Step 4: Instructional Practices Protocol

Educator Name _____ **School Year** _____ **Evaluator** _____

Construct 1: Setting Direction and Making the Organization Work

District leaders have the responsibility of working with district stakeholders to collaboratively establish a common vision and to channel that vision into a strategic plan that is directed to maximize student learning and development. This responsibility requires the use of a wide range of data sources to guide both the development of both short-term and long-term plans, along with ongoing monitoring, supported by appropriate and targeted resources.

1.1 Establishing and Communicating the District Vision

Goal ☐

The district leader organized the development and/or maintenance and communication of the district vision that is focused on student learning and development. The district leader ensured that all appropriate and representative stakeholders (both internal and external) were involved in the process. (Note: There is no expectation that a new vision is created each year.)

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader organized the development and/or maintenance of a partial, generic or unclear vision that does not seem to match district goals or needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader organized the development and/or maintenance of an incomplete vision that is loosely related to district goals and needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader organized the development and/or maintenance of a vision that is aligned to district goals and needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader organized the development and/or maintenance of a clearly defined vision that is aligned to district goals and needs and that supports the work of the district.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not utilize data to inform the vision, and little or no involvement of stakeholders (teachers, parents, students, district office and community members) occurred at each stage of the process.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized limited collection or analysis of data to inform the vision and only some involvement of stakeholders, but with critical omissions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized multiple sources of data to inform the vision and involved most of the appropriate stakeholders (staff, parents, students, school board and business community) at each stage of the process.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized multiple and varied sources of data to inform the vision and involved all of the appropriate stakeholders (staff, parents, students, school board and business community) at each stage of the process.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided no or insignificant communication about the vision or communicated about the vision in inconsistent, confusing ways.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided limited communication of the vision using only a single modality or included only a limited range of stakeholders in the communication.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader communicated the vision using several different modalities (e.g., meetings, newsletters, through technology) and included the majority of stakeholders in the communication.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader communicated the vision using a variety of modalities (e.g., meetings, newsletters, through technology) and ensured that all stakeholders were included in the communication. While particular aspects of the vision might be stressed to different stakeholders, the message was consistent.

Evidence for Component 1.1: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

1.2 Developing, Implementing and Monitoring a Strategic Plan

Goal ☐

The district leader worked collaboratively to develop, implement and monitor a strategic plan that addresses the district's vision and student learning needs. This strategic plan was clearly aligned to the district vision. Data was used to guide the process at all stages – the development, implementation and monitoring of the strategic plan.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not develop a strategic plan to support student learning needs or developed a strategic plan that is unconnected to the district vision, was developed in isolation from relevant stakeholders and without the use of data to guide and support decisions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader developed a strategic plan, partially connected to the district's vision or to support student learning, with limited input from relevant stakeholders or with limited or inappropriate data used to guide and support decisions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader developed a strategic plan that addressed most aspects of the district's vision and supports student learning, was developed collaboratively with mostly relevant stakeholders, and utilized multiple sources of appropriate data to guide and support decisions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader developed a strategic plan that effectively addressed all aspects of the district's vision and supports student learning with ongoing collaboration with relevant stakeholders and utilized multiple and wide-ranging sources of appropriate data to guide and support decisions.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented the strategic plan in a sporadic and ineffective manner.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented the strategic plan in an inconsistent manner.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader effectively implemented the strategic plan, although there were a few gaps or omissions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader effectively implemented all aspects of the strategic plan.
☒	☐ If a strategic plan is in place, the evidence indicates that the district leader did little or no monitoring to ensure its success or to make necessary adjustments.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized only limited monitoring once the plan was in place to ensure its success with few if any adjustments as a result of collected data.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader regularly monitored the plan once it was in place to ensure its success, but few adjustments were made as a result of collected data.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader systematically monitored the plan once it was in place to ensure its success with appropriate adjustments as needed, based on the analysis of collected, meaningful data and input.

