INDICATORS

Measuring progress along the Principal Supervisor Performance Standards

VERSION 2.0

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP
DESIGN LAB

UNIVERSITY *of*
WASHINGTON

This document includes a range of indicators district leaders might use to measure principal supervisors' engagement in work consistent with each standard. As you work through the materials, please keep the following advice in mind:

Don't overdo it. We provide a somewhat exhaustive list of possible indicators. You may find 2-3 of them for each standard will provide enough data. Sometimes less is more when it comes to helping leaders work well with evidence of their performance.

Don't limit yourself to this list. If you use an indicator that you find useful but is not on this list, keep using it!

Do try to include systematic observations as a main data source. Such observations, especially when they describe rather than evaluate practice, can provide far more accurate data than reports in surveys on which to base feedback. How might you stretch yourself to make observations of principal supervisors' practice a more routine source of evidence about their performance?

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 1. Dedicates their time to helping principals grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Principals report PS visited their school less than 1 time a month • Principals report PS visits to their school decreased in the second half of the year • Principals do not report participating in principal meetings focused on their growth as instructional leaders • Scores on the Standard 1 Focus on Instructional Leadership Index are below 2.0	• Principals report PS visited their school less than 1 time a month • Principals report PS visits to their school decreased in the second half of the year • Principals do not report participating in principal meetings focused on their growth as instructional leaders • Principals report that the majority of their principal meetings did not take place at a school site • Principals report that the majority of principal meetings were not led primarily by their PS • Scores on the Standard 1 Focus on Instructional Leadership Index are below 2.0	• Principals report PS visited their school 1-2 times a month • Principals report PS visits to their school were similar over both halves of the year • Principals report participating in monthly principal meetings focused on their growth as instructional leaders • Principals report that the majority of principal meetings did not take place at a school site • Principals report that some of their principal meetings were led primarily by their PS • Scores on the Standard 1 Focus on Instructional Leadership Index are between 2.0 and 3.5	• Principals report PS visited their school at least 3 times a month • Principals report PS visits to their school were similar over both halves of the year • Principals report participating in at least monthly principal meetings focused on their growth as instructional leaders • Principals report that nearly all principal meetings took place at a school site • Principals report that nearly all of principal meetings were led primarily by their PS • Scores on the Standard 1 Focus on Instructional Leadership Index are above 3.5	• Principals' reports are consistent with Engaging with Understanding over at least three years

Standard 1.
Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS reports spending little to no time on principals' instructional leadership • PS reports a decrease in the amount of time spent on principals' growth as instructional leaders over the course of the year • PS reports visiting all schools infrequently over the course of the year • PS reports a decrease in the number of visits to schools over the course of the year • PS does not report convening principal meetings focused on principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS reports spending significantly more time on principals' instructional leadership than indicated by principal reports and observations • PS reports a decrease in the amount of time spent on principals' growth as instructional leaders over the course of the year • PS reports visiting schools more frequently than indicated by principal reports and observations, or reports visiting only some schools at least every other week • PS reports a decrease in the number of visits to schools over the course of the year • PS reports convening principal meetings focused on principals' growth as instructional leaders more frequently than indicated by principal reports and observations	• PS reports spending between 50-75% of their time on principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS reports a decrease in the amount of time spent on principals' growth as instructional leaders over the course of the year • PS reports visiting schools approximately once a month over the course of the year, or reports visiting only some schools at least every other week • PS reports a decrease in the number of visits to schools over the course of the year • PS reports convening bi-monthly principal meetings focused on principals' growth less than monthly	• PS reports spending more than 75% of their time on principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS does not report a decrease in the amount of time spent on principals' growth as instructional leaders over the course of the year • PS reports visiting all schools at least every other week over the course of the year • PS does not report a decrease in the number of visits to schools over the course of the year • PS reports convening at least monthly principal meetings focused on principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Principal supervisors' reports on the Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors are consistent with engaging with understanding over at least three years

Standard 1.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS focuses minority of their time on principals' instructional leadership	• PS focuses minority of their time on principals' instructional leadership	• PS focuses approximately half of their time on principals' instructional leadership	• PS focuses almost all their time on principals' instructional leadership	• Observation data over at least three years and in multiple settings reflects Engaging with Understanding • PS is frequently observed developing new strategies for maximizing their time on instructional leadership. These strategies are likely to accelerate principals' growth as instructional leaders.

Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS talks about their job as about something other than supporting principals as instructional leaders • Other central office staff report that the PS is always available for activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS talks about their job as dedicated to supporting principals as instructional leaders but can provide few concrete, relevant examples from their own experience that reflect that they actually take this focus • Other central office staff report that the PS is regularly available for activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS talks about their job as dedicated to supporting principals as instructional leaders but does not clearly articulate what that entails or why such a focus is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders • Other central office staff report that the PS frequently declines requests to participate in other central office activities, but they are not always clear why	• PS talks about their job as dedicated to supporting principals as instructional leaders and clearly articulates what that entails and why doing so is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders • Other central office staff report that the PS always declines requests to participate in other central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over three years, interviews with PSs and other central staff are consistent with Engaging with Understanding • PS frequently provides concrete examples of how they developed new strategies for maximizing their time on instructional leadership. Provided examples are likely to accelerate principals' growth as instructional leaders.

Standard 1.
Data Source: Calendar Analyses/Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS spends 10% or less of their time on tasks related to principals' instructional leadership • PS spends the majority of their time monitoring principals' compliance	• PS spends 10% or less of their time on tasks related to principals' instructional leadership • PS spends the majority of their time monitoring principals' compliance	• PS spends approximately 50% of their time on tasks related to principals' instructional leadership • PS spends between 25-50% of their time monitoring principals' compliance	• PS spends 90-100% of their time supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS spends very little to no time monitoring principals' compliance	• Over at least 3 years and in all settings, PS spends 90-100% of their time supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders • Over at least 3 years and in all settings, PS spends little to no time monitoring principals' compliance

Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
See above for calendar reviews	See above for calendar reviews	See above for calendar reviews	See above for calendar reviews	See above for calendar reviews

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 2. Engages in teaching practices in their one-on-one work with principals to help principals grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0, including: - Assessing teaching - Providing feedback to teachers - Leading teacher professional development - Leading school improvement processes - Analyzing data - Developing teacher leadership	• Scores on the following Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0	• Scores on the following Standard 2Indices Teaching Move are between 2.0 and 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5	• Scores on the following Standard 2 Indices Teaching Move are above 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are above 3.5	• Scores are consistent with Engaging with Understanding over at least three years

Standard 2.
Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Self-reports on the following Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0, including: - Assessing teaching - Providing feedback to teachers - Leading teacher professional development - Leading school improvement processes - Analyzing data - Developing teacher leadership	• Self-reports on the following Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0	• Self-reports on the following Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5	• Self-reports on the following Standard 2 Teaching Move Indices are above 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are above 3.5	• Self-reports are consistent with Engaging with Understanding over at least three years

Standard 2.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• In their one-on-one interactions with principals, PS typically observed: - Engaging in directive or evaluative behavior - Telling principals what should be their main focus - Jumping over principals to work directly with teachers - Relying only on resources they provide when they work with principals 1:1 - Creating (or not interrupting) distractions that interfere with principals' growth as instructional leaders	• In their one-on-one interactions with principals, PS typically observed: - Engaging in directive or evaluative behavior - Telling principals what should be their main focus - Jumping over principals to work directly with teachers - Relying only on resources they provide when they work with principals 1:1 - Creating (or not interrupting) distractions that interfere with principals' growth as instructional leaders	• In their one-on-one interactions with principals, PS at least occasionally observed engaging in teaching practices associated with helping principals grow as instructional leaders (e.g., Honig, 2012)	• In their one-on-one interactions, regularly engages in teaching practices associated with helping principals grow as instructional leaders (e.g., Honig, 2012)	• Observation data over three years and in multiple settings suggests that the been performing at the level Engaging with Understanding • When PS encounters a situation in their one interactions with principals, PS is observed a teaching approach in ways appropriate to the situation likely to accelerate principals' growth as instructional

Standard 2.
Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS talks about their one-on-one work with principals in such terms as monitoring, evaluating, and ensuring principals implement the superintendent's priorities	• PS talks about their one-on-one work with principals in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach without providing concrete examples of how they do so in practice that are consistent with actually taking such an approach	• PS talks about their one-on-one work with principals in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach, with consistent concrete examples of their own practice, but does not yet clearly articulate what that entails or why doing so is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS talks about their one-on-one work with principals in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach, with consistent concrete examples from their own practice, and consistently articulates what engaging in these teaching practices entails and why doing so may help their principals grow as instructional leaders	• Over at least three years, interviews with PSs suggest performance at the level Engaging with Understanding • PS describes concrete examples of how they are developing new teaching strategies for their one-on-work with principals that likely to accelerate principals' growth as instructional leaders

