Instructional Leadership
(Instructional Leadership I: EDLPS 571A, 571B, 571C)

Lead Faculty:

Jessica G. Rigby
Assistant Professor
College of Education, Miller M207
Tel: 206-616-5607 / jrigby@uw.edu

The Leadership for Learning Program's Instructional Leadership strand engages you in an examination into understanding both the field's best knowledge of what high-quality learning is, and how to generate it at a systems level. To do so, you will read, discuss, and collect and analyze data around learning at all levels of a school district's system, including students, teachers, and school and district leaders. Concurrently, you will examine the leadership actions and formal and informal organizational systems that serve as levers for learning. We will use three key questions at each level of analysis: *what is the learning, how does the learning occur*, and *when and under what conditions do people learn*?

Year 1 of this strand has three primary parts. Part I grounds our systems-focused examination in a common understanding of what "high-quality student learning" (HQSL) means and looks like. From a systems perspective, it is often hard to see student learning absent instructional practices. We will therefore also look at some instructional moves, such as press in classroom discussions, as a vehicle to examine the kind of learning that emerges from particular instructional practices.

Part II of Year 1 will focus on teachers: both their instruction and their learning needs. This section will serve as a preliminary analysis into professional learning for teachers from a systems' perspective. We will go more in depth into PLCs and collective learning in Year II in the Instructional Leadership strand. In this first pass we will explore what counts as "high-quality instruction" (HQI) and how we know when it's happening. We will address questions such as: What are the gaps between current practice and HQI? Historically and currently, who receives HQI? What are the next and best practices to address adult learning? How are teacher frameworks reflective of HQI and teacher learning needs? How are those frameworks aligned to HQSL?

In Part III of Year 1 of the Instructional Leadership strand, we will address school and district leader learning and leadership. How much do district leaders need to know about HQSL and HQI? How much do site leaders need to know? From a systems-perspective, this is the edge of the field. Similar to divisions in school districts between leadership and Curriculum & Instruction (C+I), the research field has seemingly divided along similar lines, arguing that different levels of knowledge are both needed and practical. We will take up these questions as well as others, such as: How can school and district leaders disrupt the current system and move towards more equitable outcomes for all students? In what ways do principal and district leader frameworks reflect the leadership practices needed to create more just schools? In what ways do they address leader-learning needs?

Learning Objectives & Links to L4L Leadership Standards

Over two years, this strand aims to deepen your ability to lead along Standard 3 of the L4L Leadership Standards. According to this standard, when leaders demonstrate Leadership for High-quality Teaching and Learning, they:

- Lead the design and implementation of a coherent theory-based vision of relevant, rigorous, inclusive, and culturally-responsive instruction for all students, beyond an individual school, and shared by district and community stakeholders.
- Design, adapt, select, and use instructional frameworks, evaluation systems, and other leadership tools to optimize student and adult learning.
- Engage school and community expertise and other resources in efforts to improve student and adult learning.
- Support the learning of adults from a teaching-and-learning stance to continuously strengthen their practice in ways that increase equitable learning for every student.

In addition, we will also focus on your leadership for Equity & Excellence, specifically with the following standard:

- Foster the collective responsibility, growth, and capacity of others to identify historic and systemic disparities in learning environments and outcomes and to ensure that the needs, interests, and assets of non-dominant students are central in change efforts.

Expectations for Participation

Please see the L4L Guide to Participation and Grading Procedures for our shared, program-wide expectations of your participation in this and the other L4L curricular strands, including what to do to request accommodations.

Grading

Grades for Instructional Leadership follow the common procedures outlined in the L4L Guide to Participation and Grading Procedures. We define grades on the Instructional Leadership Grading Rubric. Per the rubric, your grade for Instructional Leadership is based 50% on participation (including completion of all IL Assignments), and 50% is based on your final project, due in May. Your final project will be an accumulation of the smaller assignments you did throughout the year: an audit of the learning and leadership towards learning in a particular system (e.g., classroom, school, district). The final project can be done in pairs or groups of three; more information will be given out in December.

Grades for EDLPS 571 A (fall) and B (winter) are based on adequate progress toward completion of the strand. For EDLPS 571 C (spring) you will receive a letter grade based on the quality of your work in Instructional Leadership across the entire year as outlined in the Grading Rubric.

