|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **1 – Beginning** | **2 – Growing** | **3 – Effective** | **Comments** |
| **Leadership** | * Leadership is not in the context of a leadership team. * Improvement efforts are individually driven. * There is neither communication from the principal to the staff that improving instruction is the main task of the Teacher Leadership, nor anticipation that it will be a joint effort | * Teacher Leaders (TLs) are part of the leadership team. * The focus of the team is *sometimes* on improving outcomes for student learning, but more time is spent talking about building issues, student behavior, etc. * Improvement efforts are noticeable by a few individuals and/or collaborative teams. * There is communication from the principal to the staff that improving instruction is the main task of the TL program, but few details as to how the principal and TL will be involved in the effort. | * TLs are part of an effective leadership team. * The focus of the team is on improving outcomes for students through improving instruction. * Collective effort to improve is evident throughout the building in all individuals and collaborative teams, not just islands of excellence. * There is a clear plan, worked out by the leadership team, about how the teacher leaders and the principal will work together to support instruction and that plan has been clearly communicated to the entire staff including the opportunity to provide feedback.  The plan is implemented, with regular collective work observed. |  |
| **Data, Goal Setting, Monitoring** | * Summative data is examined at the end of the year to see if district goals were met. * Interim assessments have not been established. * Up-close, student performance data is not collected or analyzed. * Teacher implementation data is not collected or analyzed. | * Summative data is examined at the end of the year to see if district goals were met. * The District has a plan for interim assessment administration, but the data is used inconsistently or not at all. * Up-close, student performance data is collected, and occasionally analyzed. * Teachers and students do not always understand the purpose of various data sets. * A significant amount of data is collected – interim, formative, and even implementation – but it is not analyzed systematically or it is analyzed but not used to make mid-course corrections. | * Summative data collected, analyzed, and used to determine goals. * Interim assessment data collected, regularly analyzed, and these questions and others considered:   + - Are we progressing towards our building goals?     - Do we need mid-course corrections?     - What instruction is indicated by our data? * Up-close, student performance data collected, regularly analyzed, and these questions (and others) considered: * Is each student responding to daily instruction as expected? * Where should we go next in our instruction? * Teacher implementation data collected, regularly analyzed, and these questions and others considered:   + - Are teachers implementing expected strategies?     - Are they implementing with fidelity? |  |
| **Element** | **1- Beginning** | **2- Growing** | **3- Effective** | **Comments** |
| **Instruction** | * There is no clear focus on improving instruction as the key role of the teacher leaders. * Expectations for instruction in classrooms have not been established. * There is little urgency for improving instruction. All staff are not committed to continuous improvement. | * TLs are focused on improving instruction, but the instructional work isn’t focused or clarified. * Collaborative teams meet with teacher leaders, but the work isn’t clearly focused on instruction, i.e. reviewing lesson plans/units, seeing demonstrations and rehearsals of new instruction in team meetings, study of student response to new instruction, etc. * Instruction is discussed, but there isn’t a clear plan on how to improve (a model that ensures classroom implementation of new instruction: theory, demonstration, practice, coaching). | * Improving instruction is the priority work of the teacher leaders and they embrace that role and are supported in it at the building and district levels. * Expectations for instruction in classrooms have been established and communicated. * The moves of the expected instruction have been written down and shared with teachers, principal, and others. * TLs and classroom teachers model instructional strategies in classrooms and during collaboration. * Professional development time and individual coaching sessions support instructional expectations. * TLs collaboratively plan lessons/units with teachers/collaborative teams and analyze student response to new instruction. * TLs rehearse lessons with teachers/collaborative teams. * Implementation of new instruction is ongoing, carefully analyzed, and used to plan professional learning sessions. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Element** | **1-Beginning** | **2-Growing** | **3-Effective** | **Comments** |
| **Teacher Leader Work with the Principal(s)** | * Principal(s) and TLs work separately from one another, with little interaction. * TLs are assigned managerial duties by the principal(s), such as discipline, bus or lunchroom duty, etc. * Principal(s) assign teacher leaders responsibility for all teacher learning in the building and the principal no longer focuses on instruction- that function taken over by the teacher leaders. | * Principals and teacher leaders meet regularly, but the meetings often veer from the clear focus of improving classroom instruction. They are occasionally or regularly dominated by individual student problems, managerial issues, and other topics unrelated to classroom instruction. * Principals and teacher leaders are having conversations to define their joint work related to improving classroom instruction. Additionally, they are discussing their individual roles in that joint work. However, they don't address this topic regularly nor have they come up with clear definitions * Both principal and teacher leaders receive training and support, but rarely together. There isn’t a clear plan for sharing their learning with each other. * Principals and TLs are in classrooms. However, focus on what instruction will be implemented hasn’t been established, so the observation process is difficult. It sometimes isn’t clear to the classroom teachers what the principals and TLs are looking for when they’re in classrooms. | * Both principals and TLs can clearly describe their role in improving instruction, which is their joint work. * Principals and TLs meet regularly and work in tandem to create a culture of learning and instructional improvement. They also constantly clarify expectations for the staff and each other. They receive substantial training and support together focused on improving instruction. * The principal(s), TLs, and leadership team develop agendas for professional learning using data. These agendas address the learning needs of the staff and are followed virtually all of the time. Principal(s), TLs and whole leadership teams debrief when staff meetings are over to determine what worked and what didn’t. Commitment to ongoing improvement paramount. * Principals and TLs are in classrooms observing and looking for the instructional expectations that have been established with the leadership team and staff and shared with everyone. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Professional Learning of Teacher Leaders** | * TLs use what they know in their capacity as building leaders. * The learning of the TLs is often workshops and other one-shot events with little chance of what they learn being transferred to classroom practice by the teachers they support. | * TLs engage in professional learning that focuses primarily on the affective aspects of how they work with instructional staff. * TLs engage in professional learning by themselves or with other teacher leaders. | * Teacher leaders know from studying the student learning and teacher implementation data where they need to boost their skills and engage in learning. * Teacher leaders and the principal(s) engage jointly in professional learning, knowing that if each doesn’t understand what the other is doing, they could work at cross purposes. The principal(s) and the TLs see leading instructional improvement as joint work, thus they must learn together. * TLs are learning new instructional strategies from external experts and implementing them into classrooms to achieve executive control. Principal(s) usually engage in this work as well. * TLs receive instructional support, from both the external experts and peers. * TLs are supported in working through the challenges that stem from leading school improvement focused on instruction by the principal, other TLs, the central office, and the external experts that provide support. These regular, scheduled interactions have clear agendas and a problem solving and improvement orientation. * TLs are encouraged to celebrate accomplishments in their work. |  |