Data Source: Calendar Analyses/Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Time slots for engagements with principals typically are too short for PSs to take a teaching approach	• Time slots for engagements with principals typically are too short for PSs to take a teaching approach	• Time slots for engagements with principals mostly allow a sufficient amount of time for PS to take a teaching approach	• Time slots for engagements with principals show they routinely allot sufficient time to take a teaching approach with principals • Calendar includes few if any cancelations of meetings with principals that are supposed to focus on one-on-one work in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over at least three years, calendars demonstrate Engaging with Understanding

Standard 2.
Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS does not produce or track learning goals and learning plans for their one-on-one meetings with principals	• PS does not produce or track learning goals and learning plans for their one-on-one meetings with principals	• PS produces and tracks learning goals and learning plans for some of their one-on-one meetings with principals • Learning plans not always clearly related to the learning goals	• PS produces and tracks learning goals and learning plans for all of their one-on-one meetings with principals tied to a clear scope and sequence for each principal • Learning plans rest on clear rationale for why particular plans may help each principal grow as an instructional leader	• Over at least 5 years, document reviews suggest the PS has been performing the level of Engaging with Understanding • Documents such as meeting plans and tools demonstrate PS is designing new approaches to helping principals' learn engage in instructional leadership

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 3. Engages in teaching practices while leading principal communities of practice (e.g., professional learning communities, networks) to help principals grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Scores on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0, including: - Assessing teaching - Providing feedback to teachers - Leading teacher professional development - Leading school improvement processes - Analyzing data - Developing teacher leadership	• Scores on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 3 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0	• Scores on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5	• Scores on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are above 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Scores on the Standard 2 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are above 3.5	• Scores are consistent Engaging Understanding at least

Standard 3.

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Self-reports on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 3 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices, including: - Assessing teaching - Providing feedback to teachers - Leading teacher professional development - Leading school improvement processes - Analyzing data - Developing teacher leadership	• Self-reports on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are below 2.0, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 3 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are below 2.0	• Self-reports on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 3 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are between 2.0 and 3.5	• Self-reports on the following Standard 3 Teaching Move Indices are above 3.5, including: - Joint work - Modeling - Tool use - Bridging - Buffering • Self-reports on the Standard 3 Teaching Effectiveness with Specific Instructional Leadership Activities Indices are above 3.5	• Scores are consistent Engaging Understanding at least

Standard 3.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS takes a directive approach in their meetings, spending significant time delivering information to principals or leaving principals to talk to each other with little learning support • Most/all meeting time focuses on delivering district policy or other compliance information • Frequently allows meetings to be interrupted by outside guests for matters not related to supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders • Outside guests frequently facilitate meetings	• PS takes a directive approach in their meetings, spending significant time delivering information to principals or leaving principals to talk to each other with little learning support • Most/all meeting time focuses on delivering district policy or other compliance information • Frequently allows meetings to be interrupted by outside guests for matters not related to supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders • Outside guests frequently facilitate meetings	• PS occasionally engages in teaching practices in their principal meetings (as described in the Engaging with Understanding indicators (right) and detailed in Honig, 2012) associated with helping principals grow as instructional leaders • Meeting content is split roughly half-and-half between supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders and delivering district policy or other compliance information • Occasionally allows meetings to be interrupted by outside guests for matters not related to supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders • Occasionally mediates participation by outside facilitators to help guests take a teaching approach in their running of the meetings	• PS frequently engages in teaching practices in their principal meetings (e.g., below and detailed in Honig & Rainey, 2014) associated with helping principals grow as instructional leaders • Almost all meeting content is devoted to supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders. PS delivers any content related to district policy or other compliance information during a brief announcement segment. • Mediates all participation by outside facilitators to help guests take a teaching approach in their running of the meetings ***Teaching practices:*** • Engaging in "joint work" with principals, by making moves that help principals deepen the extent to which they value their growth as instructional leaders as see the PS as mutually accountable for their growth • Modeling instructional leadership actions and thinking • Developing and using tools—various materials that engage principals in thinking and acting in ways consistent with instructional leadership • Bridging principals to resources to strengthen their instructional leadership including working with outside facilitators to ensure that they take a teaching approach in the meetings • Buffering principals from conditions that interfere with their instructional leadership including telling other central office staff that they may not attend the principals' meetings; limit information items to the last few minutes of the meeting • Ensuring *all* principals, participate in leading and supporting each other's growth as instructional leaders	• Observation over at least years and settings suggests the PS has performing level of Engaging Understanding • When PS encounters situation related to meetings, observed teaching approach ways appropriate the situation logically connected principals' instructional