Due Dates

You must complete all readings prior to the sessions for which they are assigned using the questions in to the readings guides to focus your reading. We suggest that as you read you take notes on the readings around the questions in the syllabus or engage in other strategies to make sure you come to Instructional Leadership sessions fully prepared to discuss the questions in the syllabus. Except where noted below, all Instructional Leadership Assignments (ILAs) are due in Chalk & Wire by 8:30am on the Friday of the session for which they are due. Please label your files: LAST NAME ILA#.

Where are the Required Readings?
All required readings are either in a book the program has purchased for you or posted in Chalk &
Wire.

SESSIONS & READINGS

Year 1

High-quality Student Learning (Fall Quarter, 2015)
In this four-month exploration into the meaning of high-quality student learning and the systems
that support it, we will both build a collective theory of student learning and a heuristic of the
systems that serve as levers to create the conditions under which improving ambitious and equitable
student learning can happen. As student learning is an entire field of study that can occupy a career
(or many), in the first four months we will explore the foundational elements of the field's current
understanding, often breaking into smaller groups to study particular elements of cohort members'
interests. In addition, we will have several expert guest speakers join us at different points in the
quarter.

September, 2015	High-quality Student Learning: The case of mathematics

We will start our inquiry with the information that most district leaders start with when making
decisions for instructional systems: achievement data. Then, we will explore what high-quality
student learning looks like in a mathematics lesson (taught by Dr. Emily Shahan, a mathematics
educator), and how this is different from learning opportunities in traditional mathematics' lessons.
We will focus on two important aspects of high-quality student learning in mathematics: the learning
opportunity afforded by the task and the level of cognitive demand maintained through the
experience. Finally, we will conclude the class with an introduction to The Fishbone, an approach to
understanding school systems—and in this case how school systems can support high-quality
student learning.

There are no readings or assignments for this session.

October, 2015	Building a Theory of Student Learning: Accumulation versus relinking and growth

In this class we will discuss frameworks for understanding high-quality student learning as a whole,
as well as dig more deeply into one key aspect of a student's experience important to his or her
learning: student talk. As site and district leaders, one of the most accessible means of assessing
student learning is via talk—it is (or can be) an audible instantiation of learning. Our collective
understanding of the association between student talk and HQSL will allow for a common language
of what we mean by "high-quality student learning," as well as a more nuanced assessment and
elaboration of what kind of system(s) will support such learning. Dr. Anita Lenges will join us for a
lecture and discussion on student talk as student learning.

Please see the assignment sheet for guiding questions for each reading, as well as a more detailed description of the assignment task.

<u>Common Anchoring Reading</u>
Engle, R. A., & Conant, F. R. (2002). Guiding principles for fostering productive disciplinary engagement: Explaining an emergent argument in a community of learners classroom. *Cognition and Instruction*, *20*(4), 399-483.

<u>Team Readings</u>
Team A: Accountable Talk
- Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. B. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life. *Studies in philosophy and education*, *27*(4), 283-297.

Team B: Press
- Kazemi, E., & Stipek, D. (2001). Promoting conceptual thinking in four upper-elementary mathematics classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 59-80.

Team C: Math-talk Learning Community
- Hufferd-Ackles, K., Fuson, K. C., & Sherin, M. G. (2004). Describing levels and components of a math-talk learning community. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 81-116.

Team D: Questioning Patterns
- Herbal-Eisenmann, B. A., & Breyfogle, M. L. (2005). Questioning Our Patterns of Questioning. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, *10*(9), 484-489.
- Kazemi, E., & Hintz, A. (2014). Chapter 4 "Targeting Discussion: Why? Let's Justify" in *Intentional talk: How to structure and lead productive mathematical discussions*. Stenhouse Publishers.

<u>Assignment:</u>
See Assignment page for detailed description.

| November, 2015 | Socio-Emotional Learning: Foundation for academic learning |

In the mid-2000's, Oakland (CA) preteens and teens were statistically more likely to die in a firearm homicide than kids in nearly all other major US cities (New Orleans and St. Louis topped the list). Gun violence and death was a regular occurrence in the lives of the children in Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) schools. Knowing that exposure to violence can result in a number of trauma symptoms, including depression, anger, anxiety, dissociation, posttraumatic stress, and total trauma, OUSD has responded by implementing a number of programs aimed at supporting students' socio-emotional learning (SEL), including a daily mindfulness session in every elementary school classroom. OUSD is not alone; many urban school districts face similar realities in their cities. Other districts and schools that may not face similar challenges, however, are also embracing SEL to promote the non-academic skills that all students need to succeed in school and in society.

