posts evidence-based information on effective Service Delivery.”
- U.S. Department of Education OESE Office of School Turnaround—<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oese/ost/index.html>.
From the website: “The Office of School Turnaround (OST) is responsible for providing financial assistance and other support, including through the administration of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program, for state and district efforts to turn around the lowest-performing five percent of schools in each state. The OST uses knowledge of turnaround efforts, including those of SIG and Priority Schools, to inform its monitoring, technical assistance, and policy decisions. It focuses on building the capacity of states and districts to improve student outcomes, and sustain the reforms, in their lowest-performing schools. The OST is also responsible for helping to coordinate the Department’s programs and initiatives focused on the lowest-performing schools and for working collaboratively with other Department offices to develop strategies, guidance, and networks to assist those schools.”

Other Federally Funded Resources

- The Assessment and Accountability Comprehensive Center
<https://www.charterschoolcenter.org/resource/assessment-and-accountability-comprehensive-center-special-populations-strand>
- The Center on Instruction—<http://www.centeroninstruction.org/>
- National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing
<http://cresst.org/>
- National Center for Performance Incentives
<https://my.vanderbilt.edu/performanceincentives/>
- School Turnaround Learning Community—
<http://www.schoolturnaroundsupport.org/>
- U.S. Department of Education – School Improvement Grants
<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>
- Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement
<http://www.sedl.org/expertise/historical/center-for-csri.html>

METHODS

Keywords and Search Strings Used in the Searches:

Third-party turnaround efforts; turnaround districts AND best practices OR intervention OR performance; school improvement; beat the odds schools; school transformation; effective schools; school turnaround AND results OR improvement

Search of Databases and Websites

- Institute of Education Sciences (IES) website (<http://www.ies.ed.gov>) and IES sources: Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Program, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), National Center for Education Research (NCER), What Works Clearinghouse (WWC)
- ERIC database (www.eric.ed.gov)
- Google Scholar (scholar.google.com)
- Google (www.google.com)
- Bing (www.bing.com)

Criteria for Inclusion

NOTE: We have included sources from other REL responses, previously provided to other requestors. These were retrieved from the “REL Intranet” and REL website archived responses.

REL Southwest selected resources that provide research on third party support in school turnaround efforts. When REL Southwest staff reviewed resources, we considered – among other things – three factors:

- 1. Date of Publication:** The most current information (primarily published from 2010 to the present) is included.
- 2. Source and Funder of the Report/Brief/Article:** Priority was given to publications written in relevant, peer-reviewed journals or reports or produced by well-known research organizations.
- 3. Methodology:** Sources include reported studies, literature reviews and policy reports.

Ask A REL is a service provided by a collaborative of the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Program, funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES). This response was prepared by REL Southwest under contract ED-IES-12-C-0012 with IES. The content of this document does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.