Evidence for Component 1.2: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

1.3 Seeking and Allocating Resources

Goal ☐

The district leader sought appropriate and sufficient resources to support the work of the district from local, state and federal sources. The district leader used analyses of appropriate data and consultation with stakeholders to determine the allocation of resources to support the district strategic plan, using all resources in the most efficient and effective manner to meet operational needs and district strategic plan. The district leader communicated appropriately with stakeholders about the securing and allocation of resources.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not actively seek available resources to support district work.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader occasionally sought out available resources to support district work.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader explored multiple options when seeking out available resources to support district work.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader explored multiple and varied options when seeking out available resources to support district work, and capitalized on all opportunities.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized little or no data in making decisions for resource allocation to meet student learning needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized data in a limited manner in making decisions for resource allocation to meet student learning needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader consistently utilized adequate data in making decisions for resource allocation to meet student learning needs. Resources, in some cases, were directed based on priorities for those identified learning needs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized significant data in making decisions for resource allocation to meet student learning needs. Resources were directed toward student learning needs with the highest priority.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not allocate and manage resources to support the districts strategic plan.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader allocated and managed resources to support the district strategic plan in limited ways. These resources were often administered in processes that were uncoordinated and not prioritized.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader allocated resources in most instances to consistently support the strategic plan. These resources were usually administered in a coordinated and prioritized process.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader allocated all necessary and available resources to effectively and consistently support the district strategic plan. These resources were administered in a strategic process that was coordinated and prioritized.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided little or no communication to relevant stakeholders regarding the use, availability and priorities for resource allocation.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided some limited and isolated communication to relevant stakeholders regarding the use, availability and priorities for allocation of resources.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided communication to most relevant stakeholders regarding the use, availability and priorities for allocation of resources.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided consistent and varied communication processes and channels to all relevant stakeholders regarding the use, availability and priorities for allocation of resources.

Evidence for Component 1.3: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

Construct 2: Supporting Student Growth and Development

District leaders will be advocates for the development of well-rounded and well-prepared students. Support for student learning will be characterized by the use of relevant curriculum, instruction and an appropriate assessment system to promote the success of all students.

2.1 Implementing a Rigorous and Relevant Curriculum and Support Services

Goal ☐

The district leader worked with district staff and stakeholders to implement a rigorous and relevant curriculum to prepare all students to be globally competitive for college and career readiness. In addition, the district leader provided support services to promote students' physical, emotional and social development in addition to student academic success.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not implement a rigorous curriculum with high expectations for all students.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a rigorous curriculum with high expectations for students unevenly across the district, with greater rigor in some schools, subjects or grade levels than others.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a rigorous curriculum with high expectations for all students across the district.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a rigorous curriculum with high expectations for all students across the district, with a defined process in place for periodic review.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader paid no attention to issues of curriculum breadth, global competitiveness or career and college readiness.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader paid limited attention to issues of curriculum breadth, global competitiveness or career and college readiness, or addressed the issues primarily in sporadic, inconsistent or superficial ways.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader paid appropriate attention to issues of curriculum breadth, global competitiveness or career and college readiness, although there were some gaps in the provisions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader paid thoughtful and planned attention to issues of curricular breadth, global competitiveness or career and college readiness, with access and provision for all students.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided few or no student services to support student leadership, physical, emotional, social and attitudinal growth, or access to opportunities was not equal to all students.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided limited student services to support student leadership and physical, emotional, social and attitudinal growth, and access to opportunities was uneven.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided an adequate variety of student services to support student leadership and physical, emotional, social and attitudinal growth.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided a wide variety of appropriate student services to support student leadership and physical, emotional, social and attitudinal growth, with access clearly promoted to all students.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided few or no interventions or alternative programming to address student failure or to promote student excellence.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided limited interventions or alternative programming to address student failure, with uneven availability and with few opportunities to promote student excellence.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided an adequate variety of interventions or alternative programming available to address student failure and opportunities to promote student excellence.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided a wide variety of interventions or alternative programming to address student failure and rich opportunities to promote student excellence, with access and support for all students.