**More Information**

The best hope for implementation of the Iowa Teacher Leadership and Compensation effort is that improved student learning through effective instruction will be the result. The [DE website](https://www.educateiowa.gov/teacher-leadership-and-compensation-system#TLC_Documents_and_Resources) on TLC notes this. “The overriding philosophy of the system is multi-pronged, but boils down to this: Improving student learning requires improving the instruction they receive each day. There is no better way to do this than to empower our best teachers to lead the effort.”

This rubric is designed to help districts analyze ongoing work in their Teacher Leadership and Compensation System. While there are many models, if instruction is going to improve for all students, there are some common behaviors that will support that outcome. Bruce Joyce and Bev Showers did the seminal work in professional learning identifying how newly learned instruction is transferred into classroom practice. Jim Knight and others applaud this Joyce and Showers research in their work. That research is the underpinning of this document. We thank Drs. Joyce and Showers for their ground-breaking research begun in the 1980s that still informs our work today. Below are some resources related to effective professional learning that focuses on changing instruction:

* Gentile, Amanda. “Professional Development to Support Student Achievement.” The Teacher Center. April 27, 2006. <https://www2.ed.gov/admins/tchrqual/learn/nclbsummit/gentile/gentile.pdf>
* Joyce, Bruce and Showers, Beverly. “Student Achievement through Staff Development.” National College for School Leadership. 2003. <http://literacy.kent.edu/coaching/information/Research/randd-engaged-joyce.pdf>
* Joyce, Bruce and Showers, Beverly. *Student Achievement through Staff Development, 3rd Edition.* ASCD. 2002. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/102003.aspx>

Implementing TLC is somewhat like eating an elephant, which has to be done one bite at a time. We thank those school leaders who provided feedback and helped us simplify this self-reflection rubric to a digestible tool. We offer this as a guide to self-study. In addition, Susie Olesen would be glad to work with your school and guide you through the analysis of important efforts to enhance student learning through improving instruction.

**Possible uses for this rubric:**

1. District and/or building leadership team members fill out their observations and compare with the Teacher Leadership and Compensation Plan submitted to DE for participation. Are challenges due to lack of implementation or does the system design need some tinkering?
2. Leadership teams fill out their observations and plan together how to move to closer to “effective” in identified areas of needed improvement.
3. Collaborative teams fill out their observations individually and then discuss as a team with TLs and principals present.
4. Others that you consider.