Standard 3.
Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS talks about their leadership of principals' meetings as monitoring, evaluating, and ensuring principals implement the superintendent's priorities	• PS talks about their leadership of principals' meetings in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach without providing concrete examples of how they do so in practice that are consistent with actually taking such an approach	• PS talks about their leadership of principals' meetings in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach, with consistent concrete examples of their own practice, but does not yet clearly articulate what that entails or why doing so is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS talks about their leadership of principals' meetings in ways consistent with taking a teaching approach, with consistent concrete examples from their own practice, and consistently articulates what engaging in these teaching practices entails and why doing so may help their principals grow as instructional leaders	• Over at least years, PS suggest performance at the level Engaging Understanding • PS describes concrete how they developing teaching strategies their leadership principals' that are likely accelerate grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: Calendar Analyses/Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS does not set aside adequate time to plan the agenda and activities for principal meetings	• PS does not set aside adequate time to plan the agenda and activities for principal meetings	• PS sets aside adequate time to plan the agenda and activities for principal meetings	• PS sets aside adequate time to plan the agenda and activities for principal meetings as well as strategically engage others as learning resources	• Over multiple PS sets aside adequate the agenda activities meetings strategically others as resources

Standard 3.
Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Agendas of principal meeting (if available) do not include elements consistent with the PS leading the meetings in ways that promise to help principals grow as instructional leaders. For example, the agendas: - Do not include learning objectives - List topics to be covered without evidence of strategies PS will use to advance principal learning - Include four or more agenda items	• Agendas of principal meeting (if available) do not include elements consistent with the PS leading the meetings in ways that promise to help principals grow as instructional leaders. For example, the agendas: - Do not include learning objectives - List topics to be covered without evidence of strategies PS will use to advance principal learning - Include four or more agenda items	• Agendas of some principal meetings include elements consistent with the PS leading the meetings with a teaching approach. For example, the agendas include: - Clear learning objectives - Descriptions of activities designed to promote principal learning, though connection to learning objectives isn't always clear - 3 or fewer segments or an otherwise careful use of time to enable principal learning	• Agendas of some principal meetings include elements consistent with the PS leading the meetings with a teaching approach. For example, the agendas include: - Clear learning objectives obviously tied to the PS's learning plans for the principals for the year and an overall scope and sequence for the principal meetings - Descriptions of activities and how these activities will help principals achieve the learning objectives - 3 or fewer segments to allow for adequate time for deep learning • PS creates facilitator guides for each meeting that demonstrate the PS has planned out the teaching moves they will make at particular points in the meeting to deepen principals' growth as instructional leaders. These include modeling, differentiating activities based on principals' capacity with a given task, using effective learning tools, and strategically grouping principals. • PS creates a year-long scope-and-sequence for principal meetings that lays out learning objectives and solid rationales for particular choices related to advancing principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over at years, agenda suggest that has been at the Engaging Understanding • Over multiple reviews of guides suggest the PS is performing at the level Engaging Understanding • Over multiple scope and reviews suggest the PS is performing at the level Engaging Understanding • Documents meeting plans tools demonstrate PS is designing approaches principals' engage in instructional leadership settings

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 4. Systematically uses multiple forms of evidence of each principal's capacity for instructional leadership to differentiate or tailor their approach to helping their principals grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Score on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is below 2.0 • Principals report that their PS rarely observed them across instructional leadership tasks • Scores on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are below 2.0 • Principals report that their PS rarely used data/evidence when providing feedback	• Score on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is below 2.0 • Principals report that their PS rarely observed them across instructional leadership tasks • Scores on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are below 2.0 • Principals report that their PS rarely used data/evidence when providing feedback	• The Standard 4 Differentiation Index is between 2.0 and 3.5 • Principals report that their PS occasionally observed them across instructional leadership tasks, or only observed them engage in one instructional leadership task • Scores on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are between 2.0-3.5 • Principals report that their PS occasionally used multiple types of data/evidence, or only used test scores, when providing feedback	• Score on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is above 3.5 • Principals report that their PS frequently observed them across instructional leadership tasks • Scores on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are between 2.0-3.5 • Principals report that their PS frequently used multiple types of data/evidence when providing feedback	• Principals' Annual Survey are consistent Engaging with Understanding least three