Evidence for Component 2.1: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

2.2 Supporting Rigorous and Relevant Instruction

Goal ☐

The district leader worked with building leaders to ensure that the instructional guidelines are in place and that teachers are following the district's course/grade level standards and implementing the curriculum with fidelity. The district leader worked with building leaders to ensure that all students have access to the core curriculum and that teachers differentiate instruction and interventions based on student test data and other student information.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not work with school leaders to ensure that instructional models and practices (standards, curriculum, pacing guides, etc.) exist.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader occasionally supported the development of district and school instructional models and practices (standards, curriculum, pacing guides, etc.).	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader regularly supported the development of district and school instructional models and practices (standards, curriculum, pacing guides, etc.).	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader systematically supported the development of district and school instructional models and practices (standards, curriculum, pacing guides, etc.).
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that if such models and practices were developed, the district leader did not communicate them to teachers.	☐ The evidence indicates that the instructional models and practices were available to teachers, although the communication was not thorough or consistent. (For example, the needs of new teachers were not addressed.)	☐ The evidence indicates that the use of the instructional models and practices was communicated in an ongoing way to teachers and other stakeholders.	☐ The evidence indicates that the use of the instructional models and practices was communicated in thoughtful and relevant ways to teachers and other stakeholders, with training as needed.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not establish a process for monitoring models and practices to inform instructional programs, or there is evidence that instructional programs were only partially aligned with the established guidelines.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader may have established a process for monitoring the use of the models and practices, but the process was used only periodically, on a limited basis or only for some schools or classrooms.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader established a process for monitoring the implementation of the models and practices, and the provision of feedback was articulated. This process was used across the district, although there may be some inconsistencies.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader established a systematic process for monitoring the implementation of the models and practices, and the provision of feedback was articulated. This process was used consistently throughout the district.

Evidence for Component 2.2: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

2.3 Using an Assessment and Accountability System to Support Student Learning

Goal ☐

The district leader ensured that there is a district-wide assessment plan that provides information about the progress of all students. Accountability expectations and results were communicated to all relevant stakeholders, and these results become part of the data used to evaluate the effectiveness of school and district programs, instruction and student supports.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured that some forms of assessments were used (state, local, formative, summative) but with little, if any, coordination to integrate these assessments to support school and district learning goals. There are little or no examples of assessment data used to inform and support student learning.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured some degree of coordination of various forms of assessment tools being used (state, local, formative, summative) by the district. The coordination was often based on the initiative of individual teachers and principals and not on any districtwide assessment coordination strategy. There is limited evidence that student data was used to support student learning.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured various forms of assessments (state, local, formative, summative) were integrated into a cohesive plan to guide, support and inform student learning. This integrated approach utilized data to guide the teaching and learning within and between various grades and schools.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured all forms of assessment data (state, local, formative, summative) were integrated into a cohesive plan to guide, support and inform student learning. The integration of the various assessments supported the district accountability plan and addressed local and other accountability expectations.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided little or no support to building leaders and teachers to engage with or use classroom assessment evidence to inform instruction.	☐ The evidence indicates the district leader provided limited support to building leaders and teachers to engage with and use classroom assessment evidence to inform instruction, but emphasized higher stakes assessments.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided adequate support to building leaders and teachers to engage with and use classroom assessment evidence to inform instruction and not to rely only on interim and summative assessments.	☐ The evidence indicates the district leader provided meaningful support to building leaders and teachers to thoroughly engage with and use classroom assessment evidence to inform instruction and not to rely only on interim and summative assessments.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not ensure that assessment data is appropriately analyzed to support student learning or to evaluate school and district programs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured assessment data was used in limited ways to support student learning and evaluate school and district programs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured assessment data was used appropriately to support student learning and to evaluate school and district programs.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader ensured assessment data was used extensively to support student learning and to evaluate school and district programs, with efforts made to demonstrate that the use of data supports a more transparent and fair decision-making process.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided little or no methods or strategies to communicate assessment results or their use to relevant stakeholders.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided limited communication of assessment results to relevant stakeholders, although with no consistent process or plan to make the results available to appropriate stakeholders.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided an adequate variety of methods for communicating the assessment results to relevant stakeholders.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided clear and transparent communication of information to all relevant stakeholders in a variety of ways appropriate to the audiences.

Evidence for Component 2.3: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

Construct 3: Developing Staff

The district leader will work to establish a professional learning community that is involved in the establishment of processes and systems for the support and evaluation of a high-performing, diverse staff. Effective evaluation processes are implemented for all staff, supporting reflection, feedback and continuous growth.