SEL is described with five core competencies:
- *Self-awareness*: Recognizing one's emotions and values as well as one's strengths and limitations

- *Self-management*: Managing emotions and behaviors to achieve one's goals
- *Social awareness*: Showing understanding and empathy for others
- *Relationship skills*: Forming positive relationships, working in teams, and dealing directly with conflict
- *Responsible decision making*: Making ethical, constructive choices about personal and social behavior

One challenge in the field is that SEL is often considered to be a set of models and programs that are pushed into schools. Some scholars are concerned about this trajectory, and instead focus on equity and the SEL development of low-income and racially-ethnically diverse youth.

In this class session we will explore the key competencies of SEL in greater detail and analyze a SEL opportunity in your organization. In addition, we will return to The Fishbone to both understand how SEL is a key part of high-quality student learning (the head), as well as how programs to support SEL fit into a broader system of support for high-quality student learning. The following questions will guide our session:
- How is SEL defined? How does this fit into our definition of HQSL?
- What are the current systems to support SEL in schools? What do they address? What might they background or ignore?

Readings
Jones, S. M., & Bouffard, S. M. (2012). Social and Emotional Learning in Schools: From Programs to Strategies. Social Policy Report. *Society for Research in Child Development*, *26*(4), 3-16.
Note: there are four commentaries at the end of the report that respond to the main report. They are optional to read!
- What does this report argue is the broad shift that should be made in the way schools address SEL? Why do they support this change?
- How does this report define SEL? What are its major parts? What influences this learning?
- How do these authors distinguish "culture" from "climate" in a school? What is the relationship between SEL and a school's climate and culture? In other words, how does the former influence the latter and vise-versa?
- What do the authors mean by a "continuum of approaches" to SEL? Why do they argue for this approach?

Dymnicki, A., Sambolt, M., & Kidron, Y. (2013). Improving college and career readiness by incorporating social and emotional learning. *Washington, DC: College & Career Readiness & Success Center at American Institutes for Research.* 1-19.
- How do these authors define SEL? What are 2-3 benefits of SEL in adolescence in particular?
- This report advocates for the implementation of SEL standards at the state level. What are some pros and cons to this approach (the use of standards) as a lever for change?
- What are some of the commonalities of the programs and initiatives this report highlights? How would the authors of the first report (Jones & Bouffard, 2012) respond to the promotion of these programs?
- What are some benefits of measuring the success of SEL programs? What are some barriers to doing so? Why do these authors make note of measuring implementation as well as outcomes?

Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs: Preschool and Elementary School Edition + Middle and High School Edition: CASEL, 2013.
  *Choose the Preschool/Elementary OR the Secondary version of this report.

Instructional Leadership I Syllabus

- *Skim Chapter 2.* What are the key differences between CASEL's "Theory of Action" for the District and for the School in implementing SEL systemically? What is CASEL's vision for this systemic implementation? In other words, what outcomes do they hope for?
- *Read Chapter 3.* How does CASEL describe their criteria for high-quality SEL programs? How, if at all, do these criteria differ from the other reports' explanations of high-quality/effective SEL?
- *Read through the introduction to Chapter 4.* Then carefully look at the tables evaluating ONE level of program (i.e. preschool, K-5, Secondary). What information can you glean from this guide? What information can you NOT glean? Why might that other information be important for your selection of programs?

Bryk, A., L. M. Gomez, A. Grunow, and P. G. LeMahieu. "See the System that Produces the Current Outcomes" in *Learning to Improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better.* p. 57-85.