Standard 4.
Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS self-report on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is below 2.0 • PS self-reports that they rarely observed their principals across instructional leadership tasks • PS self-reports on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are below 2.0 • PS self-reports that they rarely used data/evidence when providing feedback	• PS self-report on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is significantly higher than their principals' reports • PS self-reports that their observations of principals across instructional leadership tasks are much more frequently than their principals' reports • PS self-reports on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are significantly higher than their principals' reports • PS self-reports that they used data/evidence when providing feedback much more frequently than their principals' reports	• PS self-report on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is between 2.0 and 3.5 • PS self-reports that they occasionally observed their principals across instructional leadership tasks, or only observed them engage in one instructional leadership task • PS self-reports on Standard 4 Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are between 2.0-3.5 • PS self-reports that they occasionally used multiple types of data/evidence, or only used test scores, when providing feedback	• PS self-report on the Standard 4 Differentiation Index is above 3.5 • PS self-reports that they frequently observed them across instructional leadership tasks • PS self-reports on the Effectiveness of Evidence and Feedback are between 2.0-3.5 • PS self-reports that they frequently used multiple types of data/evidence when providing feedback	• PS self-reports Annual Survey Supervisors with Engaging Understanding least years

Standard 4.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS observed engaging in activities other than or inconsistent with collecting and using evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice ***Examples:*** - Collecting and using evidence about teachers and students—not principals directly - Providing feedback to principals without use of specific evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice • PS observed engaging in the same work with most or all principals irrespective of their individual capacity • PS observed not recording or tracking evidence of principals' instructional leadership over time	• PS observed engaging in activities other than or inconsistent with collecting and using evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice ***Examples:*** - Collecting and using evidence about teachers and students—not principals directly - Providing feedback to principals without use of specific evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice • PS observed engaging in the same work with most or all principals irrespective of their individual capacity • PS observed interacting with principals without recording or tracking evidence of principals' instructional leadership over time	• PS occasionally observed collecting evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice but not always in a systematic way for use over time • PS is observed touring classrooms with a principal or watching a principal provide a teacher with feedback but does not take notes on principals' practice during the process or takes handwritten notes • PS occasionally observed referring to a clear definition of the principalship as instructional leadership when collecting and using evidence on principal performance • PS occasionally observed using evidence of each principals' capacity for instructional leaders to differentiate their supports to principals • PS occasionally observed retrieving evidence about specific principals' instructional leadership and using it to provide them with feedback on their IL practice	• PS routinely observed collecting and using evidence of principals' instructional leadership practice to help principals grow as instructional leaders • PS routinely observed referring to a clear definition of the principalship as instructional leadership when collecting a dusing evidence on principal performance • PS routinely observed using a system for recording, tracking, and organizing evidence of each principals' instructional leadership over time • PS routinely observed using evidence of each principals' capacity for instructional leaders to differentiate their supports to principals • PS routinely observed using multiple forms of evidence of principals' instructional leadership to provide each principal with feedback on their practice	• Observations at least three multiple settings Engaging with Understanding • PS is frequently developing for systematically capturing and evidence of principals' leadership their supports provide them feedback likely accelerate growth as instructional leaders

Standard 4.
Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS says they mainly rely on student test scores, their "gut," or other impressions of principal capacity for instructional leadership when making decisions about how to support principals	• PS says they use some specific pieces of evidence about principals as instructional leaders when making decisions about how to support principals but cannot provide concrete examples	• PS says they use some specific pieces of evidence about principals as instructional leaders when making decisions about how to support principals and can provide a few concrete examples supporting that claim • PS does not clearly explain how they move from evidence to action steps related to principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS does not clearly articulate what using evidence when providing feedback entails or why such an approach is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS says they frequently use specific pieces of evidence about principals as instructional leaders when making decisions about how to support principals and can provide many concrete examples supporting that claim • PS clearly explains how they move from evidence to action steps related to principals' growth as instructional leaders including an explicit rationale for why specific pieces of evidence led them to particular actions • PS consistently articulates what using evidence when providing feedback entails and why such an approach is important to principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over at least interviews/with PSs suggest performance Engaging with Understanding • PS frequently in detail how new strategies systematically and using evidence principals' leadership with feedback accelerate growth as instructional leaders