3.1 Establishing and Maintaining a Culture of Learning

Goal ☐

The district leader worked to establish a collaborative learning ethos with the common purpose throughout the district of achieving district learning goals. The district leader modeled the role of "learner." The district leader built collective efficacy throughout the district by working with district and school leaders to celebrate district, school and individual accomplishments, contributions and efforts in reaching student learning goals.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader developed little or no communication efforts or awareness among stakeholders of the district message that learning is important for everyone.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader developed some awareness among stakeholders of the district message that learning is important for everyone, but with limited evidence of communication across the district.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader appropriately communicated through an adequate variety of strategies awareness among most stakeholders of the district message that learning is important for everyone.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader extensively communicated through a wide variety of strategies to effectively target each audience. This created an understanding among all stakeholders of the district's message that learning is important for everyone.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not build or nurture a collective sense of efficacy. While there may have been occasional rhetoric of learning for all, there is little evidence that it had meaning.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader attempted to build a collective sense of efficacy through occasional, but inconsistent, promotions of student learning.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader made adequate attempts at building a collective sense of efficacy, promoting the belief that all students and adults are learners with evident support across the district.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader built a deeply held collective sense of efficacy, with obvious promotions of the belief that all students and adults are learners, with learning clearly supported and celebrated consistently across the district.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not participate in professional development to support his/her own growth or the district strategic plan and goals, but instead participated in stand-alone, disjointed activities or only professional development targeted for other staff within the district.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader participated in some professional development activities to support his/her own growth or the district strategic plan and goals.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader participated in appropriate professional development activities to support his/her own growth or the district strategic plan and goals, although the activities may have been narrowly focused.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader had a personal growth plan, and actively pursued professional growth and was visible as a learner to staff.

Evidence for Component 3.1: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

3.2 Establishing and Maintaining a Process for Staff Evaluations

Goal ☐

The district leader was responsible for establishing and maintaining a process for staff evaluations in a fair and effective manner to recognize excellence, support growth and identify the need for remediation.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader maintained an evaluation process that was not transparent, and many staff did not view the evaluation process as fair or relevant in providing for continuous improvement.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader maintained an evaluation process that was somewhat transparent in that documentation of the processes existed, but was not widely available or was generic across different roles and responsibilities. Some staff did not view the evaluation process as fair, relevant and meaningful for continuous improvement.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a transparent staff evaluation process. The evaluation processes and criteria were shared and discussed with those staff members being evaluated, with training for all involved. Evidence indicates that the evaluation process was seen as important and fair.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a transparent evaluation process that involved the relevant stakeholders, and appropriately considered the work relevant to each position within the district. The evaluation processes and criteria were shared and discussed, with training for all involved. Evidence indicates that the evaluation process was seen as important, fair and instrumental in staff development.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader maintained an evaluation process that did not use multiple measures or time points in evaluating staff performance and did not have a formative component in the process. Staff members received a summative evaluation at the end of the school year, with little or no prior discussions of performance during the school year. There is no evidence of actionable performance feedback being provided during the school year.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader maintained an evaluation process that occasionally used multiple measures and had a formative component that was weak and not utilized for the most benefit. The process did not identify the time or frequency that formative evaluations should take place during the school year, so that it was largely haphazard. Continuous improvement was discussed as part of the evaluation but was often not adhered to in the actual process.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented an evaluation process that regularly used multiple measures and had both formative and summative components. The formative was effectively utilized in following up with the previous year's summative remediation needs and with the current year's goals and objectives for each member of staff. The formative sessions provided immediate feedback and assessment of progress toward the professional improvement goals and a focus on continuous improvement.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented an evaluation process that systematically used multiple measures collected over time and had a strong formative component. The process provided the opportunity of a self-assessment prior to each formal formative and summative meeting. The process, implementation and results of both formative and summative evaluations incorporated best evaluation practices by connecting evaluations to future professional development.