Assignment:

See Assignment sheet for a full description. In short: a Brief SEL Analysis in your context. Identify a SEL-related initiative in your context or a context you are familiar with (i.e. your school, a school you work with, your department in a Central Office, your district as a whole, etc). Using the observation OR interview protocol spotlight, gather information about the initiative. Write a brief 1-page description of the initiative based on your exploration. Then, identify four characteristics of SEL described across the readings that you found particularly compelling or important to quality design or implementation. Write an additional 1-2-page analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of this program/initiative in relation to these four elements. How well does the program/ initiative/ policy in your context exemplify these characteristics (or not)? Finally, make one recommendation that would bring the initiative more in line with high-quality SEL. *Note: you can also do this in pairs around the same initiative. In this case, you will use both the observation and interview protocols, and your analysis should be one page longer (2-3 pages).*

December, 2015	Informal Learning Spaces: Learning outside of school

Students spend very little time in formal learning environments in their schooling years, and especially over a lifetime: in grades 1-12, they spend about 18.5% of their waking hours in school (waking hours = 16); this decreases to 7.7% by undergrad, and 5.1% in graduate school. This time only decreases the further a person gets from school age. If we are going to have a deep understanding of student learning, we need to first, understand that learning is happening in all kinds of places, second, understand what is happening in those spaces, and finally, work towards leveraging what is happening to create spaces that are productive and can support children in a more expansive conception of learning than we typically have in classrooms. These productive and expansive spaces are called Third Spaces. In this session we will address the following questions:

- How are conceptions of learning in Third Spaces distinct from those in traditional classroom learning?
- What types of designs for Third Space lead to productive learning?
- In what ways is the learning that happens in Third Spaces distinct than what is traditionally learned in classrooms? In what ways is it similar?

In this session we will read several foundational texts as well as a study by Dr. Megan Bang. Dr. Bang will join us for an hour during the class to talk about Third Spaces as an idea as well as about her work in particular.

Readings (guiding questions TBA)
Nasir, N. S., A Rosebery, B. Warren, and C. D. Lee. Learning as a Cultural Process: Achieving equity through diversity. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of The Learning Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 489-504.
Guiding Questions:
- What is an example of a repertoire of practice that you learned outside of school? Did you make connections to academic subjects (perhaps unknowingly)? If so, which and how?
- Think of an example of a student who learned a repertoire of practice outside of school, and how you might make (or made) explicit connections to academic content (make the structure of the domain visible).

Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational researcher*, *32*(5), 19-25.
Guiding Questions:
- This paper is about a different way of understanding how culture impacts learning (not about learning outside of school, per se). Read this first.
- How do the authors problematize "cultural learning styles"?
- Describe "linguistic and cultural-historical repertoires" in your own words. How is this approach different from cultural learning styles?
- From a systems-leadership perspective, what's one approach you can take to start to make this shift with your teachers and principals?

Bang, M., & Medin, D. (2010). Cultural Processes in Science Education: Supporting the Navigation of Multiple Epistemologies. *Science Learning in Everyday Life,* 94(6), 1008-1026.
Guiding Questions:
- How are culture and learning utilized in designed learning environments in this study? What are the implications for classroom learning and instruction?
- This study not only positions learners as cultural beings but also subject matter. What questions, challenges, and opportunities does this raise, particularly with respect to science education?

Assignment:
See Assignment sheet for a full description. In short: Learning about Third Spaces in your Context
    Either by yourself or with one or two other colleagues who work in the same context: choose a cultural group that has a presence in your organization (school, district). Learn about one Third Space learning opportunity that exists in that community by utilizing the observation spotlight and interview protocol. In two to three pages, describe the Third Space, the learning that takes place there, and how these relate to the concepts raised in both the Nasir and Gutierrez articles.

Instructional Leadership I Syllabus

January, 2016	High-quality Instruction: What is it and how we grow it at scale? Using Special Education as a case.

Description: For the last four sessions, we focused on what counts as high-quality student learning, and how we identify it at scale. We are now moving out one level to look at instruction. What counts as high-quality instruction (HQI)? Similar to our focus on mathematics as a case of high-quality student learning, we are going to use a case to explore this rather unwieldy question: the case of special education. In addition, we are going to rely on the work we did in the last four sessions, exploring how our repertoires of practices and those that exist in our schools/districts relate to HQI.

Need to prep them for the shadowing experience. How long, etc—be intentional about your choices.

Essential Questions:
- Using the case of special education, what counts as HQI?
- How do these characterizations of HQI relate to what we described as high-quality student learning?
- How do we know if this level of instruction is happening at scale?
- What are informal and formal structures that both enable and hinder HQI at scale?