Standard 4.
Data Source: Calendar Analyses/Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Calendar does not include time dedicated to document, clean, and organize collected evidence	• Calendar does not include time dedicated to document, clean, and organize collected evidence	• Calendar includes sufficient time set aside to document, clean, and organize collected evidence	• Calendar includes sufficient time set aside to document, clean, and organize collected evidence	• Over at least PS demonstrates performance engaging with understanding

Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS does not produce documents that indicate they record and track principals' growth as instructional leaders using multiple data sources	• PS usually does not produce documents that indicate they record and track principals' growth as instructional leaders using multiple data sources	• PS produces documents that indicate they record and track some principals' growth as instructional leaders using one or two sources of evidence of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS produces regular, detailed documents of how they systematically track multiple forms of evidence of all their principals' capacity for instructional leadership over the course of the year	• Over multiple has produced detailed documents they systematically multiple forms of all their capacity for leadership of the year

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 5. Engages principals in the formal district principal evaluation process in ways that help principals grow as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Score on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is below 2.0	• Score on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is below 2.0	• Score on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is between 2.0 and 3.5	• Score on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is above 3.5	• Principals' reports Survey of Principals Engaging with Understanding least three years

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS self-report on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is below 2.0	• PS self-report on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is significantly higher than their principals' reports	• PS self-report on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is between 2.0 and 3.5	• PS self-report on Standard 5 Use of Evaluation is above 3.5	• PS self-reports of Principal Supervisors with Engaging with at least three years

Standard 5.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS observed using only district evaluation tools to drive PS principal interactions around evaluation including: - Does not include learning objectives - Drives the conversation as a report; does not engage principal as partner in the conversation - Talks about principal performance without reference to PS performance - Leaves meeting with clear next steps for principal but not for PS	• PS observed using only district evaluation tools to drive PS principal interactions around evaluation including: - Does not include learning objectives - Drives the conversation as a report; does not engage principal as partner in the conversation - Talks about principal performance without reference to PS performance - Leaves meeting with clear next steps for principal but not for PS	• PS occasionally observed using teaching practices during formal evaluation meetings: - Clear learning objectives are tied to feedback plans for principals - Engages principal in learning conversations for goal setting and assessment around evaluation - Uses required district evaluation tool as one piece of evidence in reference to broader principal growth plan - Is heard reflecting on their own work in relation to principal performance - Leaves meeting with clear next steps for both principal and PS	• PS routinely observed using teaching practices during formal evaluation meetings: - Clear learning objectives are tied to feedback plans for principals - Engages principal in learning conversations for goal setting and assessment around evaluation - Uses required district evaluation tool as one piece of evidence in reference to broader principal growth plan - Is heard reflecting on their own work in relation to principal performance - Leaves meeting with clear next steps for both principal and PS	• PSs over at least multiple settings Understanding

Standard 5.
Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS reports their role is to evaluate principals	• PS says that their role in principal evaluation is to help principals grow • PS cannot provide concrete examples of their practice using the district evaluation process to support principals growth as instructional leaders	• PS says that their role in evaluating principals is to help principals grow • PS can occasionally provide concrete examples of their practice using the district evaluation process to support principals growth as instructional leaders	• PS clearly explains that their role is to help principals grow and that the district evaluation process is one tool of many to do so • PS can routinely provide clear examples of how district evaluation tool can be used for growth in conjunction with other tools	• Over multiple PSs suggest performance Engaging with Understanding

Data Source: Calendar Analyses, Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• Scheduled meetings with principals follow formal evaluation deadlines • PS spends almost all of their time with the principals evaluated as "low" on the principal evaluation	• Scheduled meetings with principals primarily follow formal evaluation deadlines • PS spends almost all of their time with the principals evaluated as "low" on the principal evaluation	• Scheduled meetings with principals primarily follow formal evaluation deadlines • PS spends almost all of their time with the principals evaluated as "low" on the principal evaluation	• Scheduled meetings with principals primarily follow the PS's learning goals for principals, with evaluation ratings completed as a by-product of the learning processes • PS spends their time with all principals, including the principals evaluated as "low," as well as "high," on the principal evaluation	• Over multiple data sources suggests been performing with Understanding