Evidence for Component 3.2: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

3.3 Supporting Professional Learning

Goal ☐

The district leader analyzed district and school data to identify staffing needs, supported the delivery of needs-based professional learning services and used evaluation data to monitor the impact of professional learning on student learning and professional practice. The district leader made appropriate and needed resources available to support and deliver a differentiated professional learning program. The district leader recognized that change takes time and requires ongoing support.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized little or no data of any type to inform decisions on professional development activities that supported district goals. Decisions about professional development were based on "hunches" or personal preferences, with little communication to staff about rationales.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized limited data (primarily from formative and summative evaluations) to inform decisions on professional development activities to support district goals, with little effort to communicate how the data analysis informed decisions.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized adequate data (primarily from formative and summative evaluations and staff input) to inform decisions on differentiated professional development activities to support the district goals, with a clear articulation of how the various data sources informed the decisions made regarding the professional development activities.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader extensively utilized varied types of data (staff evaluations and observations, staff input, student assessment data, district goals, strategic plan) to inform decisions on differentiated professional development activities to support the district goals, with a clear communication about the decisions.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized little or no data from staff evaluations, observations, surveys or student assessments to monitor professional development activities.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader monitored the effectiveness of professional development being provided within schools and district in a limited way. Limited data from staff evaluations, observations, surveys and student assessments was used to assess the effectiveness of professional development, but there was no evidence of a systemic plan in place for consistent monitoring and feedback.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented an adequate plan for monitoring the effectiveness of most professional development being provided within schools and district. The monitoring plan made use of multiple data sources, such as staff evaluations, observations, surveys and student assessments.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader placed a strong emphasis on monitoring the effectiveness of all professional development activities and utilized multiple sources of data, building a strong base of support for accountability on the part of all involved in the identification and implementation of professional development activities.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates professional development activities tended to be of the "one-size-fits-all" variety, with little or no evidence that they are job embedded.	☐ The evidence indicates professional development was occasionally based on data but with limited differentiation and reliance on job-embedded approaches. There was limited choice offered to staff.	☐ The evidence indicates professional development across the district was regularly differentiated for most staff, using job-embedded approaches with some degree of choice recognizing needs, interests and specializations.	☐ The evidence indicates professional development across the district was systematically ongoing, job embedded and differentiated for all staff, with a variety of choice recognizing needs, interests and specializations.

Evidence for Component 3.3: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

3.4 Building and Sustaining Capacity for Leadership Throughout the System

Goal ☐

The district leader implemented programs and strategies to build leadership capacity throughout the system. Leadership was encouraged, recognized and celebrated at all levels of district staffing. Every effort was made to ensure that leadership capacity is being emphasized and encouraged by all district staff in an effort to create sustainability for improving success with student learning goals.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized little or no data in planning activities and strategies to build leadership capacity in school and district leadership positions. Data was seldom, if ever, used to identify leadership needs in the schools and district or prepare for changes in formal leadership positions at any level.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized limited data in planning activities and strategies to build leadership capacity in school and district leadership positions. Data was used, although inconsistently and with no systemic approach, to identify leadership needs in the school and district or prepare for changes in formal leadership positions at any level.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized appropriate data in planning activities and strategies to build leadership capacity in school and district leadership positions. Data was regularly used to identify leadership needs in the school and district and prepare for changes in formal leadership positions at any level.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader utilized data extensively to build leadership capacity in school and district leadership positions. The district leader placed emphasis on a collaborative approach that involved all relevant stakeholders to identify and implement varied leadership development activities. These activities were designed to build leadership capacity and prepare for changes in formal leadership positions at all levels.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided no commitment or plan to build leadership capacity at the classroom, building and district level. The district leader did not recognize the responsibility to share district leadership skills with the community.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided some activity, although not a plan, to build leadership capacity at the classroom, building and district level, but with insufficient time, resources and professional development activities. The district leader occasionally recognized the responsibility to share district leadership skills with the community, but was somewhat inconsistent.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented an appropriate plan to build leadership capacity at the classroom, building and district level, with mostly adequate time, resources and leadership experiences. The district leader recognized the responsibility to share district leadership skills with the community, but the support had to be sought out.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader implemented a sophisticated and professional plan to build leadership capacity at the classroom, building and district level, with broad staff buy-in and support. The district leader recognized the responsibility and actively encouraged staff to share district leadership skills at all levels with the community.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not recognize, promote and celebrate leadership accomplishments.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader occasionally recognized, promoted and celebrated leadership accomplishments.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader regularly recognized, promoted and celebrated leadership accomplishments for staff members.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader systematically provided a strong and consistent commitment to recognize, promote and celebrate leadership accomplishments for all staff members.

Evidence for Component 3.4: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

Construct 4: Engaging Stakeholders and External Influencers

The district leader will establish structures and processes that result in broad community engagement with all district stakeholders in promoting ownership for the district vision. This engagement will be with school and district staff, students, parents, school board members, community members, government leaders and business leaders.