Readings:
Smith, R. M., Salend, S. J., & Ryan, S. (2001). Watch Your Language Closing or Opening the Special Education Curtain. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *33*(4), 18-23.

Guiding Questions:
- In your own words, <u>define</u> "deficit-oriented language," "deficit-oriented interactions," "competence-oriented language," and "competence-oriented interactions," based on the examples presented in the reading. How, if at all, do your definitions differ from any previous understandings you've had about these ideas?
- How does the use of competence-oriented language and interactions fit into your understanding of high-quality instruction?
- How would the use of competence-oriented language be a means to get to HQSL in the case of special education?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the "watch your language" checklist in Figure 1 as a tool for teachers and leaders? Would you improve it in any way? How, if at all, could it be incorporated into a discussion or training on HQSL?
- Imagine a tool to assess if competence-oriented language is happening at scale in your context.

Barrett, L. (2013). Seamless Teaching: Navigating the Inclusion Spectrum. *Teaching Tolerance*, *52*(43), 53-55. [Also read the 3-page toolkit.]

Guiding Questions:

Instructional Leadership I Syllabus

- The authors state that Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and Differentiated Instruction (DI) are two approaches that can meet the needs of all learners. Reflect on the math lesson that we did in the first session with Emily Shahan—what about that lesson met the authors' descriptions of both (or either) of these approaches?
- Make two lists: one that describes the characteristics of what you think high-quality instruction looks like generally, and one that describes the characteristics of HQI for students with identified into special education (based on this article). In what ways are your lists the same? Different? Discuss the comparison.
- Look at the six co-teaching models. Which do you think will lead to more opportunities for HQSL? Why?

Theoharis, G., Causton, J., & Woodfield, C. (2015). Inclusive Leadership and Disability. In *Leadership for Increasingly Diverse Schools*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Guiding Questions:
- The authors discuss the "social construction of disability" (pages 17-18). In what ways is this similar to the ideas in the Smith et. al. article? How does it add to the argument?
- The authors raise challenges with RTI, a commonly practiced approach to providing services to students with identified disabilities. What are the concerns they raise? Do you see this playing out in your context?
- Look at the service delivery maps on pages 24-26. Is your school (or a school in your district) organized in one of these ways? How does the structure of your school (or a school in your district) align to the goals for students identified with special needs? How do the structures and the goals align to the services provided?

February, 2016   Leading indicators of high-quality instruction: practical measures.

Description: In the fall, we briefly explored practical measures as one way of knowing if HQSL was happening at scale. We return to the concept this session in more detail, and with a deeper common understanding of HQSL and HQI. Further, we will discuss how a case of one can illustrate what is happening at scale.

Essential Questions:
- What kinds of information can you learn about HQSL and HQI vis-à-vis a practical measure? What kinds of information are backgrounded?
- What can a case of one (i.e., the student you shadowed) illustrate about HQSL and HQI? What kinds of information are backgrounded?

Readings:
Easton, L. B. (2004). Shadowing students. In L. B Easton (Ed.), *Powerful designs for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council. *(And "Handout")*

Guiding Questions:
1. The author states several benefits of shadowing as a form of professional development. What are your goals for your shadowing experience? Are the similar or different to the ones Easton writes about?
2. What preparation are you going to do before you shadow? Make a list (use both the chapter and the handout for this).

3. Make a plan to debrief (written) within 12 hours of your shadowing experience. Write out questions you plan to answer, but be sure to leave yourself time and space to reflect on other things that emerged.

Anonymous L4L Student. (2006). The Life of a High School Immigrant Student: A Case Study of Farah.

Guiding Questions:
1. What did the author want to learn and why?
2. What can you surmise about how she set up the process so that it was practical, productive and comfortable for all?
3. How did she focus her attention? (What did she want to observe?)
4. How do you imagine she took notes? (Considerations: For example, did she say if she worked out advance agreements with the student? How would you imagine she kept track of facts/inferences/wonders? When thinking about your own approach, will you separate your notes into different columns, sort them out when you review your notes, or use another system?)
5. Think ahead to your shadowing experience: how will you make sense of your notes?
6. The author's approach informed her teaching. As educational leaders, what do you expect to do with the information so that it transfers to your own context?