Standard 5.
Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS only uses formal evaluation tools as tools in their work with principals	• PS only uses formal evaluation tools as tools in their work with principals	• PS uses formal evaluation tools as main tools in their work with principals	• PS uses many tools in their work with principals that promise to advance principals' growth as instructional leaders, including the formal evaluation tool	• Over multiple data sources suggests been performing with Understanding

INDICATORS FOR

STANDARD 6. Selectively and strategically participates in other central office work processes to maximize the extent to which they and principals focus on principals' growth as instructional leaders

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principals

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
N/A[1]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Data Source: DL2 Annual Survey of Principal Supervisors

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS self-reports on Standard 6 Primary Job Responsibility and Other Central Office Work are below 2.0	• PS self-reports on Standard 6 Primary Job Responsibility and Other Central Office Work are below 2.0	• PS self-reports on Standard 6 Primary Job Responsibility and Other Central Office Work are between 2.0 and 3.5	• PS self-reports on Standard 6 Primary Job Responsibility and Other Central Office Work are above 3.5	• PS self-Survey are consistent Understanding years

[1] The ASP does not ask principals to report on items related to Standard 6 because principals do not see their supervisors as they engage in their work with the rest of the central office.

Standard 6.
Data Source: Systematic Observations (e.g., using the DL2 Whisper Observation Platform)

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS frequently participates in various district and/or central office work processes, *very few to none* of which relate to helping principals grow as instructional leaders	• PS frequently participates in various district and/or central office work processes, *very few to none* of which relate to helping principals grow as instructional leaders	• PS occasionally participates in district and/or central office work processes that do not obviously relate to principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS occasionally responds to requests or directives by explaining why their participation or non-participation in particular district and/or central office work processes relates their role in supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS frequently declines requests or directives to participate in district and/or central office work processes that do not obviously relate to principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS responds to requests or directives by explaining why their participation or non-participation in particular district and/or central office work processes relates their role in supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over observations and settings the PS the level Understanding

Standard 6.
Data Source: Interviews and Conversations

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS talks about the importance of their participation in other central office work processes for reasons other than advancing principals' growth as instructional leaders • Other central office staff report that the PS is always available, often for activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS sometimes talks about the importance of limiting their participation in other central office work processes that do not clearly support principals' growth as instructional leaders • Other central office staff report that the PS is always available, often for activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS talks about the importance of limiting their participation in central office work processes that do not clearly support principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS talks about struggling to decide which activities relate principals' growth as instructional leaders, and that they sometimes choose activities that do not clearly relate • Other central office staff report that the PS occasionally declines requests to participate in other central office activities but they are not always clear why	• PS talks about the importance of significantly limiting their participation in any central office work processes that do not clearly support their focus on helping principals grow as instructional leaders • PS talks clearly about which activities do and do not relate to their focus on principals' growth as instructional leaders, and provides a solid rationale for their characterizations • Other central office staff report that the PS always declines requests to participate in other central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over with PSs the level Understanding • Over with other suggest level of Understanding

Standard 6.
Data Source: Calendar Analyses, Time-tracking Systems

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS spends more than 50% of their time involved with central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS spends more than 50% of their time involved with central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders	• PS spends between 25-50% of their time involved with central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders • PS calendar is often overbooked; it is difficult to distinguish which activities related to the core work that helps principals grow as instructional leaders • Calendars include "blackout days" on which all time is dedicated to being in schools during school hours but those days are not always honored	• PS spends little to no time involved with central office activities not clearly in support of principals' growth as instructional leaders • Calendars include "blackout days" on which all time is dedicated to being in schools during school hours	• Over spent with central clearly growth

Standard 6.
Data Source: Document Reviews

NOT ADOPTING	ADOPTING THE TALK	ENGAGING AT A SURFACE LEVEL	ENGAGING WITH UNDERSTANDING	MASTERY
• PS frequently authors emails and other communications related to central office activities other than helping principals grow as instructional leaders	• PS frequently authors emails and other communications related to central office activities other than helping principals grow as instructional leaders	• PS sometimes authors emails and other communications related to central office activities other than helping principals grow as instructional leaders	• PS rarely, if ever, authors emails and other communications related to central office activities that do not related to helping principals grow as instructional leaders • When/if they do, PS clearly articulates their rationale for participating/not participating in particular district and/or central office work processes related to their role in supporting principals' growth as instructional leaders	• Over rarely, and other related that do principals leaders • Over clearly for participating/ in particular central related principals' leaders

DISTRICT LEADERSHIP
DESIGN LAB