4.1 Advocating for Education

Goal ☐

The district leader advocated for education and students at the local, state and national levels. The district leader provided information to allow others to be advocates and developed advocacy capacity within the district.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not engage in any forms of advocacy for educational policy to support the district's vision and strategic plan at the local, state and/or national level.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader engaged in limited forms of advocacy for educational policy to support aspects of the district's vision and strategic plan at the local, state and/or national level, but rarely at more than one level and in sporadic ways.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader engaged in appropriate forms of advocacy for educational policy that supports the district's vision and strategic plan at the local, state and/or national level.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader engaged effectively in multiple forms of advocacy for educational policy that supports the district's vision and strategic plan at the local, state and national level and that supports the overall welfare of students at the local, state and national level.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader rarely, if ever, communicated to stakeholders about his/her advocacy activities, nor provided updates to the board with respect to appropriate laws, policies and procedures from local, state and federal mandates.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader occasionally communicated to some of the relevant stakeholders about his/her advocacy activities and provided infrequent updates to the board with respect to appropriate laws, policies and procedures from local, state and federal mandates, although sometimes information was not forthcoming, was unclear or was not timely.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader regularly communicated to most relevant stakeholders about his/her advocacy activities and ensured board members were kept up to date with all appropriate laws, policies and procedures from local, state and federal mandates.	☐ The evidence indicates the district leader systematically communicated effectively to relevant stakeholders about his/her advocacy activities. The district leader ensured that board members were kept up to date with all appropriate laws, policies and procedures from local, state and federal mandates; had a clear understanding of the specific impacts that they would have on the district; and recommended alternative actions for board members to take.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader rarely, if ever, provided guidance to staff and other stakeholders across the district as they engaged in advocacy at various levels.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader occasionally provided guidance to staff and other stakeholders across the district as they engaged in advocacy at various levels.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader regularly provided guidance to staff and other stakeholders across the district as they engaged in advocacy at various levels.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided structured opportunities for staff and other stakeholders to build advocacy capacity across the district and provided guidance to help them develop skills.

Evidence for Component 4.1: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

4.2 Collaborating with the Local Community and Special Interest Groups

Goal ☐

The district leader consistently collaborated with staff and community members (including parents and special interest groups) and responded to diverse community interests and needs. This was a two-way process that both used community resources to support student development and learning and provided district resources to support community projects. An active effort was made to create programs, initiatives and projects that utilize the resources of the community in support of student learning. The district leader attempted to use resources, facilities and expertise in providing support to community projects and initiatives.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader made no efforts to engage in two-way relationship building between the district and the local community. There is little or no evidence indicating that the district leader was able to make connections across people or projects in a way that supports student learning.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader made limited efforts to engage in two-way relationship building between the district and the local community, with results being largely one-sided at best. The process was not planned but capitalized occasionally on presented opportunities.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader tried to engage in two-way relationship building between the district and the local community, with active and mostly successful efforts to both create district programs, initiatives and projects that utilized the resources of the community in support of student learning and to provide the use of district resources, facilities and expertise for community projects and initiatives. The two-way support capitalized on opportunities, but was not actively planned.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader actively engaged in two-way relationship building between the district and the local community, with active and successful efforts to both create district programs, initiatives and projects that utilized the resources of the community in support of student learning and to provide the use of district resources, facilities and expertise for community projects and initiatives. This two-way support was actively planned for and developed.
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader was not able to get support from stakeholders or involve them in district projects and initiatives.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader was limited in his/her ability to get support from stakeholders and involve them in district projects and initiatives.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader was mostly successful at getting support from stakeholders and involving them in district projects and initiatives.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader was consistently able to get support from stakeholders and involve them in district projects and initiatives.

N/A	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
☒	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader did not provide opportunities for stakeholders to engage in, react to or provide support and feedback on district initiatives.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided limited opportunities for stakeholders to engage in, react to and provide support and feedback on district initiatives. Opportunities were sporadic or had no feedback.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided adequate opportunities for stakeholders to engage in, react to and provide support and feedback on most important district initiatives.	☐ The evidence indicates that the district leader provided multiple and varied opportunities for stakeholders to engage in, react to and provide support and feedback on all relevant district initiatives.

Evidence for Component 4.2: Please describe any artifacts to be included in the evaluation file.

Construct 1 **Construct 2** **Construct 3** **Construct 4**

IPP Summary Rating

Instructional Practices Rating Comments

Evaluator Signature _____ **Date** _____

Evaluatee Signature _____ **Date** _____