Yeager, D., Bryk, A., Muhich, J., Hausman, H., & Morales, L. (2013). Practical measurement. *Palo Alto, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (Note: some of you looked at a measure that we created based on this study in the second session in the fall—it might sound familiar!)*

Guiding Questions:
1. How do the authors define *improvement research*? Describe the six tenets. How is this different from other kinds of research?
2. What is the persistent problem the researchers are trying to assess in the case study?
3. What is their *practical theory*? What makes a practical theory different from other theoretical approaches?
4. Given that you are not a research institution, how will you assess changes, predict, and set priorities in your process of practical measurement?

Assignment (see assignment sheet for more details):
Part One: Shadow a student for a ½ of a day.
Part Two: Design a practical measure to assess the level of HQI the student you shadowed received

March, 2016   Teacher Frameworks and High-quality Instruction: how they are used in practice, and how *can* they be used to improve instructional practice?

Description: Teacher frameworks are key levers are used in school systems to answer the question, "is HQI happening?" In this session we raise several questions about this lever, relating the tools to our previous discussions about HQSL and HQL. We will investigate how the frameworks support our ability to know when and under what conditions HQI and HQSL are happening, and in which ways they constrain our ability to do so.

Guest Speaker: Anneke Merkle, co-creator (and ongoing developer) of the CEL 5D

Essential Questions:
- Do the frameworks provide clarity around what we mean by HQI?
- How are the frameworks used (rather than "done") that lead to instructional improvement?
- What are the conditions that enable or hinder this process?

Readings:
Baeder, A. (2010). Stepping into students' worlds. *Educational Leadership. 67* (5), pp. 56-60.

Ginsberg, M. (2007). Lessons at the kitchen table. *Educational Leadership. 64* (6), pp. 56-61.
Guiding Questions for both above readings:
- Describe "funds of knowledge" in your own words as explained in these two pieces. How can home visits use this concept?
- Throughout these articles, what are 3-4 benefits of home visits—instructional, social, communal, etc.-- that the authors highlight?
- In preparation for your own home visits, what are 1-2 strategies, frames, or best practices that you take away from these articles? Why those?

Hallinger, P., Heck, R. H., & Murphy, J. (2014). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *26*(1), 5-28.
Three eminent educational leadership scholars wrote this article. It is a review of three key bodies of literature that, together, examine whether or not a strong focus on modern-era teacher evaluation is likely to lead to school improvement.
Guiding Questions:
- On pages 7-8, Hallinger, Heck, and Murphy lay out the "policy logic," used by policymakers to support teacher evaluation policies as a "theory of action" of how teacher evaluation will positively impact student learning. How do they explain this logic? How might you critique the way that they explain this "theory of action," based on the work you've done in Inquiry?
- In section 3.1, the authors examine research on teacher effects on student outcomes and conclude that teachers do have measurable effects on student learning. What are the authors' main critiques of the most-often studied and used form of " value-added-measures" (VAMs) in measuring these effects? You don't need to fully understand the models that are laid out as evidence in Table 1, but what implications for using these "two-level " VAMs to study teacher effects are uncovered here?
- In section 3.2, the authors see what research says about whether new models of teacher evaluation have made an impact on student learning and find quite "inconsistent and unstable" results in the literature. Which evidence from this section made the most compelling argument for using VAMs with caution? Why that evidence?
- In section 3.3, the authors turn to broader organizational literature to examine how teacher evaluation might fit in the broader educational landscape. In your own words, summarize what they found in this section of the review. What might need to change about educational organizations for teacher evaluation to better "fit"?
- After reading their conclusion and ultimate criticism of this prevailing logic used to support teacher evaluation policy, return to the "theory of action" on pages 7-8. What elements might these authors change in or add to this model?

Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Conceptualization, measurement, and improvement of classroom processes: Standardized observation can leverage capacity. *Educational Researcher*, *38*(2), 109-119.
This article makes a case and advances a framework for foregrounding rich observational data in teacher evaluation systems. Near the end (p.114), it also presents some statistical analyses summaries

to uncover some implications about using such frameworks in research—focus here on the implications and not on the statistical terms.

Guiding Questions:
- On the whole, why do these authors say we need to include observational data from teaching interactions and classroom environments in evaluative frameworks?
- What are the authors' criticisms of value-added and prevailing notions of teacher quality?
- Pages 112-113 elaborate the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) model, which is visualized on p. 111. What are the 1-2 benefits and 1-2 challenges of using a conceptual model like the CLASS when thinking about and evaluating teaching and classrooms?
- What does the CLASS highlight as skills and competencies vital to teaching that *aren't* highlighted in more widely-used frameworks?
- How might Pianta and Hamre describe HQI?

Assignment (see assignment sheet for more details):
Part One: Complete the home visit and interview sections of the final project.
Part Two: Bring in the teacher evaluation framework you are most familiar with.

April, 2016 Instructional Leadership at the School Site: Current capacity and capacity building

Description: Since the fall, we have been discussing student learning and teachers' instruction. Now, we step back to the role of leaders to support instructional improvement to reach the goal of high-quality student learning opportunities for all students. In this session we will discuss the notion of the forms and functions of instructional leadership at the school site. Rather than thinking about the principal as instructional leader, or the coach as instructional leader (forms), we will first think about the variety of ways in which IL can serve to improve instruction in schools (function). We will also address the ways in which your practical measures can serve to inform instructional leadership at both the school and district levels.

Essential Questions:
- What are instructional leadership functions? Forms?
- In what ways do HQSL and HQI influence the functions of IL?
- How can we use practical measures to inform both the forms and functions of IL?

Readings:
Halverson, R., & Clifford, M. (2013). Distributed instructional leadership in high schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *23*(2), 389-419.

Guiding Questions:
- From the theoretical background on the first 3 pages, what is your working definition of "distributed leadership?" How do the authors distinguish "social" and "situational" distributed leadership? How do these ideas compare to your former notions, if any, of the concept?
- Describe distributed leadership's distinction between the "leadership environment" and "learning environment" in your own words. Keep refining these definitions throughout the article as the authors build on this idea.
- Describe distributed cognition's key concepts of tasks, tools, and routines in your own words. How does a leader engage with these--in the Woodrow Roosevelt case or in your own experience?

- The authors are arguing for a task-level focus for analyzing distributed leadership instead of a role-level focus. What does this mean in your own words? Can you think of an example of this distinction in your own setting?
- In what ways did distributed instructional leadership in the Woodrow Roosevelt biology curriculum case defy traditional "forms" of instructional leadership? In what ways did this distributed instructional leadership influence high-quality instruction? High-quality student learning?

Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *92*(3), 66-69.
Guiding Questions:
- Describe what the authors mean by "organizational management for instructional improvement" in your own words.
    - How does this differ and/or relate the notions of instructional leadership presented by Halverson & Clifford? ?
    - How does this differ from your own experience of principal instructional leadership?
- What might principal instructional leadership "look like" in Horng & Loeb's view?

May, 2016	Principal Evaluation: Support for Instructional Leadership

Description: Earlier this year we discussed teacher evaluation frameworks: the good, the bad, and everything in-between. In this session we will address how *school leaders* are evaluated and supported. We will start with the state view, with the leadership of our esteemed colleague Scott Seaman, and also address the role of the district in the process. The standards addressed in this session are part of the initial superintendent certificate.

Guest Speakers: Rob McGregor and Scott Seaman

Essential Questions:
- What are the WA principal evaluation criteria? In what ways do they address HQSL and HQI in meaningful ways?
- How are our current systems designed to support principals' growth as a part of the evaluation process? How can we redesign systems to do this better?
- In what ways is the principal evaluation system similar or different from the teacher one?

Readings:
Fuller, E., Hollingworth, L., & Liu, J. (2015). Evaluating State Principal Evaluation Plans Across the United States. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education. 10*(3), 164-192.

Guiding Questions:
- What are the purposes of evaluating principals?
- What are the potential challenges?
- What are the various ways that states are evaluating their principals?
- The authors argue that there is "almost no research [that] exists on how to create a fair and accurate principal evaluation system…" (186) What is their evidence for this claim?
- How does your district evaluate principals? Can you find the model in this paper? Do you think that it is "fair and accurate"?

AWSP Leadership Framework Criteria
http://www.awsp.org/resources/FrameworkCriteria

Instructional Leadership I Syllabus

- Familiarize yourself (if you're not already) with the eight criteria.